

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 25 August 1983

The SPEAKER (Mr Harman) took the Chair at 10.45 a.m., and read prayers.

## THE LATE MR JIM COX

### *Condolence*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Harman): It is with deep regret that I record the death yesterday of Mr James Albert Cox, who recently retired from the position of Chief Hansard Reporter in this Parliament.

I shall convey the sincere sympathy of the members and officers of this House to the bereaved family.

I invite all to rise for a few moments' silence as a mark of respect and tribute.

[Members stood.]

## EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR PEARCE** (Armadale—Minister for Education) [10.48 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Section 7C of the Education Act has for some time been the subject of concern and critical comment from a number of sources, including myself, the State Legislative Review and Advisory Committee, the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia, and the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations Inc.

In particular, criticism has been levelled at the latter half of the section on the grounds that its wording allows the Education Department to monitor the private, social habits of teachers, irrespective of whether those habits impinged on teachers' fitness to carry out their duties.

The previous Minister therefore agreed to engage in consultation with the Teachers' Union and the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations in an effort to achieve an amendment acceptable to all concerned. After a number of meetings with these groups and with the assistance of independent legal counsel, agreement on the rewording of the subsection was achieved. The proposed amendment to paragraph (e) of subsection (2) of section 7C reflects the consensus view of all parties.

It reads as follows—

- (e) He engaged in disgraceful or improper conduct in his official capacity or otherwise by reason of which he ceases to be a fit and proper person to hold office as a teacher.

In addition, transitional provisions have been included to allow the department to proceed with inquiries and deal with any act of misconduct by a teacher which takes place prior to this amendment being passed.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hassell (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## ACTS AMENDMENT (STUDENT GUILDS AND ASSOCIATIONS) BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR PEARCE** (Armadale—Minister for Education) [10.51 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The amending legislation has been prepared in accordance with the Government's policy to support the right of students in post-secondary education to organise and control their affairs free from Government interference. Its purpose is to abolish amenities and services fees and to enable student guilds and associations to make their own decisions regarding the expenditure of funds collected by way of membership subscriptions.

The Bill provides the framework for these changes by means of amendments to the Acts governing the relevant post-secondary education institutions—the University of Western Australia Act, Murdoch University Act, Western Australian Institute of Technology Act, and the Colleges Act. These amendments relate to matters of principle and are broadly consistent for all the institutions involved. However, some matters of detail concerning the implementation of these principles are left to be determined within each institution by means of Statutes. This will allow for variations in the approach to implementation, to suit the individual circumstances of each institution.

Students will no longer be required to pay amenities and services fees under the amending legislation. All students will be required to join a student guild or association established at their institution, unless they are ineligible for, or exempted from, membership under the terms of the legislation and relevant Statutes. An annual subscription will be payable by members to the student guild or association. The amounts of subscriptions will be determined by the student guild or association and approved by the senate or

council of each institution. There is provision for variations in the levels of subscriptions payable by different classes of students or members.

A provision for conscientious objection has been written into each of the respective Acts to ensure that any person who would otherwise be required to be a member of the appropriate guild or association may be exempted.

The amendments to the Colleges Act will provide for a student association established at a college to be a corporate body with the usual powers and liabilities associated with corporate status. This will overcome problems encountered at the Western Australian College of Advanced Education in formally establishing a guild as a corporate body within the terms of the existing legislation. The formation of a student association at a college established under the Colleges Act will not be mandatory, as such a provision might give rise to difficulties at smaller colleges, particularly during the early stages of development. These colleges will, however, be free to establish student associations as soon as circumstances permit.

It is intended that the legislative changes will be operative by the time enrolments for the 1984 academic year commence. At some institutions, it may not be possible to prepare Statutes by this time, and for this reason transitional provisions are included with respect to ineligibility of certain classes of students for membership of a student guild or association. These transitional provisions will be repealed by proclamation when relevant Statutes are promulgated. The co-operation of institutions and student bodies is being sought in preparing Statutes which are in keeping with the spirit of the amendments.

The amending legislation will remove constraints imposed on student guilds and associations by existing legislation and will provide an opportunity for these bodies to become fully responsible for the management of their affairs for the benefit of students.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hassell (Deputy Leader of the Opposition.)

### **FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR WILSON** (Nollamara—Minister for Housing) [10.55 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to increase the limit of the gross assurance sum under which contracts

can be made with any person from \$6 000 to \$25 000.

The Friendly Societies Council of Western Australia approached the previous Government to increase this limit of \$6 000 which was last set in 1964, but because of the tax advantages received by friendly societies on assurance contracts arranged over those written by life insurance companies, the previous Government did not proceed with the amendment.

This particular tax advantage was recognised by the Hon. Paul Keating, MP, the Federal Treasurer, and when he announced his economic package on 20 May 1983, he said that the tax exemption friendly societies had on life disability and accident insurance would be terminated in respect of 1983-84 and later income years.

As the friendly societies will now be assessed for tax on income derived from their commercial activities, the Act should be amended to stop any flow of funds to other States from this type of operation.

With successful marketing of single premium assurance schemes, Victorian friendly societies increased their holdings from this source, in the 12-month period to 30 June 1983, by over \$200 million. It is not known how much of this \$200 million came from Western Australia, but with the increase in the amount to \$25 000, the 10 WA friendly societies through the Friendly Societies Council of Western Australia have given assurance that the development of their schemes will reverse any trends that may have been set.

The council has also given an assurance that its policy of keeping the money derived from its assurance contracts in WA for home buyers will be retained. This is achieved by investing the funds with the Western Australian permanent building societies.

Under today's conditions in the financial markets, the limit of \$6 000 per member is not adequate. The increase to \$25 000 will, however, provide a more realistic figure for WA friendly societies to compete with their counterparts in other parts of Australia, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hassell (Deputy Leader of the Opposition.)

### **CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 4 August.

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.59 a.m.]: My understanding, from the remarks of the Minister when

introducing this Bill, and my reading of it, is that this Bill is consequential upon the amendments to the Electoral Act which the Minister has introduced.

Under those amendments he seeks a uniform Australia-wide system of qualification for enrolment based on Australian citizenship. He now seeks to delete from the Constitution Acts Amendment Act a specific provision that a member of Parliament must be a British subject. Instead, the qualification for membership of Parliament will be based upon the qualification for enrolment to vote in elections for Parliament. On that basis I do not see any difficulty with the Bill and it has our support.

**MR TONKIN** (Morley-Swan—Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform) [11.01 a.m.]: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his support of the Bill. As he said, it is quite a minor amendment to the legislation, and is designed to bring the qualification for membership of either House of this Parliament into line with the qualifications passed by this House in the Electoral Amendment Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

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

#### *Third Reading*

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform), and transmitted to the Council.

#### **ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY**

##### *Amendment to Motion*

Debate resumed from 24 August.

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.04 a.m.]: I second the amendment to the motion and give it my support, in my capacity as shadow Minister for Employment and Administrative Services, and with a concern for the issues that are raised in the amendment.

I want to refer firstly to the points made by the Premier last night in defence of the Government's position on the Yeelirrie development. It is a very significant development, and it highlights the essence of the matters covered by the amendment to the motion when it refers to the Government's

policies and platforms and the inhibition they will have on economic development and the growth of employment in Western Australia. The Premier's defence of the State Government's stance on Yeelirrie was weak and technical. He sought to find refuge in the constitutional power of the Commonwealth to control exports. The Premier did not give a substantive answer to the charge made by the member for Narrogin in moving the amendment, that the State Government was not standing up for the development of this State, and in particular of the Yeelirrie project and the many thousands of jobs available through that development.

**Mr Grill**: You had nine years to get it off the ground. You did nothing.

**Mr HASSELL**: It was going very nicely until the Minister's Government came to office.

**Mr Grill**: It had bogged down.

**Mr HASSELL**: It was going very nicely and now the Minister's Government is reversing the commitment the Minister gave personally when in Opposition. The Minister might well keep quiet about this matter because he has a lot to answer for to his electorate and to the public.

**Mr Grill**: I am not the least bit concerned about any promises I made.

**Mr HASSELL**: I bet the Minister is not concerned, because that is his attitude to promises.

I come back to the substance of the issue which is that potentially thousands of jobs are available for unemployed Western Australians in the Yeelirrie development project and in other development projects. The only answer the Premier could give to the charge that the project is being stifled was to say, "Of course, we have to ask the Commonwealth if we can go ahead with it". The substance of the situation is far broader than that. The essential point is that, if the State wants development, it has to fight for it. It has to be prepared to lay down a clear policy and expression of determination that the State's resources will be developed, and the jobs which flow from those resources and developments will be provided.

There always will be competition with conflicting interests in the development of resources and other projects in this State. Conflicting interests arise in Australia in relation to the sugar industry. Queensland does not want our sugar project to go ahead because it sees it as competition for its industry. If this State is to establish a sugar industry, it will need the committed dedication of the Government, and not a preparedness to lie down and die because the Commonwealth or one of the Federal Ministers says it may not be appropriate,

or may not fit in with the grand design the Government has in Canberra.

Internal competition exists in relation to the development of the aluminium smelter. That is an important development relating to the growth of the processing phase of our production. There is external competition as well. I refer to the iron ore industry. Its future development and the well-being of jobs tied up in it are directly related to iron ore sales. Those sales depend on international competition, particularly that coming increasingly from Brazil whose record on industrial relations and delivery performance is so much better than ours. Never again in the foreseeable future will demand for development be knocking at the door. Never again, within the foreseeable future, will companies be lining up seeking the opportunity to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in this State, and thereby to provide hundreds and thousands of jobs. What will be required is a determined State Government with developmental and resources policies which encourage people to invest, and which will make their investments successful and their markets competitive. That will depend on a whole range of things, including policies about wages, redundancy, and industrial relations, and a determination that we will be competitive, that we will get these industries, and that we will keep them.

Development is the only means by which there will be a substantial increase in employment in Western Australia. Our economy is not based on manufacturing industries. We need growth, and with it a growth of jobs and a return in the direction of higher levels of employment—one would have to be brave to predict that we could have a return to full employment. A return to moving in the direction of higher employment will depend on the Government's being prepared to grasp every opportunity for resources development and growth, as well as all the other things that have to be done in relation to the existing businesses that we have, and in the kinds of industries in which the Deputy Premier is interested; they are, the technological industries and so-called sunrise industries. Our employment prospects continue to be dependent on a resource-oriented approach. We need to continue policies which will promote and enhance the possibilities of discovery, and here again the very words of the amendment before the House are relevant as they refer to environmental management and Aboriginal land rights.

The Australian Labor Party's environmental policies, if adopted by this Government, its support of the Tasmanian dam decision, and its support of the Aboriginal land rights on the Northern

Territory model, will lock up huge areas of the State and make them unavailable for exploration and the discovery of resources and minerals which can be exploited. The development of full employment depends on the exploitation of our natural resources, such as energy, minerals, and so on. It depends also increasingly, one would hope, on the capacity of the State to provide energy resources from which processing industries can be developed.

We need to maintain our agricultural industries and to keep them viable because they still represent such a vital part of the economy.

The point I am making—the point the Premier failed to face up to in his response last night—was that our economy and our employment will continue to depend on resource policies which realistically bring to fruition development projects such as Yeelirrie. Thousands of jobs are tied up in the Yeelirrie project. There are direct jobs for the construction phase and for the mining operation; and at least as many if not many more indirect jobs are tied up in the associated transportation, supplies, and support services. When the whole project gets under way—if it ever does, and this is now doubtful—many jobs will be tied up with the establishment of towns, schools, hospitals, and of course, housing.

Essentially the State Government must declare itself. Does it want the Yeelirrie development to go ahead? The Premier appears content to let the project die on the vine and to hide behind the overriding Commonwealth power as his feeble excuse. When will the Premier say to the people of this State that the Government is committed to the Yeelirrie development? When will the Premier say that the Government will use every means at its disposal to proceed, and if possible, to force the Commonwealth Government to allow the export of uranium yellowcake from Yeelirrie?

Mr MacKinnon: Could I suggest that that will be never?

Mr HASSELL: It is interesting to note that it was all so easy when the Labor Party was in Opposition—commitments were easy to make. I would like to read from *The Esperance Express* of 16 December 1982, where it states—

The State Labor Government would allow the Yeelirrie uranium project to go ahead and would favour Esperance as the port used to export the yellowcake.

Mr MacKinnon: Who said that?

Mr HASSELL: This was the then shadow Minister for Mines (Mr Julian Grill). He said—

Western Mining Corporation's project was not an election issue as both parties wanted the project to get off the ground.

That is a change from what the Premier said last night. The Premier stood up and said, "Of course we will have to go and ask Canberra. The Labor Party in Canberra has another policy, and its policy is built into its laws". Of course it has, but it did not have one when it suited the ALP in this State, when the ALP wanted the votes of the people to be elected to Parliament.

Mr Bertram: No trouble!

Mr HASSELL: No trouble? What a dramatic change we have seen. What a weak and feeble approach we heard from the Premier last night. It was a lot of loud, hot air, but he had no defence of Western Australia's right to develop Western Australia's resources to provide jobs for Western Australia people.

Mr MacKinnon: Hear, hear!

Mr HASSELL: When will we see that defence, that commitment? I would like to refer to the article again.

Mr Gordon Hill: We did not see it in the last nine years.

Mr Grill: You had years to get this development off the ground, and you did nothing about it. You are a disgrace.

Mr MacKinnon: Do you support the Yeelirrie development?

Mr Grill: Do I support it? I would like to see it get off the ground.

Mr HASSELL: When is the Premier going to do something about it?

Mr Peter Jones: Do you still support your statement?

Mr Grill: What statement?

Mr HASSELL: I will quote it to the Minister. He said—

ALP policy would not prevent Yeelirrie from proceeding and Yeelirrie will be designated as one of those projects which was already undertaken and as such would be helped to continue under a Labor Government.

Mr Grill: Do you agree with that?

Mr HASSELL: That is the Minister's statement.

Mr Grill: I do not disagree with it.

Mr HASSELL: Yet what is happening?

Mr Grill: You allowed it to bog down. It didn't get off the ground, did it? You had the opportunity.

Mr HASSELL: Come on—the Minister cannot be serious. All the Premier had to say last night was, "Of course, we have to go and ask Canberra". He retreated into the feeble stance of hiding behind the coat-tails of the Commonwealth constitutional power. When will he make a commitment to Western Australia? When will he make a commitment on behalf of the Government he leads? When will he fight the bureaucrats and ideologists in Canberra to allow this State to provide the jobs that the people need?

Mr Grill: Don't you talk about bureaucrats—your Government built up the biggest bureaucracy ever.

Mr HASSELL: With every day that passes, thousands of jobs that are tied up in the Yeelirrie project are going down the drain. We will miss out on these opportunities because we will be too late in the competitive world in which our economy has to survive.

If this Government thinks that it can sit back, use nice words, patter about, and still have development and jobs in this State, it is making a mistake. Even in the area of job creation, under the portfolio of Employment and Administrative Services, its action has been deplorably slow. It has been deplorably inactive. At the time of the State election, the job bank programme was in progress.

Mr Bryce: What a rort! You ought to be ashamed to attach your name to that. Do you remember what the *Daily News* called it? "Hoax" was the word used, and it was not the Opposition using it.

Mr HASSELL: The Deputy Premier at least ought to get his newspapers right! The paper that called the job bank programme a hoax was the supporter of the Labor Party, *The Western Mail*.

At the time of the State election, the job bank programme had in place projects worth more than \$250 million. They were providing a bridge of employment until the economy could be stimulated and brought back into action. At the end of the day, I would be the first to acknowledge, as I did throughout the life of the job bank programme, that employment will be provided by the private sector and not by Government job creation schemes. However, I was shocked when I asked in question 614 in the House last week of the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services how many job creation schemes were currently operating in Western Australia and being administered by his department, and what were the titles of them. The Minister replied that there were two. He was referring to the wages pause programme, on which we made submissions to the Commonwealth in December 1982, and the com-

munity employment programme, which is a new programme begun by the Commonwealth. The Minister told me further that the number of jobs which could be identified as having been provided to date under the schemes was 143.

Only 143 jobs have been provided in employment creation programmes by this Government after it has been in office for six months, and after it had all the machinery in place for the job bank programme at the date of the State election. Commitments had been made for millions of dollars to be spent on job creation programmes under the wages pause scheme, and other schemes; but the Government has abandoned the fast track procedures document and all that it meant in administrative terms in speeding up investment—the very necessary task that we had undertaken so that the private investment that was ready to be made would be made, and the jobs would flow from it. The Government has completely fumbled such minute employment creating programmes as it has left, involving some \$40 million in all, as against the job bank programme of \$250 million.

It is interesting that last Sunday I issued a Press statement indicating that the Government's job creation programmes were not being administered with any kind of urgency, and we saw sudden action from the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services because on Tuesday of this week he sent to his committee all the details of the applications for the money that was available. He told the committee that it had to make a decision about those, not in a week's time, but yesterday.

Mr Laurance: A remarkable coincidence!

Mr HASSELL: It was indeed a remarkable coincidence. The Minister called his committee yesterday and had it work on \$6 million worth of projects. He wanted the committee to give an answer; a Press release quickly went out; and it was announced on the news this morning that this action was being taken. This is the only action that we have seen flowing out of the Ministry of Employment and Administrative Services in the six months since the Government came to office.

Mr Laurance: Shame!

Mr HASSELL: In the meantime, the rate of unemployment in this State has risen month by month.

Many other arguments could be developed, but time does not permit me to do so, unfortunately. I support the amendment.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [11.24 a.m.]: Had it not been for the Premier's speech yesterday, I would not have participated in this debate; but I am obliged to respond to two attitudes and com-

ments expressed by the Premier. We are now becoming used to personal attacks by the Premier on members, but I will deal with the Premier's attack on the member for Narrogin because he will have no opportunity to speak again in this debate. The other matter I want to raise—perhaps the more important one because the member for Narrogin does not need much defending—is the accusation against the previous Government that, out of political expediency, it wasted hundreds of millions of dollars of the State's money in connection with the North-West Shelf project.

Regarding the first matter, we all know that the Premier has sufficient skill to use words to their best advantage and to order them into sentences; and he used his skill in Opposition, on almost every occasion he rose to his feet, to attack members personally. Although one did not agree with his attacks, one could understand them because it was an example of a youthful Leader of the Opposition raising a controversial subject, hoping to obtain publicity. However, it ill becomes the office of Premier for the present Premier to continue personal attacks all the time. As the political leader of this State, he has sufficient intelligence and understanding to manage without such attacks.

It is a pity the Premier is not here, because I would like to tell him of my assurance that, although we are separated by a generation—I knew and respected his father well, and he was virtually the first man I met in 1950 when I came to this State—I believe the Premier has no need to use personal accusations. They are useless, anyhow, because he uses them so often that their worth is simply devalued. In addition, the Premier proves subsequently that the accusations are not truthful.

In my case, the Premier said several times that the job I had done was done incompetently or wrongly; and he threatened a shake-up in the organisation of the State Energy Commission and the Metropolitan Water Authority. There have been no shake-ups in those organisations; and the people I appointed, or who were appointed on my advice, still hold their positions. The two instrumentalities are intact; and the Minister for Water Resources said, in a statement to the electronic media, that he never saw such a good organisation as the reorganised Metropolitan Water Authority.

The Premier not only implied, but also said straight-out, that the previous Government had cost the State hundreds of millions of dollars because of the way it had organised the affairs of the North-West Shelf project for the Government's political advantage. I place it on record,

although the Premier's comment had not been published before, that it is entirely incorrect. A previous Premier (Sir Charles Court) was involved. If he were here, he could respond much more eloquently than I do to that accusation; but I also was involved in the North-West Shelf project for about six years. Had I done nothing else in this Parliament and for this State, I would still be proud that the North-West Shelf project was born under my stewardship and because of it. That fact was confirmed publicly several times by Sir Charles Court.

Let me outline to the House, calmly and factually, the history of this, the largest project Western Australia has ever seen.

When we took office in 1974, we inherited the problem from the Tonkin Government. It wanted to develop the North-West Shelf in the same way as we wanted to do so. During their term of office, members of the Tonkin Government experienced the same problems and difficulties as we did; they are, the difficulties caused by the attitude in Canberra.

At that time the offshore permits upon which the whole venture was based were about to expire. I had to have long discussions with the permit holders—the companies involved—the advisers from the Mines Department and the Crown Law Department, and the Solicitor General who is now a High Court judge.

According to the offshore legislation prevailing at the time, the almost unanimous advice to me from these people was that, as a State, we could not extend the permits without the agreement or co-operation of Canberra.

The joint authority, as it was called, who was the Minister for Mines of this State, could not act unilaterally. At that time I virtually closeted myself for days in order to study this legislation on my own account. Having done that, I came to the conclusion that I would, as the joint authority, have the right to extend the permits unilaterally.

I then sought the advice of the Hon. Ian Medcalf who was not the Attorney General at that time, but whom I respected, not only as a friend, but also as an eminent lawyer. The Hon. Ian Medcalf took the same action; he studied the legislation for a few days and came back to me and indicated he was inclined to agree with me that a possibility existed to extend the permits unilaterally.

Thereupon we had a conference with the Solicitor General and representatives of the Mines Department, the Crown Law Department, and the Department of Industrial Development, as it was then, and the Premier of the day (Sir Charles

Court). Ian Medcalf and I were able to convince Sir Charles Court, if not all the other advisers, that it would be right economically for the State to extend the permits unilaterally.

We did that. The late Mr Connor, who would not answer phone calls whenever I rang him day after day, wanted to speak to me after that in order to arrive at a compromise. From that time on I refused to talk to him. My motives were not based on retaliation, but on pragmatic reasons.

An additional complication at that time was that, as everyone knows, Burma Oil could not maintain the required expenditure without a cash flow; therefore, we had to help it negotiate a deal of sale with BHP. It was essential that we convinced those companies that this enormously costly and risky project was on safe ground as far as the Government of Western Australia was concerned. Indeed, it was necessary also to convince the companies that, if the Opposition of the day became the Government, the companies would be on equally safe ground. Had we been unable to do that, we would not have succeeded in concluding the deal between these two companies. Once BHP executed the purchase, we were assured that the project was once again in the hands of viable and large companies.

Then, of course, the Government in Canberra changed and we had the job to negotiate the agreement to which I believe the Premier referred. Of course, on the negative side of the negotiations, this was an enormously costly project from the point of view of capital expenditure and extremely difficult geologically and engineering-wise because it involved gas reserves under the sea a long way off shore.

The positive points in favour of the project were that the petroleum products were in great demand at that time throughout the world, and everybody predicted the price of petroleum products would keep rising. I have not met one person who held the opposite view then.

At that time it was our task to conclude this agreement in the best interests of the State in order to keep the project going. Looking at the situation in terms of the conditions prevailing at the time, I believe we were tremendously successful, because we were able to ensure the viability of the project by applying escalation clauses of the price of gas not only based on the oil prices, but also taking into account various other indices, such as the cost of living, the cost of local energy—namely, steaming coal—the cost of construction, and other cost indices, which appeared to be tremendously advantageous at that time.

It is absolutely unfair of the Premier to say today that we made an error at that time, particularly when he says that we have deliberately done so to obtain political advantage or for political expediency. Such criticism is like the argument the member for Collie used to raise every year. I am sorry that we have ceased to hear it, because it was quite good fun. He used to say that the Brand Government made an enormous mistake by building an oil-fired power station. When that occurred, everybody knew the capital and ongoing costs of an oil-fired power station were infinitely lower than those for a coal-fired one. Under the leadership of Sir Charles Court, the previous Government kept the North-West Shelf joint venturers here. It persuaded them to take a plunge and enter into this risky venture. The Government prepared the ground which enabled other overseas joint venturers to prepare for and ultimately employ the construction work force necessary for the development of the heavy stage of the construction which local companies were unable to do.

If indeed the Government did make a mistake, it was that it could not predict what would happen to oil prices three, four, or five years in the future.

As the Premier has made this comment about the activities of the previous Government, he must have been advised by some of the public servants. Based on my experience, and with due respect, I advise the Premier to take such comments by public servants with a grain of salt. A minority of public servants, regardless of their competence, have the habit of trying to persuade the Government of the day that they support it politically. I have much more respect for public servants who serve the Government of the day objectively and do not make any secret about it. The minority of public servants to whom I referred tell the same story in colours opposite to those of whichever Government is in office.

In conclusion, I place on record that nothing could be further from the truth than that the previous Government's action in this matter was motivated in any way by political expediency. The Government was motivated by the economic interests of the State. Its actions certainly paid off, because it kept the project alive against all odds in 1974-75. The Government kept the project going against all political and economic odds later. We enabled it to proceed; we secured the advantages which went with it and which have in the past and will in the future accrue to the benefit of this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! I acquaint members with the information that the Hon. Mack Lefevre from the Tasmanian upper House is in my gallery.

**MR STEPHENS** (Stirling) [11.40 a.m.]: I would like to reiterate just where the National Party stands on amendments to the Address-in-Reply: We do not support them; we did not support them when the present Opposition was in Government and we do not support them now.

**Mr Blaikie**: Do you believe the Government is doing a wonderful job?

**Mr STEPHENS**: If the member were prepared to listen, he might learn a few things, which would be a change from his normal pattern.

We believe the situation in Western Australia and in Australia is far too serious for political point scoring, which is all these amendments are meant to achieve. This amendment tries to convey the idea that everything in the garden was fairly rosy under the previous Liberal Government and that all our problems started with the change of Government.

It is no wonder that the public tend to look down upon politicians and to realise that they spend most of their time in political point-scoring exercises and spend very little time addressing the problems that beset the nation. As I have said previously, we will achieve more in the interests of the people we serve if we stop these political point-scoring exercises, if we get through the Address-in-Reply as quickly as we can, and if we then get down to dealing with substantive motions that might be of benefit to the people.

To illustrate what I am saying, I indicate that we have had Liberal Governments in Australia for 25 of the last 28 years and we have had Liberal Governments in Western Australia for 21 of the last 24 years. But a recent article written by Robert Anderson, which appeared in the *Sunday Independent*, indicated that Australia is jorjiding to insolvency. Certainly some of the figures he gave from official statistics indicate that this is so.

The figures he gave indicated that in the period 1978-80 our exports were down 11 per cent; in 1980-81 they were down 29 per cent; in 1981-82 they were down 47 per cent; and in 1982-83 they were down 31 per cent. This has left us with a deficit of \$6 460 million on current account. Plainly our trading figures are anything but desirable.

He went on to point out that Australia is now borrowing abroad to meet interest payments on our past borrowings. Any man in business realises that, once someone gets to the stage of having to borrow to pay interest on interest, he is on a very steep slippery dip. The article went on to say—

To the trained eye, an economy is fundamentally out of order, when in the past four years it borrowed almost \$23 billion



abroad to secure only \$2.3 billion increase in exports. Exports are the vital source for servicing and repaying such external borrowings.

So it is quite obvious that the Australian economy is fairly sick, and this has not happened overnight. It ill-behoves anyone to get up and criticise one party as being solely responsible for this situation. Both Governments and Oppositions have to take a degree of responsibility for the problem we are facing.

The motion refers also to increased Government taxes, rates, and charges and gives the impression that these increases are something new and have not happened before. I point out that just after the 1980 election the present Opposition when in Government increased electricity charges by 18 per cent. The present Government managed to keep its increase down to 15 per cent.

Mr MacKinnon: Do you know what inflation was in that year compared with this year?

Mr STEPHENS: Reasonably comparable. Once before one of the member's colleagues interjected on me and said that inflation this year is only 7.2 per cent. I told him it was more like 10 per cent and just a couple of days later it was shown to be 11.2 per cent.

Mr Tonkin: Inflation is not strictly relevant; it depends on costs.

Mr MacKinnon: Was there a wage freeze that year?

Mr STEPHENS: The implication in the motion is that this sort of increase has not happened before. I am not damning the present Government or the previous one; I am making a comparison to point out that this Government has done nothing new. The public are getting fed up with parliamentarians trying to score points rather than getting down to solving the problems facing the nation. That is the point I am trying to make; I am not saying I blindly support what the Labor Government is doing. I want members to understand that as a Parliament we should get down to the job of governing the State and forget about political point scoring. I am saying that what is happening now has happened previously. This amendment is just a matter of the pot calling the kettle black. It is interesting for us on the crossbenches to note that what was right last year when the present Opposition was in Government is now wrong; likewise, what the Government thought was wrong last year now appears to be right. The fact is that we are not making any progress towards solving the problems facing our State or the nation.

However, to continue with the comparison of charges, I indicate that in 1980 gas charges increased by 24 per cent, whereas the present Government has increased them by 15 per cent; in 1980 fixed charges for water went up 15 per cent, whereas this year they have been put up by about eight per cent; in 1980 rates for excess water went up by 26 per cent, whereas the present Government has increased them by 16 per cent; in 1980 the base rate for sewerage was increased by 15 per cent, whereas the present Government has increased it by 11 per cent.

Those figures show that it is quite erroneous for the Opposition to imply that, suddenly, with a change of Government, we have this unusual and tremendous increase in charges. It has happened before.

Mr Mensaros: Your figures are absolutely not right.

Mr STEPHENS: I have made these comparisons to show that nothing is new and to show that nothing has changed because we have had a change of Government; only the roles of the parties have changed. The point I will be making frequently in years to come is that Parliament should address itself to the problems confronting the community rather than indulge in political point-scoring exercises.

Let me say now that I will agree with comments made that Labor Party policies tend to be centralist; I do not deny that.

Mr Pearce: We deny it.

Mr STEPHENS: On 5 December 1973, when the Liberal and National Country Parties were in Opposition, they issued a Press statement about the Australian Constitutional Convention. This was at the time that Sir Charles Court was Leader of the Opposition and Mr McPharlin was Leader of the Country Party. Among other things, the Press release said—

It then became obvious that the Labor Party was determined to centralise all power in Canberra and, in the process, destroy the Constitution. This, they seek to do by using the financial power of the taxpayers' purse in Canberra and by other means, to achieve de facto variations and by-passing the Constitution in addition to attempts at referenda.

It went on—

The people of Australia need to be warned about the devious ways in which the Commonwealth Labor Government is seeking to hoodwink the people.

I tend to believe that one can interpret Labor Party policies as being centralist, and a moment

ago we heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition saying the same thing.

The question I raise about that Press statement is: Why did not the Liberal Government in Western Australia and the Liberal Government in Canberra, together with five other Liberal Governments that have held office since 1973, make an endeavour to curb that problem and to alter the Constitution so that centralist policies could not be pursued? Was their inactivity deliberately designed to use this policy as a political weapon for point scoring every time they become the Opposition? Since 1973 throughout Australia there have been six State Liberal Governments and a Federal Liberal Government, yet nothing was done to overcome the problems perceived in 1973. The example illustrates the point I made when I commenced my remarks. The Liberal Party is more interested in political point scoring than in doing anything positive.

They had years in which to overcome these problems and to strengthen the Constitution in order to make it difficult for Labor, with its centralist policies, to do anything about following those policies. But nothing was done; it was much easier for the Liberal Party to try to score political points.

Mr Blaikie: I take it you have never tried to score a political point in this House?

Mr STEPHENS: Yes, we have tried, but this amendment represents a completely different type of political point scoring. It tries to indicate that previously the economy was sound, but it was not.

Mr MacKinnon: Where does it say that in the motion?

Mr STEPHENS: That point is made in the lead-up of the amendment. It states that the policies of the Australian Labor Party will inhibit economic development and the growth of employment.

Mr MacKinnon: All that is saying is that the policies now adopted by the Government will inhibit economic development and our future growth of employment.

Mr STEPHENS: That is so, but the amendment infers that until now the economy has been going well. The member is entitled to his opinion, and I am entitled to mine, which I have expressed. The sooner the Address-in-Reply is out of the way, and we get down to tackling the problems facing this nation, the sooner the people will have increased confidence in us.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House).

[Continued on page 1609.]

## TEMPORARY REDUCTION OF REMUNERATION (SENIOR PUBLIC OFFICERS) BILL

### *Returned*

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

### *Council's Amendments: In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Barnett) in the Chair; Mr Brian Burke (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Council were as follows—

#### No. 1.

Clause 4, page 6, line 33—Insert after the passage "promotion," the passage "reclassification of position or office,".

#### No. 2.

##### Clause 7—

Page 9, line 13—Delete the words "by order published in the *Gazette*".

Page 9, line 17—Delete the words "by order published in the *Gazette*".

Page 9, line 26—Delete the full stop and substitute the following passage—

" , and notice of the numbers (but not names) of persons who are the subject of exemption or reduction of the rate or amount of remuneration reduction under this subsection shall be published in the *Gazette*. "

#### No. 3.

Clause 17, page 15—Delete paragraph (c).

#### No. 4.

##### Schedule 1—

Page 16, line 6—Delete the words "Chain Locks" and substitute the words "Chain Lockers".

Page 16, lines 13 to 16—Delete the following passage—

" Cleaning out ships holds immediately after coal, iron ore, alumina, sulphur or phosphate cargoes, or working on ships during the loading of bulk grain (except whilst working in the engine room) "

Page 16, line 18—Delete the words "Cleaning Tubes" and substitute the words "Cleaning Boiler Tubes".

Page 16, line 22—Delete the word "Composite" and substitute the words "Composite Disability".

Page 17, line 26—Delete the word "Limbers".

Page 19, after line 12—Insert the words "Uniform and Boot".

Mr Blaikie: It is interesting that private members' business has been ignored again, and the Government has used its force of numbers.

A Government member: Why don't you stand up and make a speech?

Mr Blaikie: It has been to the exclusion of private members' business.

A Government member: Stand up and make a speech.

Mr Blaikie: The Government is abusing this Parliament with the conduct of Government business.

Mr Brian Burke: We are simply accepting amendments.

Mr Blaikie: What you are doing—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Blaikie: —is stopping private members' business.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the member for Vasse to order! I do not intend to call order three or four times before the House comes to order.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I move—

That the amendments made by the Council be agreed to.

The Government has no objection to any of the amendments made in another place; we intend to accept them. In answer to the interjection, we have no want to use this matter to intrude into the time of private members' business. As members would appreciate, in our accepting the amendments of the Legislative Council, we had not anticipated that this matter would be controversial or would take very long to handle.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Opposition supports the amendments and the comments made by the Treasurer. The main amendment is No. 3, which relates to clause 17(c). It was the first time that such a provision had been used since the time of Henry VIII, and I am glad the Government has agreed to this amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

## Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

### Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [12.00 noon]: I wish to add my support to the amendment, unlike the member for Stirling who resumed his seat only a short while before its introduction by the Government, so the Government could conduct its affairs. In regard to private members having a fair go in this Chamber, it has always been my view that it is the responsibility of members to pay due regard to motions in the House such as this one and to respond accordingly. It is interesting to note that the member for Stirling does not support the amendment and, in fact, has indicated that the Government's performance is fair and reasonable. I contest that.

Mr Stephens: I didn't say that at all.

MR BLAIKIE: I reject that argument.

Mr Stephens: You are quite right in rejecting it because it is an untruth in the first place.

MR BLAIKIE: It is a pity the member for Stirling sits on this side of the House. He should be on the other side of the House because his votes and his comments in the House indicate where he ought to be.

Mr Stephens: In the National Party, we think; we do not just do what we are told to do.

MR BLAIKIE: If the member reads the *Australian Parliamentary Diary* which came out only yesterday, he will find that it included the member for Stirling and his colleagues as part of the Government. It associated them with the Australian Labor Party.

Mr Stephens: You just do what you are told.

MR BLAIKIE: The motion moved by my colleague, the member for Narragin, is important and deserves the full consideration of the House. I support it. It reads as follows—

But we regret to advise Your Excellency that the platform and policies of the Australian Labor Party and State and Federal Labor Governments will inhibit economic development and the growth of employment in Western Australia; and in particular, those platform provisions, policies and Federal Budget decisions relating to—

It goes on to list a series of matters. I raise the additional point that the way the Government has

handled the business of the House and has given absolute priority to Government business and totally and absolutely ignored the rights of private members is nothing short of a scandal.

Mr Wilson: Who cares about your opinion?

Mr BLAIKIE: It is all right for the Minister for Housing to query as to who cares about private members.

Mr Wilson: I said, "Who cares about your opinion?"

Mr BLAIKIE: It is all right for him to say that. The Minister for Housing—

Mr Pearce: His mother cares.

Mr BLAIKIE: I indicate a note of caution to the Leader of the House who, I suggest, does not share the view of the Minister for Housing—

Mr Wilson: I am sure he does.

Mr BLAIKIE: —that the Parliament is for the people and for the members of Parliament. Parliament is not to be used and abused as a House for the conduct of Government business only.

Mr Bryce: Did you ever tell Sir Charles Court that?

Mr Bertram: Come off it!

Mr Pearce: All his comments to Sir Charles Court were prefaced by, "Please sir, may I speak?"

Mr BLAIKIE: The very important stature and role of the Parliament is not for the conduct of Government business to the exclusion of private members' business. The Government is falling into a most unsavoury pattern in this regard.

Mr Cowan: I can't believe I am hearing this.

Mr BLAIKIE: Government business now seems to take priority over all other business. I again remind the Leader of the House that it ill-behoves his Government to continually perform in this fashion. Provision must be made for private members' business to be heard and dealt with.

Mr Tonkin: You have an amendment before the Chair now.

Mr Brian Burke: Can I ask you a question? Are you suggesting private members' day should interfere with the Address-in-Reply?

Mr BLAIKIE: No, I am not saying private members' day should interfere with the Address-in-Reply. I am suggesting that the Government should not use the convenience of the House and of the Standing Orders to preclude private members from submitting their business to the will of the Parliament.

Mr Tonkin: We are not doing that. You have an amendment now before the Chair.

Mr Wilson: Get on with it.

Mr BLAIKIE: The Parliament is not the tool of Government. I will certainly remind the Government of that point when we return from the recess in two weeks' time.

Mr Pearce: Your time will run out while you carry on like this.

Mr BLAIKIE: In respect of the provision we are now discussing, it is very interesting to look at the actions of this Government and its Federal counterparts, and their policies and what they have done to stifle and inhibit economic development and growth in this State. One needs to look only at what happened in relation to fuel prices. We should look at what the State and Federal Governments have done in respect of fuel prices and especially what the Federal Government did in its now 48-hour-old Budget. The Australian Labor Party gave an undertaking to the electorate, both State and federally, that, if it were elected to office, it would reduce the price of fuel by 3c a litre. What has the Government done in that regard?

Mr Pearce: It has saved Western Australians \$1.5 million a month on their petrol prices.

Mr BLAIKIE: Because of those budgetary measures, the price of fuel will continue to rise.

Mr O'Connor: By another 2c in the Federal Budget!

Mr BLAIKIE: As my leader has indicated, it is rising by another 2c according to the Federal Budget. The price of aviation and turbine fuels will also increase. Country people will feel the effects of these increases the most. We all know how the ALP feels about country people; it has no regard for them. This increase in fuel prices is another indication of the ALP's lack of concern for people in country and remote areas of this State. These recently announced measures will have a profound effect on all people throughout this State, but more particularly on country people.

I condemn the Government for its actions. One could go on and look at what the Government has done in relation to the committees which were either associated with the Parliament or appointed by the Parliament and which have been referred to as QANGOs. On the subject of a Legislative Council committee, the Premier made the following statement which appeared in the *Sunday Times* of 31 July under the heading "Burke to axe Quangos"—

The State Government is preparing to crack down on the number of

quangos—quasi autonomous non-governmental organisations—in Western Australia.

The article continued by saying there were too many of these bodies and they cost the people of this State a considerable sum of money. The Government was heralded for its proposal to crack down on QANGOs. The Deputy Premier has indicated by a nod of the head, which I presume is a nod in the affirmative, that is what the Government proposed to do.

Mr Bryce: It still is.

Mr BLAIKIE: As he said, it still is; yet, while the Government is supposedly cracking down on QANGOs, a week later the same newspaper recorded an article in the section entitled "Bennett on Sunday" on 7 August under the heading—

Jobs for the Burke boys!

On the one hand, it is cutting down on QANGOs to make room for jobs for the Burke boys—

Mr Pearce: Read out the rest of that article, a lot of which is to do with political appointments by the previous Government.

Mr BLAIKIE: What an interesting exercise that has been.

Mr Bryce: Would you like to give me a list of 55 Liberal QANGOs or former committees?

Mr BLAIKIE: Of course the Minister for Education has put his mouth into gear before putting his brain into motion. When one looks at the Government's area of ministerial advisers, one realises that the Government's actions are nothing short of scandalous.

Mr Bryce: You wait until we open the cupboards.

Mr BLAIKIE: Here is a Government of double standards, on the one hand, it claims to be saving money because of its QANGOs policy, and, on the other hand, because it is spending more by appointing more and more advisers. It is interesting that those advisers, by sheer coincidence, appear to be from either the Trades and Labor Council or the ALP Executive.

Mr Bryce: Can I ask a small question?

Mr BLAIKIE: No, I am running out of time.

The Government's attitude towards economic growth and development is one of major concern to members on this side of the House and I have referred to it on several occasions. What is the Government doing in relation to the redundancy wage case for the council of trade unions? It is supporting that proposal which will cost this State tens of millions of dollars. It will also cost the State job opportunities and will severely disadvantage people regarding secure employment as they

get older and they will fall short of employment opportunities. That is what this Government is about.

I refer now to environmental management. If ever we have seen a Government that is a sham in the field of environmental managers, it is this Government because, in the five or six months it has been in power, its performance in environmental management would have to have set an all-time low record of achievement in the State of Western Australia.

I refer to an article in *The West Australian* on 31 March 1983 which reads as follows—

Call for prompt action in Shannon

The South-West Forests Defence Foundation has called on the WA Government to direct the timber industry to leave the Shannon River basin immediately.

Further on it states—

Mr Bob Bunning, general manager of the timber division of Bunning Brothers Pty Ltd, which runs mills at Northcliffe and Pemberton, said that Mr Maley—

Mr Maley was the person making the statement on behalf of the south-west forests defence foundation. The article continues—

—showed a total disregard for the people who earned their livelihood through timber operations.

The article concluded as follows—

The Premier, Mr Burke, said that he expected the Forests Department report within six weeks.

That was on 31 March and, Mr Deputy Speaker, you will understand the significance of that because within days of this demand being made on the Government—notwithstanding the fact that the Premier said he was waiting for a Forests Department report which was expected within six weeks that would allow him to weigh up and understand what the department asked for—the Government acted and made a decision to reserve the Shannon River basin.

The Government acted even though it had not received the Forests Department's report or its advice. This is one of the most amazing actions of the Government; and what is it doing to the forest industry? It is destroying the industry by acting politically without advice from forest advisers. That is what happened in relation to the Shannon. I repeat again that when the call was made, the Premier said that he expected the Forests Department's report within six weeks and within days of that Press report the Premier had, in fact, acted to lock up the Shannon.

I say again that this State has sunk to an all-time low record in relation to environmental management because the Government has acted in this fashion. This leads me to another point which, I believe, is of greater concern and I refer to an article in the *Daily News* of 11 August 1983 which was written by John Arthur, and reads as follows—

Greenies: Act on the forests

Conservationists today called on the State Government to exclude 100 000 hectares of jarrah forest in the Darling Range from bauxite mining.

Further on it continued—

"The present State government was elected with policies to create a national park of not less than 100 000 hectares in the jarrah forest of the Darling Range and to set up tighter controls on bauxite mining operations.

The article concluded—

A senior ALP source said today that the party did have a policy to establish a national park in the "northern" jarrah forest of not less than 100 000 hectares.

I ask the Premier and the Deputy Premier what the Government is doing in relation to the northern jarrah forest area and I will pause to give senior Government members time to answer.

Mr Brian Burke: We have the matter under active consideration now and in due course we will make a decision whether to establish a national park and, if possible, what size would be appropriate.

Mr BLAIKIE: I draw the attention of the House to the State platform of the Australian Labor Party. I refer to section 43(a) and (b) which reads as follows—

43. (a) declare the 50 000 hectare Shannon River Basin a National Park, and
- (b) establish a National Park in the northern jarrah forest of not less than 100 000 hectares in extent;

Mr Bateman: Your time is up.

Mr BLAIKIE: I can assure the member for Canning that I have three minutes left.

It is of great concern to me to see what this Government has done already by establishing unilaterally, without any discussion with the forest industries, what it proposes to do with the Shannon. It made a decision to declare the 50 000 hectare Shannon basin a national park. Again I ask the Premier or Deputy Premier: If that is the Government's decision in relation to the Shannon, does it follow that it is proposing to carry out the

ALP's policy in relation to the northern jarrah forest area? This is important and I trust Government members will understand that it is a matter of grave concern.

Mr Brian Burke: Are you asking me?

Mr BLAIKIE: Yes, I have 1½ minutes left.

Mr Brian Burke: We are considering that particular part of the policy and, in due course, will make a decision. You must understand that the platform is not an election manifesto.

Mr BLAIKIE: I remind the Premier that he has many supporters who believe that it is the election manifesto and that is how they expect the Australian Labor Party, which is in Government, to act.

The timber industry is in a state of shatters. Employers in that industry have lost confidence and are concerned for their future because of the actions of this Government. I will have more to say on this subject in due course.

People in the bauxite industry are also feeling nervous because this Government has said that it is actively considering whether it will establish a national park in the northern jarrah forests of the size of 100 000 hectares which is approximately one-quarter of a million acres.

The sandmining industry is also disturbed with the actions of this Government and what it has done in relation to the inquiries it initiated. There is no doubt in my mind that there is a degree of grave concern over what this Government and its Federal counterparts have done and this is inhibiting economic development, growth, and employment. I support the amendment moved by the member for Narrogin.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch) [12.20 p.m.]: Last week I rose to participate in a debate and to agree with the member for Stirling. I begin my remarks today by disagreeing with him. He made comments in relation to the debate; that is, that we should be addressing ourselves in Parliament to the problems facing our community. This motion gives us that opportunity and, in my view, the member for Stirling missed it completely and did not address himself to any of the problems facing our community today. This motion is worded in such a way as to encourage just such a debate on policies for the future. My comments will be directed towards that point. I will concentrate my remarks on the implications for our State and the nation of the Federal Budget announced on Tuesday.

I would like to paint some background to give members an idea of the challenge we are facing. I will quote from ANZ Bank and Reserve Bank

publications—two different sources, but with similar conclusions. The ANZ Bank in July 1983 prior to the Budget stated—

A major challenge facing the Australian community will be to ensure that the impetus towards economic recovery in 1983-84 is maintained in future years. To this end, appropriate long term policies and adjustments will be vital if progress is to be sustained.

I emphasise the words "long term policies". I will return to them shortly. The ANZ Bank goes on as follows—

Accordingly, a major long term issue centres on the need to achieve an appropriate balance between the shares of national income accruing to wages and profits. An adequate level of profitability is an essential basis for capital formation, innovation, economic growth and employment creation.

Those words are mirrored in a publication of the Reserve Bank entitled, "The Deterioration in Economic Performance". I am quoting from *The Weekend Australian* of 20-21 August which published an extract from that document as follows—

"For inflation, the link is from demand to prices. That is, the big rise in inflation in the 1970s seems to stem importantly from the large increase in the growth of demand (which in turn, can be related in part to the growth of government outlays or the level of budget deficits).

"For the growth of production, the link is from profitability to production. That is, the decline in the growth of production in the 1970s appears to stem mainly from the fall in profitability."

It is clear from these two articles that the problems besetting our community are largely based around the premise that a decline in profitability has occurred in this country, and therefore, if any recovery is to be successful, a return to profitability by industry must take place.

Has the Federal Budget worked to that end? Have ALP policies, actions, and proposals since that party was elected at the State and Federal levels indicated an understanding of that underlying problem? My answer to these questions clearly is, "No". The real problem of this Budget, and one which will bring about its demise—unfortunately to the cost of many Australians' jobs—can be summed up in one word, "inflation". The Budget clearly is inflationary and will not do anything to tackle the underlying problem—that lack of profitability in industry. The Federal Budget strategy and the actions taken by this State Government in recent months

mean we will see Western Australia head the other States at the top of the inflation list by the end of this year. I make that prediction now with confidence, and I hate to say it, but we will be leading Australia to that extent.

I will give a couple of reasons for my contention. Firstly at Federal level we have seen excises indexed to six-monthly intervals which will lead immediately today to price rises across the board in certain areas such as fuel, cigarettes, beer, and others. That will not lead to a restoration of profitability. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, we will see an increase in the price of fuel of 2c a litre across the board. That will flow through to all sections of the community and will impact more on Western Australia than on other States because of our isolation.

I would like to draw attention to the Premier's hypocrisy in this area. When asked to comment on the Federal Budget, he was quoted in *The Western Australian* of 24 August as saying—

His greatest concern was the increase in fuel costs which would have the heaviest impact in remote areas.

I do not understand the thrust of that comment when in recent months the same Premier has increased the State fuel levy by 13.5 per cent. Where was his great concern then about fuel costs which would have the heaviest impact in remote areas? I bet it was not contained in his Press release announcing the increase. That is his comment on the Federal Budget. In the words of the member for South Perth, it is hypocrisy in the extreme.

The large Federal deficit is itself inflationary. The Premier himself indicated as much in the *Daily News* yesterday when he said interest rates could be put under pressure as a result of the Budget. Any economist knows that interest rates and inflation go hand in hand. Interest rates are under pressure as a result of this Budget, and clearly inflation is, too. The Premier admits as much and I believe it will prove to be the undoing of this Budget and the death of many jobs in this country.

Perhaps the most insidious increase in this Federal Budget which was not even commented on by the Premier—and I do not think he is aware of the problem—is the large increase industrial users will have to pay for the price of oil. This was drawn to the attention of the general public today on the front page of *The Australian*. The implications for industry and consumers in this State are horrendous, to say the least. We have several large consumers in this State which have recently

faced gas price increases in excess of 100 per cent, up to 117 per cent in some instances.

An industry spokesman with whom I discussed the subject this morning indicated that his gas price has doubled in the two months from 1 July to 1 September. On top of the State Government impost, the Federal Government is imposing an extra 9.03c a litre or \$92 a tonne on the cost of industrial oil. For that one consumer in Western Australia it will mean an imposition in excess of \$700 000 a year on his costs. How many jobs do members think that will cost? How much will it cost the people who buy that particular company's products in due course? What will happen in due course to that consumer's electricity and gas charges? As members know, the State Energy Commission's gas charges are related to oil costs comparisons. As oil prices now have increased by more than 30 per cent across the board, will consumers face another 30 per cent on top of the 100 per cent they have just been asked to pay?

Where is the profitability? How is it being restored to industry by such a severe and savage impost by way of the fuel levy?

The other point of interest to me and, I am sure, to many consumers in this State especially, is what effect that imposition will have on the State Energy Commission. As members know, country power supplies largely are generated by fuel oil; it is the energy source.

I asked a question recently about the imposition in 1983 of fuel price increases. The answer indicated that the fuel oil increase of 14 per cent in 1983 had an impact of \$2.2 million on the commission's operating costs. If the SEC is to face an increase in excess of 30 per cent, that will mean an extra cost of more than \$5 million now imposed on the SEC.

The commission recently brought down a budget showing it is \$3 million in deficit. From today it is probably in excess of \$8 million in deficit. People in country areas should be very concerned about this as their power costs are likely to be raised again in the immediate future if the Government is to balance its Budget. If the Budget is to be balanced, from where is the Government to obtain the funds? What other costs will it increase? What other consumers of electricity or gas will bear the brunt of the savage increase imposed by the Federal Government? What other State Government charges will rise again?

I would like to come back to the comments of the member for Stirling. Those increases certainly were not imposed by the previous Government; they were not the idea of the previous Govern-

ment, but they are now being imposed and certainly they will have an inhibiting impact on economic recovery in this country.

I would like to turn now to State charges and to come back to my opening comments. What will be the effect of the recently increased Government charges, the redundancy payments supported by this Government, and the withholding tax provisions—with so many companies involved—and how will these measures restore profitability to the private sector in this country? It is beyond me.

Clearly, the Reserve Bank has seen and acknowledged the problems with the economy. Unfortunately ALP Governments, at both State and national level, have no idea whatsoever.

My second major concern relates to the comment in the ANZ Bank report where it stated "appropriate long-term policies and adjustments will be vital". I did not read anywhere in the Federal Government's Budget that any hard biting of the bullet was undertaken in relation to long-term decision making. I can indicate where some short-term policy decisions have been made.

I have spoken before in this House about tariff reform, and I was completely ignored. If we are to get any sense back into the private sector, the problem of tariffs must be tackled. The Government has ignored completely improvements in the finance sector as recommended by the Campbell committee. It has ignored completely the new growth industries highly lauded by the Deputy Premier—genetic engineering and high technology. No new initiatives or new incentives have been created, and so our Deputy Premier has been sold a pup—sold down the drain.

The Prime Minister has promised that there will be tax reform next year. That will be another promise, like all the rest, that the Prime Minister will break.

Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. has been bailed out with no real plan for long-term recovery, and there are no real long-term prospects for the people employed. The ANZ Bank and all other commentators on the economy ask what is wrong in regard to industrial assistance. Obviously there is a lack of profitability, that industrial assistance is one of the few sections of the Budget in which expenditure has actually fallen. I would like to quote from *The Australian* which stated, "Total direct outlays will fall marginally to \$1 104 million". That would mean about a 10 per cent reduction in industrial assistance programmes—a fine way to restore profitability to industry. The ALP apparently has learnt nothing from all its years in Opposition and its members



seem hell-bent on getting back to the Opposition benches—and we will give them every assistance.

Thirdly, this Budget indicates clearly that the style of government that we are to see from Mr Hawke's Government is one that redistributes wealth and does not create it, and where possible, it will put resources back into the hands of the Government sector. The Hawke Government reflects the socialistic thinking that Governments can best deal with our money—that we do not know how to best make up our own minds. I will give several examples of that, the first being Medicare, or perhaps "Medi-disaster". We have been down this track once before under Gough Whitlam. The ALP has not learnt its lesson, and we in Australia are about to pay the cost all over again. The emphasis has been taken away completely from the private sector and put back on the public sector, at our cost.

I am pleased to see that the Australian Tourist Commission was given an increase of 75 per cent in its budget, but why were not taxation incentives given to the travel industry? Why is not the private sector encouraged to develop tourism, and why is this development being left to a Government which thinks it knows best? Why is the Australian film industry being penalised, and why are incentives being taken away from the private sector, and the money transferred into the hands of the Australian Film Commission? I am certainly not critical of the Australian Film Commission; it does a good job under the chairmanship of Sir James Carruthers. However, it seems to me that the private sector would know best how to develop the film industry. Here we have the Government taking away from the private sector and concentrating everything in the hands of the Government which supposedly knows best.

Australia Post is to get couriers. Why is this? We have fleets of couriers operating today in the private sector. It beats me why this decision was taken.

The Government should be successfully supporting the private sector. It should be returning profitability to that sector by making long-term decisions which might give long-term benefits at short-term costs to the community.

Do the policies of the ALP hold hope for the future? We see the Premier, the Prime Minister, and our Federal Treasurer saying that the prices and income accord is our hope for the future. We know that the accord is an agreement negotiated between the ALP and the trade union movement prior to the election—private enterprise was totally excluded from participating. The underlying theme of that document is that the Govern-

ment will redistribute wealth—it will move right away from profits.

I come back to the quotation I referred to earlier to remind members that the Reserve Bank had this to say—

For the growth of production, the link is from profitability to production. That is the decline in the growth of production in the 1970s appears to stem mainly from the fall in profitability.

How the heck are we to have a return to profitability when we have a prices and income accord that is designed to take away even further profits from the private sector? How will full indexation give us a return to profitability? It is an inflationary step and a destructive step, and it has been shown to be so. How is prices control designed to restore profitability to the private sector? It is designed to reduce profitability, to redistribute income. We have the Prime Minister and our own Premier supporting wage increases that have no relationship to industry's ability to pay or its productivity. That is what the prices and income accord is supposed to be about—giving wage increases in line with productivity. The Premier and the Prime Minister support a wage increase that has no relationship whatever to productivity or industry's ability to pay.

In support of the amendment, I indicate that the Budget gives us little or no hope that the future will be better and that inflation will go down hill. The overriding message we have on this Budget from Mr Hawke is that it may bring short-term relief—hence the healthy stock market. However, inflation will take hold; it will fail to tackle the long-term problems of this country, and will lead to long-term profitability downturn in this country and hence a downturn, a decline, in the future economic and employment prospects for all Australians.

**MR COWAN (Merredin)** [12.40 p.m.]: This amendment is what one expects to be brought before the House; but I notice that it contains one or two differences inasmuch as it does not deal directly with initiatives taken by the present Government, but tends to deal with the probable platform and policy issues that the incumbent Government is promising to implement; and of course it deals with the Federal Government in its approach to policies.

My colleague, the member for Stirling, has indicated that we will not support the amendment. He has indicated also that it is something of an indictment upon the members who moved it—

**Mr Bertram:** Hear, hear!

Mr COWAN:—to the extent that the Liberal Party had 25 years of the last 28 in Government in Canberra; and it had 21 years of 24 in Government in Western Australia.

Most of the issues to which the amendment relates deal specifically with problems that have been created over that period of time. For that reason, while the amendment may be directed towards the Government, clearly it is an indictment of the members of the parties who have moved it and who have spoken to it. They are the ones responsible for the economic position of Western Australia and Australia.

I have some comments to make about specific industries which will demonstrate precisely the areas of neglect about which I am speaking. I will deal with Phillips-Merredin, which is the largest four-wheel drive tractor manufacturer in Australia. In fact, only two others exist, and they are part-time operators who build tractors on a one-off basis. In Merredin, Phillips-Merredin produces up to 30 Acremaster tractors a year.

The man who began the company started with nothing; and the company developed with a lot of effort and a lot of guts. Of course, it took an extremely large amount of money. The man started with nothing and ended with a multimillion dollar business building machines which, at the top of the range, cost in excess of \$170 000 for each individual unit, and at the bottom of the range cost just under \$100 000; so the industry is capital intensive.

The developer of Phillips-Merredin went through some lean periods because of drought conditions in agricultural regions. He applied for and was granted two drought loans; and the repayment of those loans was made difficult for him because of the continuation of drought in the areas in which he would expect to make tractor sales. He had some markets in the Eastern States; and when the drought hit them, he was again affected. He went to the previous Government and asked it, not only for an extension of his drought loans, but also for further assistance. The assistance was granted to the extent that, at the time the company went into receiver-managership, he owed the Government about \$143 000. Given the level of indebtedness of industry in these days, that was chickenfeed. However, the former Minister—the man who just resumed his seat—

Mr Stephens: A Minister in the previous Liberal Government?

Mr COWAN: Yes, a Minister of the Liberal Government in Western Australia in his wisdom and, I would imagine, with Cabinet sanction, decided to appoint a receiver-manager to Phillips-

Merredin. At the time, the question was raised as to whether a receiver-manager should be appointed, or whether the Government of the day should issue a guarantee giving this man enough finance to trade his way out of trouble. He was seeking something like \$1 million, of which half—\$500 000—was to be indemnified by way of a Government guarantee. The alternative was to put in a receiver-manager; and the previous Government chose to put in the receiver-manager because it believed that would cost less, and it wanted some management control over the company.

The problem with Phillips-Merredin was nothing other than that while the man was a good tractor manufacturer and designer, he had no management experience. The Government decided that the company would progress if a receiver-manager was put in; and the cost to the Government would be less.

In answer to a question I asked, I learnt that the receiver-manager has cost the current State Government \$420 000 of taxpayers' money for the supply of component parts to the company, and something like \$55 000 for the expenses of the receiver-manager. That sum is about the amount that the previous Government was too miserable to guarantee. The Government would not necessarily have had to pay out any of that money; it was only a form of guarantee on a loan from the Australian Bank Ltd., over an extended period of time to give the fellow the liquidity to see him through the drought, and to trade his way out of trouble.

Instead of that, the previous Government chose to put in a receiver-manager who has cost the taxpayers of Western Australia something like \$500 000—the very figure that the previous Government would not guarantee over a period of time. We all know that if a guarantee is issued, it is not always the case that the payment has to be made.

The situation at the moment is that not only was the appointment of the receiver-manager made, but also the money has been spent. Of course, the Government will have the opportunity to recover it by selling the tractors being manufactured; but the point is that the company is a private industry which could be regarded as a small business and the people on this side of the House claim to be the champions of business, and particularly small business; and that is what they did to this fellow. They sent him to the wall.

Here we have the hypocrisy of an amendment to the Address-in-Reply which deals with what

may happen in the future, when everybody knows what has happened in the past.

Some comments of importance have been made in the House by members. The matters relating to the Shannon River basin raised by the member for Vasse have some validity; and when the Address-in-Reply debate is finished, if the member for Vasse is prepared to move a substantive motion allowing that subject alone to be addressed, our party will consider it and give it the support that it deserves.

It is hypocritical for the Opposition to move an amendment like this in the knowledge that, at State level, it has been in Government for 21 of the last 24 years, and for 25 of the last 28 years in Canberra. They are the people who, more than anybody else, are responsible for all the problems that we and the economy face at the moment. Rather than having fears about what may happen, they should be looking closely at themselves and reorganising their own policies. They should make sure that if they do win the Government benches again, the economic mess that they created does not recur.

**MR COURT (Nedlands) [12.50 p.m.]:** I support the amendment, because I am concerned at the effects the policies of the Labor Government are having on the economic development of and employment in this State. I disagree with many of the comments made by the previous speaker.

The Government has promised the people it will improve the employment situation and do many other things, but the fact is that is not occurring. Since the Labor Government has come to power, all we have seen is a procession of increased charges and taxes and its policies are full of red tape. Indeed, there is certainly more Government intervention both in business and our private lives than previously.

When outlining his taxation measures the other night, the Treasurer said the tax burden must be shared to a greater extent by those who have the capacity to pay; that is, the high income earners. That is already the case, but the Treasurer wants that section of the community to accept more of the burden.

When debating the legislation relating to Public Service salary cuts, the Premier said those cuts must be borne by the higher income earners.

As the member for Murdoch said, all these measures seek to redistribute incomes in this country. One of the problems associated with that sort of policy is that it tends to remove the incentive for people to progress. It removes the initiative from the economy.

Surely in these tough times we need that section of the community to provide drive and initiatives to ensure that we grow and, in turn, provide more money for the welfare programmes which we all support, provided the money is available.

Industry is under attack in many areas as a result of the policies of this Government. They include the introduction of a withholding tax which will have severe liquidity effects on business. Members opposite must have received representations from many business people concerned that this tax could be the last straw which puts them out of business.

Another area of concern is the redundancy provisions this Government supports. Once again, such provisions will add to the burden on the business community. A further area of concern is the increases in Government charges which have occurred at a time when the economy is in recession. All these factors make it very difficult for business to perform.

Other areas where industry is under attack, as has been mentioned already, include uranium mining, forestry, and the failure of the Government to arrive at suitable tariff policies. The Government quite willingly accepts the additional, heavy protection given to BHP at a time when the money expended in that area could be used far more productively in this State.

I shall comment briefly on the changes to sales tax. The Government has changed the sales tax payable on a number of different items, but one item, which warranted only a couple of lines in the newspaper, was swimming pools. Members might think swimming pools are a luxury item and people who have them deserve to pay 20 per cent sales tax. The sales tax on video equipment was increased to 32.5 per cent, but there is a big difference between video equipment and swimming pools, because the latter are manufactured in this State. The swimming pool manufacturing industry is relatively small, but it employs many people and the Government should stand up for them and support that industry.

I turn now to the iron ore industry, because it is a vital part of the economy of this State. The Government has bungled in its performance in connection with this industry. The iron ore industry provides a great deal of income for many sectors of the economy of our State and it employs thousands of people. Over the last decade or so, the iron ore industry has been established by Liberal Governments and this Labor Government has walked in and treated it as the goose which has laid the golden egg. The Government is not doing much to protect the iron ore industry to ensure it

remains competitive and is able to expand when the opportunity arises in the future.

In order for the iron ore industry to remain viable and have the opportunity to expand, it must maintain its international competitiveness; it must be able to supply iron ore at prices which are not the same as those charged by other efficient producers, but which are cheaper. When the industry is capable of doing that, it will be able to expand.

The Japanese are concerned about the industrial action which has occurred in the Pilbara for many years. When Liberal Party members refer to this matter, members opposite jump up and say that we are using scare tactics. However, the fact of the matter is the Japanese will no longer accept Western Australia as their major supplier of iron ore. They have turned to other countries in an endeavour to develop alternative supplies of iron ore. The Japanese do not intend to put all their eggs in one basket.

Mr Grill: They have conned us into putting all our eggs into one basket now though.

Mr COURT: Shortly after being elected, the Premier went to Japan and tried to wield the big stick over the Japanese. This indicated either his inexperience or his immaturity in handling trade negotiations. Before the Premier starts to tell the Japanese what to do, he should improve his own knowledge of the iron ore industry in other parts of the world in order that he might be aware of with whom we are competing.

Mr Grill: You are treading on very dangerous ground here.

Mr COURT: The Premier gave an interview when he was in Japan which reads, in part, as follows—

I pointed out to them today that it was all very well to be talking about investing in Brazil or Iran, but those investments at the best of times look pretty shaky and as far as I am concerned, I don't perceive any imminent revolution in Western Australia as there was in Iran and as far as Brazil is concerned, then I can't think of many more unstable areas politically and socially on the globe than South America. And I pointed out that very forcefully to the Japanese and I said to them that in 1995 no-one's going to remember the difficulties of 1983 and at the end of the day we are still going to own the resources.

As if we are the only people who have them! To continue—

They may have all the technology in the world, but of course without resources that technology is not worth a great deal and they

are not going to find iron ore in Japan, they are not going to find reserves of LNG and it's in their interests in the long term to maintain their creditability and sign the contracts.

The Japanese have maintained their credibility; but we must maintain our credibility as a reliable supplier of iron ore at competitive prices. The Premier takes the attitude—

Mr Grill: I don't think you are going to help the position by bad mouthing this State. That is a fact.

A Government member: Like father like son!

Mr COURT: —that Western Australia is a super-reliable supplier of resources and these third world, banana republics are unreliable suppliers. However, these countries have proved over the years to be reliable suppliers. They might have revolutions and overthrow their presidents, or whatever, but they keep exporting their products, because they need the currency they are earning.

To support my remarks, one needs only to look at the difficult position in which overseas producers are placed when they sign uranium contracts with the Liberal Government here which, when a Labor Government takes office, are no longer valid. That has occurred in respect of Yeelirrie. We can no longer talk about contracts of this nature, because the policy changes overnight.

I shall mention Brazil, because it is a country which has an enormous wealth of natural resources. One of the aspects which concerns me about Brazil is that its projects are being funded by many other countries, international banks, the International Monetary Fund, and the United States Treasury.

All these organisations are propping up Brazil when I would much prefer resource development in this country to be supported, because we tend to pay our debts more conscientiously than does Brazil.

Japan also supports Brazil. However, the fact is the Carajas iron ore project there will proceed. It is in the process of construction now and it will create problems for the industry in this State.

*Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.15 p.m.*

Mr COURT: This Government must take more interest in the iron ore industry. A few weeks ago I asked the Minister for Transport a question in connection with the shipping of iron ore and he said he was not aware of any problems. In fact, the industry has been experiencing severe industrial trouble; many iron ore ships have been di-

verted, and are still being diverted; others have been delayed from sailing.

Mrs Buchanan: When or where did that happen?

Mr COURT: The member for Pilbara should know about it; it was on the front page of the member's local newspaper. Yet the Minister had no idea this was occurring—that shows how much interest he has. I know he is not the Minister for Mines, but he expected to be and I thought he would have more interest in the matter. Many problems are being experienced in the Pilbara at present and there is a great deal of instability in the region. As the member for Pilbara would know, for the first time in many years there are long dole queues in that area and many businesses are on the verge of going broke or have already gone broke.

Mrs Buchanan: That started before we got into Government; that situation started under the Liberal Government.

Mr COURT: The member for Pilbara should be concerned about what is taking place in the business community in her area because if a number of businesses close there will be less competition, particularly in the retail section. Prices will be pushed even higher, something I am sure the member does not want to happen.

The Premier does not mind being sarcastic and throwing the odd joke around in this House but when he goes to Japan representing the State I believe he should treat the Japanese with due respect. I am glad the Premier is now in the House. Prior to his departure for Japan the Premier thought he would be forceful and hit them over the head, saying, "You have to buy our iron ore or else". When asked by Howard Sattler to comment on how the Japanese reacted to his forceful approach, he said—

Well I would hate to be hanging by the thumbs waiting for them to smile Howard. They don't burst into gales of laughter very often ...

That is a cutting, insulting sort of comment to make about those people, when supposedly the Premier is trying to assist in what is really a delicate negotiation.

I now refer to the uranium industry, which has been discussed by other speakers. The Premier's policy on uranium seems to be a little obscure. The Minister for Transport said he would very much like to see the Yeelirrie project go ahead. He made that comment before the election and he repeated it in this House today. On the same Howard Sattler show, when questioned about his

Government's policy relating to uranium, the Premier had this to say—

Our policy is very clear and we are not in the business of exporting uranium from mines that haven't yet been discovered. That won't be permitted by the Federal Labor Party's policy.

In other words, he is saying he is bound by that policy. The Premier continued—

And as far as mines which are in the process of operating now or in the process of finalising contracts, then the stage at which they are at, when they seek the Government's blessing, will determine whether or not that project goes ahead. For example, in South Australia, there are two projects—one was Roxby Downs a Labor Government passed the Indenture Bill. I am sorry, a Liberal Government passed the Indenture Bill with Labor support and ... that ... mine will ... go ahead and I understand John Bannon's Labor Government is not changing that, ... decision, but the other mine in South Australia was one called Honey View and that one is not to get the go ahead, so, it depends on the stage at which, at which the mine, ... has reached, ... when the application is made as to whether or not it goes ahead and quite frankly that policy is in place simply because we accept the economic difficulties involved in stopping projects or in when times are difficult, doing anything that affects employment.

In other words, the Government does not really want the projects to go ahead but because things are tough it will allow them to go ahead. The Premier continued—

But you know, and the public knows, that the Labor Party's policy is one which says we are not happy about the export of uranium ...

The Government must decide one way or the other: Does it support the Yeelirrie project going ahead, or not? The Minister for Transport is saying one thing and the Premier is not too sure about the matter.

Resource projects such as the LNG North-West Shelf project, were very difficult to get off the ground and I think the Premier is aware of the competition we are facing in regard to the sale of gas from that project. It does not matter whether that competition is from Indonesia, Malaysia, or Canada; many countries in the world compete for that market.

I will comment on the steel industry, because in recent weeks the Premier has been very critical of

BHP over the Koolyanobbing closures. I hope the Premier keeps in mind the good work that BHP has done and is doing in this State. That company is involved in many projects which compete for international markets. BHP is an efficient producer in those areas and this should be encouraged. I do not support the giving of millions of dollars to BHP's steel division because I think it is time we faced up to the fact that it is a big company, and, if it wants to be involved in the steel industry, it has to be competitive. What concerns me about that decision is that the Premier is arguing about providing a few million dollars for the Koolyanobbing project, and yet he is giving hundreds of millions of dollars to BHP. Surely that money could be better spent elsewhere. Surely the Premier could put up a case for that money to go into development projects in this State which will provide real long-term employment. The money going into the steel industry will not provide new jobs; it will simply maintain the existing levels of employment. The Deputy Premier, who is very keen that our industry should get into the new technology area, should be more forceful; he should oppose the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars to prop up the steel industry.

The recent Budget has been a disappointment in the new technology area. I am sure the Deputy Premier will agree with me. He has just walked into the House. I repeat that he must have been disappointed with the assistance that has been given in the Federal Budget to the new technology area.

Mr Bryce: Very small.

Mr COURT: CSIRO's grant has been slashed by 3.4 per cent.

Mr Bryce: Before you go too far in over your head—

Mr COURT: I have only a couple of minutes left in which to complete my speech.

Mr Clarko: You should not have asked him a question then.

Mr COURT: We were looking forward to taxation incentives in that area of industry and I cannot see those incentives in the budget.

Mr Bryce: They are the subject of a supplementary and special statement by Senator Button on Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Mr COURT: They are the subject of a supplementary statement which was not announced in the Budget.

Mr Bryce: It was announced in the Budget. It said there would be a supplementary statement.

Mr COURT: It said how many millions of dollars would go into that area. The Deputy Premier could make a Press release about how the million dollars will be spent.

Mr Bryce: It will not impact upon the 1983-84 Budget, and that is why it was not mentioned. It will impact on the 1984-85 Budget as forgone revenue; that is the point.

Mr Tonkin: You don't understand these things.

Mr COURT: I conclude by saying it is becoming fashionable for the Federal and State Governments to announce harsh tax increases between Budgets and, when the Budgets actually come out, increases appear to be a bit softer. I predict that this Government will run into problems, as the member for Murdoch said, and I anticipate that in April or May next year we will see increases in income tax and not the cuts that have been promised. If the Government does not increase income tax, it will impose a wealth tax. Already, one day after the Budget has been brought down, the Government is talking about bringing in a wealth tax. It has also been talking about bringing in a wine tax. It said that it would be looking at a wine tax in the future.

MR SPRIGGS (Darling Range) [2.26 p.m.]: I want to make a few brief comments on the amendment before the Chair. The Budget which came out 48 hours ago was very cleverly worded and it will have a tremendous effect on this State and Australia as a whole. One of the easiest ways for the Government to attack the public and raise funds is by increasing fuel tax. Since this Government was elected, we have seen it viciously attack the public by applying an additional tax on fuel and now the Federal Government has further viciously attacked the people of Australia, country people in particular. I am sure members of this House do not realise that people who heat their homes with home fuel and who use a tank that sits on the wall and holds 100 gallons or 410 litres, from the implementation of this tax, will pay \$40 or \$39.80 extra per tank. If that tax will not affect every home in this State, I do not know what will.

The differential subsidy which has been in existence in the country for a long time will be interfered with. This will hit harshly the remote areas of our State. They will be judged at the reseller point. That may not mean much to city dwellers, particularly those on that side of the House—

Mr Tonkin: You are a city dweller.

Mr SPRIGGS: What does it mean? I am a country member.

Mr Tonkin: What a joke!

Mr Pearce: You live closer to Perth than I do.

Mr Tonkin: You live closer to Perth than does the member for Armadale.

Mr SPRIGGS: Government members' knowledge of the country is so limited that they do not even know the area I represent.

Mr Pearce: Your knowledge of the country is so limited that you do not even know when you are out of the metropolitan area.

Mr SPRIGGS: That tax will affect people living in remote areas of our State.

We know what respect members on the other side have for the people who produce 60 per cent of the gross national income of this country. We know they want to take away the right of those people to representation. The Government wants to replace their representatives with bureaucrats. The Government will not give them anything. That attitude is evident in the Federal Budget which attacked people in the country and remote areas. Members opposite are pleased that every homeowner who heats his home with kerosene will from tomorrow have to pay an extra 8.73c a litre, or \$40 for a tank full. They are pleased that the farmers of this great State of ours will be penalised in an unfair fashion.

When the Government came to office, it said it would reduce petrol prices by 3c a litre. Then the Federal Government came to office through a propaganda campaign. Since then we have seen the State Government break its promise and increase the price of petrol by 2c a litre. Now the promised 3c a litre reduction by the Federal Government has been replaced with an increase of 2c a litre, and in country areas it will cost up to 10c a litre more through the reduction of the differential subsidy. It will affect not only farmers, but also mining areas and mining camps. Its effect will be drastic. It will reduce further the standard of living in country areas.

I rose today for two reasons. One was to express my dismay that the public are being treated in a shameful fashion by this Government and its Federal counterparts. The other reason was to express my total disgust at what took place in this House on Thursday afternoon last week. I overheard a remark made at the time, but I did not catch the import of it. It was made by a person whom I consider to be the most insidious, repulsive, and animalistic person I have met.

Mr Tonkin: This is a member of the House?

Mr SPRIGGS: I would like to read the remark made and those leading up to it.

The SPEAKER: The member cannot describe members of Parliament in such a fashion.

Mr SPRIGGS: If I have to withdraw my remarks I will do so, but I point out that I was described as something that I most certainly was not. The remark in no way was truthful and could only have been said by a repulsive person. I would like to read out what was said and recorded in *Hansard*. At the time I did not pick up the complete remark, but I made it my business to get a copy of what was said by the member.

Mr Tonkin: When was this; what date?

Mr SPRIGGS: From memory it was Thursday.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr PEARCE: The member for Darling Range has not named any member. Before we get to the name, it seems to me that for him to describe a member of this House as "repulsive and animalistic" is not within the terms of Standing Orders.

Mr O'Connor: I can understand your being touchy; you probably think it is yourself.

Mr PEARCE: I have never referred to the member for Darling Range in those terms.

Will you, Mr Speaker, rule on the proposition that the member for Darling Range can use terms as he did about a member of this House who may be a member of the Opposition for all I know.

The SPEAKER: I remind the member for Darling Range of Standing Order No. 131 which states—

No Member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any Member of the House.

Mr SPRIGGS: I accept whatever your ruling is out of respect to you, Mr Speaker, and I certainly will retract those words if that is what you desire me to do.

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

I point out that documentary proof exists that I was referred to in a particular way. I believe in all sincerity that if I am referred to in a remark that is degrading, surely I can return that type of remark.

Mr Tonkin: No, they are both disorderly.

The SPEAKER: The problem the member faces is that under Standing Orders he should have sought withdrawal of the remark that offended him at the time it was said. He did not do so and it is not possible to do so now.

Mr SPRIGGS: As I mentioned, the remark was made in a very cunning fashion, in such a way that it was picked up by the loudspeaker and by

the *Hansard* reporter, but it was not said so that it could be heard and I could ask for its retraction.

I refer now to the debate which was taking place when the remark was made. The House was discussing precisely the subject about which I have been speaking today—events that had taken place in this State since that memorable day Parliament was recalled to pass the prices control legislation. The House was debating the price of petrol. My interjection in the debate the other day was factual and truthful. The debate continued as follows—

Mr TONKIN: It is not the only one; we have amended it.

We brought the price back to 42.9c a litre. Since then State and Commonwealth taxes have been increased, and the price of petrol in the metropolitan area and certain controlled areas is now 44.2c a litre. That is still cheaper than it was when we became Government on 25 February. Those are the facts.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr TONKIN: I know members opposite do not want to hear the facts and they have said time and again that petrol is dearer now than when we became the Government. That is a palpable untruth.

Mr Spriggs: You are misleading the House. It is dearer now than before you became Government.

Mr TONKIN: How far is the member going back? Is he going back to the time of Noah's Ark?

Mr Spriggs: I am talking about the day you became Government. It is dearer now than it was then.

Mr TONKIN: That is untrue.

Mr Spriggs: It is not. You have already said it is true.

Mr TONKIN: I have not said it is true. On 25 February, when we became Government, the price of petrol was 44.9c a litre.

Mr Spriggs: It was 42.9c a litre.

Mr TONKIN: No, it was 44.9c a litre.

Mr Parker: We became Government on 25 February. Has the member for Darling Range forgotten that?

Then follows the remarks to which I object totally. *Hansard* continues as follows—

Mr TONKIN: I will ignore the member. I think he is drunk.

I do not think any decent member on that side of the House would agree that that should be recorded for all time in *Hansard*.

Mr Pearce: This was last March.

Mr SPRIGGS: It is totally and utterly untrue. It is a disgusting remark; and it could be made only by a member of the type that I described previously.

Mr Tonkin: If you weren't, I apologise; but you were certainly bellowing like a bullfrog.

Mr SPRIGGS: It fits in with the history of the member. Ever since I have been in the House—and I have been here for just on 6½ years—

Mr Barnett: For 5½ of them, you have been asleep.

Mr SPRIGGS: —the member has debased the House by his attendance here and by the remarks that he has made. He has turned the House into one of which nobody could be proud. Nobody could be proud of the fact that he is a member.

Mr Barnett: It accurately described your antics.

Mr O'Connor: That is very unfair.

Mr SPRIGGS: He should not be a member of the House. In fact, he is unworthy to be a member of human society.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: We hear a suggestion that a member of this place is unworthy of being a member of human society. I suggest that that is unparliamentary.

An Opposition member: For goodness sake!

The SPEAKER: In reply to the Minister for Education, I cannot rule that that is unparliamentary.

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

Mr SPRIGGS: Furthermore, in the coming weeks we will hear from this member about what he believes is fair; but that is unfair and dishonourable so far as I am concerned. Whatever the Minister says in the future will be of no consequence to me. I despise anybody who uses a sneaky method of having my name recorded in a complete untruth.

Mr Tonkin: It was not done sneakily. I said it quite openly.

Mr Barnett: You were not in full control of your senses if you did not hear it.

Mr SPRIGGS: The only people who picked it up were the *Hansard* reporter and the tape.

Mr Gordon Hill: The Opposition did not jump up to object.



Mr SPRIGGS: That is right. They did not hear it.

Nothing unfair has happened in this place since I have been here; but after listening to that member, I am assured that, in the future, anything at all will go. Members can do what they like and say what they like, and that will be upheld.

The short period of time in which this Government has been in office is an appalling period.

I will now deal with petrol prices, and what was said before. We have read all the stories about what the Government did. It was a great gimmick when we came back here on 22 March.

The Minister made a statement that fuel prices today are cheaper than they were when the Government came into office. The figures I will quote for *Hansard* are authentic. In January, in the metropolitan area, one could buy fuel at prices that ranged from 40.6c a litre to 39.7c. In February, the price for petrol in the metropolitan area ranged from 42.9c to 40.9c a litre. Today, one cannot buy fuel anywhere for a price under 42.9c; and after yesterday's Federal tax, it will probably be 46.9c a litre.

When I interjected the other day and said that the Minister was misleading the House, that statement can be proved because it is the truth.

Mr Tonkin: That is not the truth. We became the Government on 25 February. You are mixing the date of the election—

Mr SPRIGGS: If the Minister requires further proof, I am quite happy to bring into the House accounts from petrol resellers with monthly statements. They will prove indisputably that the Minister misled the House, and that what I said was the truth.

Mr Tonkin: That is rubbish.

Mr SPRIGGS: The truth would be something that some members on that side of the House do not understand. I am not referring to all of them.

Mr Tonkin: You are getting mixed up between the date of the election and the date of our becoming the Government.

Mr Blaikie: Why don't you give him a go?

Mr SPRIGGS: Anything said by that Minister I will ignore completely.

I support the amendment because it is time the Government pulled up its socks and decided to do something about the things for which it has a mandate. It has a mandate to try to create jobs, but what has it done? Western Australia is losing jobs. For the first time in two decades, we are losing jobs at the rate of 50 a day, every working day. That is the history of the Government—it is

losing 1 000 jobs a month, 5 000 in five months. For the first time in two decades, that is what is happening to Western Australia.

MR TRETHOWAN (East Melville) [2.46 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment to the Address-in-Reply—

Mr Pearce: What was said about you last week?

Mr TRETHOWAN: —because it highlights the inconsistency within the Government of this State. As I outlined last week, that inconsistency relates to the conflict between the words uttered by those whom one could describe as political pragmatists, and the policies which have been developed by the supporters of the Government, which are based on an ideology that, in many cases, is totally in conflict with that kind of political pragmatism needed to ensure the continued development of this State, and to ensure that the employment record of the State is maintained.

I would have thought it was obvious to almost anyone in Western Australia that the State's future is highly dependant on the mining industry. We have seen that industry as the principal instigator of growth within the Western Australian economy for at least the last 16 to 20 years. I am confident that it will remain the principal instigator of growth within the economy of Western Australia well into the middle of the next century.

In this State, we have commodities which the rest of the world will purchase if we can produce them efficiently, and if we can assure supply and compete on the world market. The first step in the development of a mine is for the mineral to be found. The key to a buoyant mining industry is a continuous exploration programme. It requires a considerable amount of money in the field of exploration before the fruits of the exploration and development of a resource can become available.

As I am sure some members of the Government would know, exploration is an extremely high-risk venture. It requires that the ground rules, under which the exploration is undertaken, are clear, consistent, and long term because of the risk involved and the amount of money to be expended.

Companies which have the expertise to carry out exploration effectively need to be assured that they can gain access easily to areas of interest for exploration purposes; and following the exploration, they should be in a position, should an economically viable resource be found, to develop that resource for the benefit of themselves, obviously, and also for the benefit of this State.

Any uncertainty related to the ground rules for an exploration programme, any inhibition of the ability of exploration companies to explore the ground to find the minerals, will in the long term tell very heavily on the development of the mining industry in this State and, as a result, on the rate of economic growth we can expect.

One of the points that worries me the most is the effect of an inhibition to prevent exploration companies being able to gain easy access to Crown land suitable for mineral exploration. The economic benefit of such exploration programmes is not just in the long term. I am sure the member for Kalgoorlie, the Minister for Transport, and many other members opposite who may have mining areas within their electorates, will know only too well that exploration provides a significant impetus in the communities within those areas. We can almost measure the buoyancy of Kalgoorlie by the degree of exploration in the Eastern Goldfields area. Mining and exploration activities employ people in the transport industry, the support services industry, and in the industries which supply the products the exploration companies require. These activities frequently provide isolated communities with the infrastructure they might not otherwise have had; infrastructure such as better services with telecommunications, daily air flights, and perhaps the establishment of medical posts. These are the kinds of advantages that flow to communities in remote areas following major exploration programmes, and particularly if any mineral resource is found and developed.

My concern is that an inhibition may be placed on exploration companies in this State, so preventing their being able to cover Crown land. That inhibition relates to Aboriginal land rights. I understand that the State Government is committed to a policy of introducing Aboriginal land rights and, further, as with the Federal Government at present, it is committed to a policy of Aboriginal land rights modelled on the system which currently prevails in the Northern Territory.

The effect since 1975 of the land rights legislation in the Northern Territory has been extremely salutary; the effect has almost brought to a standstill exploration programmes in the Northern Territory. Exploration companies have found that to comply with the Act they must pass through a maze of bureaucracy.

I will quote from a paper issued by the Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy. It is dated June 1982 and is titled, "Some comments on Aboriginal land rights as it affects the administration of mining in the Northern Territory". I would like to outline to the House the

steps required of an exploration company in the Northern Territory before it can actually get on to the ground to look for minerals.

The first of these steps is similar to the first step in almost every other State in Australia; it is similar certainly to the procedure in Western Australia. The first thing a company must do is apply to the Department of Mines and Energy and lodge an application for an exploration licence. Following this is the preliminary processing to record the application in a register and to record the application on departmental maps. The next step is to notify the relevant land council in writing of the application and to advertise the application in appropriate newspapers.

Following this the application is assessed on the following basis: Technical competence of the applicant; financial resources of the applicant; past exploration history of the applicant; the suitability of the proposed work programme; and the programme's environmental effect. This is very similar to the requirements in almost every other State. A recommendation is then made by the Department of Mines and Energy to the Minister and then approval by the Administrator is required.

In almost every other State, those steps take two to three months to complete, which is not an unreasonable period; but this is where the difference occurs. From that point on the exploration companies enter a period of waiting. The following steps have to be complied with. The Northern Territory Minister for Mines and Energy offers in writing an exploration licence to the applicant and advises the respective land council, which allows the applicant to commence negotiations with the land council; in other words, there is what is known as an offer from the Minister for an exploration licence. The applicant then negotiates with the land council for the consent of the council to the granting of the exploration licence. So the company cannot begin work on the ground until the land council issues a consent to the exploration licence. Once the consent is obtained from the land council, the application is referred to the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. The Minister for Mines and Energy then grants the exploration licence subject to the appropriate conditions and the approval of the Administrator.

I illustrate the situation that has occurred in the Northern Territory in relation to these forms of applications. Paragraph 3.1.2. headed "Mining Consent Delays" reads as follows—and I point out that this is as at June 1982, 12 months ago—

The step-by-step procedures necessary for a mining concern are lengthy, especially

when the compensation and/or consent agreements are negotiated. Since the commencement of the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act, only 3 compensation agreements (Ranger, Naborlek and Mereenie) have been completed by the Land Councils. Land Councils presently have 55 offers of grant of exploration licences before them, all of which were lodged or were connected with an interest in existence before 15 December 1972. There are at present approximately 250 more applications for exploration licences lodged after 15 December 1972 that have been considered and offers are about to be made to successful applications.

I understand that since that time, in relation to Arnhem Land, 121 exploration licence offers were made as at July 1982, only a month after the publication of this paper, but, although negotiations have been proceeding with the land councils, none of those offers has been brought to a conclusion. No agreement has yet been reached with the Northern Land Council in relation to those exploration licences. Instead of a wait of two to three months, as would happen in this State, from the time of an application by a suitable applicant complying with all the requirements of the department to get on to the ground to look for minerals, in the Northern Territory the companies have to wait at least 12 months. They are just not able to get on to the ground to do any exploration work. I point out that the Northern Land Council has 80 members, including highly skilled lawyers, accountants, and anthropologists, yet they still cannot process these applications.

The mining companies run into a wall of bureaucracy, which does not encourage them to proceed, and which is currently antagonistic to their proceeding. Unless an exploration company can get onto the ground to look for minerals, we will not find those minerals, and, if we do not find them, we will have nothing in the future on which to base our development. Under the policies of this Government the mining industry may well get into that situation in this State. It would be catastrophic for exploration companies in this State to be frustrated in the way they have been in the Northern Territory.

I have been told by members of the mining industry that a number of very large companies, which operate worldwide and are very heavily invested in exploration programmes, are considering and have been considering for some time whether there is any point in exploring in the Northern Territory, despite the fact that they are

sure suitable minerals are to be found in the ground there. This is as a result of the wall of bureaucracy which inhibits their actually getting onto the ground to find the minerals that are needed.

Mr Bryce: Would it surprise the member to know that I agree, and that I would hope Western Australia is never confronted with the shemuzzle that exists in the Northern Territory.

Mr Peter Jones: Why then create the uncertainty?

Mr Bryce: No-one is creating uncertainty.

Mr TRETOWAN: I remind the Deputy Premier that my time is starting to run out; and I remind him that it is the policy of this Government and the Federal Government, behind which this Government has hidden in relation to the mining of uranium, that the mining model of the Northern Territory could be extended to mining in all States of this country. In fact, the Premier has indicated that himself.

I wonder how hard members of the Government are prepared at the present to fight against the sort of legislation now sought by the Commonwealth. I am sure the Deputy Premier well knows that the effect of that legislation will be to reduce all exploration in this State dramatically, and it will reduce the potential for finding mineral deposits so that they can be developed now or when suitable economic windows present themselves for the developing of a mine in the future, if at present suitable conditions are not available. Such projects would permit the growth of future employment in this State. It all comes back to our being able to get onto the ground to explore; it all comes back to a knowledge that the ground rules we have are to encourage a responsible industry, encourage an industry which will produce wealth to benefit the whole of the State, as well as the whole of the country.

I have very grave concern about this State Government, even if it does not entirely and actively support, or even some of its members do not actively support, the attitudes of the Federal Government. I do not believe they have shown any sign that they will actively avoid the imposition of those sorts of controls in this State. It concerns me that one of our principal industries could be stifled by people who seek to introduce legislation that will inhibit reasonable and responsible companies, which are only too prepared to meet reasonable community demands in their industry area, and which in the past have produced first-class results in this State for the benefit of future Western Australians.

I only hope that sanity will prevail and that we will see the kinds of rulings brought forward similar to that which occurred in South Australia in relation to that State's Lands Rights Act. Mr Justice Millhouse indicated that he viewed the Lands Rights Act in conflict with the Federal Racial Discrimination Act. I only hope we will be able to have sensible ground rules which encourage exploration in this State. I hope too, but I fear my hope is a vain hope, that the policies of the current Federal Government will give an indication that it will favour a strong mining industry. Some of the words and promises of this State Government indicate that it has a potential for reasonable acceptance of the necessity for strong growth in the mining industry to benefit this State. However, its actions have yet to be seen. Its action to fight for the Yeelirrie project was non-existent. Its actions in regard to the sensible development of the mining industry will be watched very carefully.

Because of what I have said, it gives me great pleasure to support the amendment before the House.

**MR RUSHTON (Dale)** {3.06 p.m.}: I fully support the amendment, the first few words of which emphasise the position we are in, and those words are—

But we regret to advise Your Excellency that the platforms of the Australian Labor Party and State and Federal Labor Governments will inhibit economic development and the growth of employment in Western Australia.

The Federal Budget just introduced indicates that point clearly, as well as the threat to the future of the financial stability of Australians. We speak about so many separate issues and items that we tend not to address ourselves to the main problem, which is that the industrial power that is still marked by and emphasised in the whole structure of that Federal Budget is dependent upon the ACTU and the TLC; it is dependent upon union executives being able to maintain control over the wage structure. Such control might seem to be good, but some people are tending to doubt that the Prime Minister can maintain the necessary control over wages through his old friends.

He could have some success, but it has not been shown in the past that that approach can work. If anyone is to make it succeed, he is the person who, through his old associations and buddies, has more chance than anybody else. However, I suggest that is totally unfair for the Australian structure. For instance, I think it was the main factor that brought down the Fraser Government.

The power within the ACTU and the TLC, and held by union executives, to control the financial structure and future of Australia is too dangerous altogether. Basically we are back to the days of faceless men and women controlling the country other than those who have been elected. It is not something we can accept now or in the future. It is totally unfair to have people other than the elected representatives run this country. Basically through backdoor methods and measures, others have been able to run the country. Our people, conservative Governments, do have something for which to answer; they did not act strongly and directly in an endeavour to root out this evil within our community.

**Mr Bryce:** What is that evil again?

**Mr RUSHTON:** I will tell the Minister. This was emphasised at the time the Prime Minister was an advocate for the ACTU. He was a man of ability, and effectively destroyed the sanctions written in law covering the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Through the O'Shea case, I think it was, he was able to make it operate thereafter that the penalties inflicted by that commission for the lack of performance or acceptance on the part of others to follow its decisions were destroyed. The sanctions have not been applied, although it is law that they can be applied.

**Mr Bryce:** You are being uncharacteristically generous if you attribute that change of situation to the Prime Minister. There were a great many other Australians who participated in that.

**Mr RUSHTON:** If the Deputy Premier reads the background of this, as I have, he will know that much of the success of the unions from an industrial point of view was due to the advocacy of the Prime Minister. The Deputy Premier will find that Mr Hawke basically intimidated the commission of the day. Certainly he won his point in the way he did try to win it. He was the one who generated the turmoil and strife within the industrial scene and then orchestrated the O'Shea case.

What is the financial future of Australia? It is in doubt and is, in fact, in desperate need of a remedy. It can be understood easily why this situation has occurred because the Labor Party and the unions are one and the same family. The Labor Party was created from the unions and, of course, when we see a situation like that which arose the other night concerning the Minister for Transport who was told by the TLC to change his ways, it is a reflection of our independent election system and the administration of the State. The Labor Party has a group of faceless men who can call—

Mr Bertram: They are not very faceless, not like the Liberal Party.

Mr RUSHTON: They cannot do this. I suppose the member for Balcatta would say there is some credit in being blatant. If the Government continues in its present way, there will not be anybody else in this place because it will be run like the old jack boot system and people will be appointed from the outside and not by elections.

Mr Bertram: You can do better than this—it is awful stuff.

Mr Gordon Hill: Haven't you got a better imagination?

Mr RUSHTON: I like the facts.

Several members interjected.

Mr Blaikie: Be quiet, dope!

Mr RUSHTON: That is all right; I do not mind. That is the way he makes his speeches these days.

The present system is structured so that the unions can maintain their commitment to the Federal Government for a prices and wages accord. It has not worked anywhere else, but we hope that in the interests of Australia it will have some effect because without it the Budget is certainly out the door. It will be destroyed and the economy of the country will be shattered.

The sooner we can initiate a better system—I would call it a contract system—so that everyone knows what they are dealing with, the sooner Australia will return to a commonsense position and we will have the stability that is desired.

I cannot emphasise enough that we need to give urgent attention to the question of our industrial future. I put it above everything else—above federation for that matter. If we cannot get industrial sense or stability, there is no hope of this country being financially stable.

There is an urgent need to make the financial future of Australia independent of big business and big unions. The way that we are heading at the present time with the introduction of a withholding tax and redundancy payments the Government is certainly getting itself into trouble. The support of redundancy payments by the Burke Government is certainly destroying the confidence of employers. It has been introduced for the benefit of the unions. Small businessmen cannot cope with it and they will not be able to cope with the withholding tax.

Mr Bryce: Why didn't you tell Fraser and Howard that when you were in Government? You had the perfect opportunity as Deputy Premier of Western Australia to convey that to Fraser and Howard.

Mr RUSHTON: How does the Deputy Premier know that I did not convey it to Howard? He knows and I know that I have private meetings with John Howard.

Mr Bryce: There is no evidence that the previous Government in Western Australia lifted one finger to protest to the Federal Government about the withholding tax provisions.

Mr RUSHTON: A withholding tax would not be accepted by conservative parties.

Mr Bryce: It was, and they voted for it. The system designed by Howard was for 25 per cent, not 10 per cent.

Mr RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier knows and I know that it is totally unacceptable by the Liberal Party.

Mr Bryce: It was voted for in Canberra.

Mr RUSHTON: There are many things that are voted for in Canberra but with which we disagree. We voted against the fuel tax.

Withholding tax and redundancy payments are directed towards destroying small businessmen and certainly the financial well-being of Australia.

One of the factors of redundancy payments is related to *pro rata* long service leave and sick leave. This brings me to the decision of the Tonkin Government. When that Government was in power it received a claim from the waterside workers that accumulated sick leave be paid. The port authority resisted this claim, but it was directed by the Tonkin Government to implement the claim. It now applies not only to the waterfront, but also to the administrative staff employed by the port authority. A person can accumulate sick leave for the entire period of his employment and apply for *pro rata* sick leave when he retires. It would be calculated on his current rate of salary. This was initiated by a Labor Government and it reflects the type of administration this Government encourages. The effects of redundancy payments can be outlined by two examples. A person who retires at 45 years and has 20 years' service could accumulate 4½ years' wages for sick leave. How can that be accepted by a Government which says that it is encouraging small business and employment?

It just cannot work. Let us consider the case of a 45-year-old employee with one year's service who has been made redundant. Such a person could be entitled to the equivalent of one year's wages. A great deal more thought has to be given to the future of the business well-being of this country, and even the Australian Labor Party is accepting that fact. A healthy private sector is

what we must achieve to get the employment situation moving. Employment generation comes from a healthy private sector, and therefore, there is an urgent need for the Labor Party to question what it is doing on the expenditure side. Certainly it is not setting an example—it is providing facilities for Ministers and hangers-on that are far beyond what is acceptable in a commercial sense. It is wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I would like to refer to an answer given by the Minister for Transport when he was asked about the collection of fares on the railways. I asked him why did not the MTT inspectors carry out this inspectorial service. His reply was as follows—

MTT inspectors are only used for bus and ferry operations. It is surprising to say the least that the member was not aware that Westrail has its own qualified inspectors to cover train operations.

- (a) 45 uniformed inspectors used in various capacities.
- (b) eight specifically related to fare inspections.

A million dollars could be saved by a rationalisation of railway employees, and just to prove it would be satisfactory from a safety point of view, I say that after 8.00 p.m. two-man or two-women crews are quite acceptable, although more staff are required during the day.

I set up an inquiry into the introduction of a light rail service. This study was well advanced, and the report has now come forward. Coupled with that was the negotiation with the union for the proper manning of our suburban trains. I suppose that will go by the board now. The Minister is appointing more inspectors when all that was needed was to transfer inspectors from the MTT to carry out inspectorial service on the suburban trains. This Government should start setting an example by saving money. It ought to encourage the private sector by spending less in the public sector. Whatever its words are, unless it achieves that result, it will not be a good example to the private sector. The Government will be judged by its achievement.

The other point I would like to make about the private sector is in respect of the Government's consideration of a 100 000 hectare reserve in the northern forest area. Such a reserve will affect Jarrahdale, North Dardanup, Dwellingup, Pinjarra, Boddington, and many other areas. I have referred to the forest areas in my electorate, and members can see that, if ever a move was counterproductive to increasing employment and increasing financial gain for this State, it is a move such as that. The State Government does

not take this action once only—it is taking the same sort of action all over the place. Everything it touches has this sort of socialistic cobweb hanging over it. People will not be encouraged to invest here and to work here because they know they will be ill-treated.

I would like to conclude by saying that the amendment has my strongest support. It highlights the central dangers Australia faces today by the industrial malaise and the industrial climate we are enduring, and this fact shows through clearly in the structuring of this year's Federal Budget.

**MR WILLIAMS (Clontarf)** [3.24 p.m.]: I enter this debate in support of the amendment. I support also the comments of the previous speaker, the member for Dale who said that unless we have industrial peace, we will not get back on a sound financial footing in this State.

I was very interested in the headlines in today's *The West Australian* which read, "Unions to back budget, says Government". The question that immediately entered my mind is: Who runs this country? Is it the unions or is it the Government?

Mr Old: Good question.

Mr WILLIAMS: The Government was elected by the people, but I do not believe the unions are elected by the people. For the Government of the day to be so concerned about what the unions think, obviously the unions run the Government. We all know this is so in practice and therefore, we do not have a true representative Government governing Australia today. It is governed by the Communists and their so-called leaders.

Several members interjected.

A Government member: That's outrageous!

Mr WILLIAMS: I am speaking here to give people on the other side of the House a little bit of advice. After all those years of their wandering in the wilderness because of the unions, I might be able to knock some sense into Government members to make them realise that they must govern in their own right and not be dictated to by those people from Moscow.

Several members interjected.

Mr WILLIAMS: If we are to get back on the rails, one of the most important things is to ensure that private enterprise—which employs three out of four of the work force—is put back into a profitable position. The Government can do this in many ways, but after reading Tuesday night's Federal Budget, we see that the Federal Government has done nothing whatever to help small business. Even the pro-Labor Party newspaper, the *Daily News*, has come out and stated that it

will cost people an extra \$16 a week. That figure is not quite correct—it is more like \$24 a week.

Mr Bertram: I think you are getting confused, aren't you?

Mr WILLIAMS: Certain comments have been made, and I would like to refer particularly to the 17½ per cent holiday loading. I know we have mentioned this matter before, but nobody has taken much notice of it. The Confederation of Western Australian Industry took a case to the Industrial Commission over this loading. It is very interesting to note that when the Labor Party came to power, the Premier said that it would not interfere with the arbitration system.

Mr Blaikie: It even directed the arbitration system.

Mr WILLIAMS: So what did the Government do? When the Confederation of Western Australian Industry took action to try to keep as many businesses as possible in a viable position, and took a case to the Industrial Commission to remove the 17½ per cent loading, what did this Government do? After saying it would not interfere with the arbitration commission, it said, "No matter what the ruling of the arbitration commission is, we will remain with the 17½ per cent loading for all Government employees". No other country in the world tolerates such nonsense as a holiday loading. The commission said that had it not been for the direction from the Government, it would have removed the 17½ per cent loading. However, it did not do that.

Mr Parker: It did not say anything of the sort—that is completely untrue.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am talking—the Minister is gagged by his Premier.

Mr Parker: We are not gagged at all.

Mr WILLIAMS: The Minister is not allowed to talk, so he should be quiet.

Mr Parker: I am just suggesting that you cannot be telling the truth to the Parliament.

Mr WILLIAMS: The commission said it is not fair to private enterprise, so therefore it would not remove the loading. This Government has already gagged the arbitration commission. I think it was the member for Dale who said today, and quite rightly, that in certain Government departments, sick leave entitlements can accumulate. In fact, if an employee does not take his sick leave, in some cases he could retire on sick pay 12 months before the official retirement age. In other cases sick pay entitlements may be taken in a lump sum. In the private sector, sick leave has never been an entitlement and it never should have been an entitlement.

Sick leave is available if it is required in genuine cases and private enterprise recognises that. However, it does not recognise sick leave as an entitlement and it should not be an entitlement. It is a great impost on private enterprise. For many years we have heard also about payroll tax. We have learnt to live with it and hopefully, gradually, it will go. Payroll tax was all very well when the economy was all right, but it is an impost today.

The most damaging impositions on private enterprise are the excessive increases in wages. When my party was in Government, it had the right idea. It introduced a wages freeze which would have worked had it been allowed to, but the unions instructed the Government it was not to be proceeded with and, therefore, it has not been.

Another matter which is the ruination of private enterprise is the provision of shorter working hours. Such reductions in working hours cannot be tolerated. If employees were to work 40 hours a week, perhaps it could be said private enterprise could tolerate it, but they are not doing even that. One of the greatest detrimental problems in this State—I have said this in the House many times and it is worth repeating—is industrial disputation. This has done more to undermine private enterprise industry and the wealth of this State than has any other single factor.

When a downturn occurs overseas in the number of export commodities required, if our export market for those commodities is to survive—I refer here to minerals and rural products—we cannot tolerate increases in prices. However, they have occurred over the last three or four years. Prices have been increasing while, at the same time, demand for the commodities has been reducing. The inevitable has happened: Overseas importers have looked elsewhere to obtain commodities at reasonable prices and, in turn, Australia has lost those export markets. We have no-one to blame but ourselves and, in particular, we have no-one to blame but the unions and the Labor Party which supports them.

I often hear the question posed, "Why do we not employ more young people?" I think it is a shame that more young people are not employed and I say that quite sincerely. However, one of the reasons for that is that the wage structures for apprenticeships within certain unions have increased to such a degree that it is not a reasonable proposition to employ a young person on an apprenticeship. It is far better to employ an older person who has more experience and can do the job, for the simple reason that a 15-year-old person undertaking an apprenticeship today, in many cases, earns from the word go, 40 per cent of the

wage of a fully qualified person. That is just not acceptable to private enterprise.

If we reached a more equitable situation where a 15-year-old perhaps started on a lower wage and, after five or six years of his apprenticeship, at the age of 21, was able to earn the full wage, far more young people would be able to be employed. This is an important factor and we must take the steps I have recommended if we are to achieve our goal.

There is no award for apprenticeships or junior pay in the Builders Labourers' Federated Union of Workers, so a 15-year-old has to be paid the full wage when he walks onto a building site.

Mr Parker: That is not right.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am not interested in what the Minister has to say—the chief, No. 1 boy who stops cement pours and so forth. That is a disgrace.

Mr Parker: That is not true and you know it.

Mr WILLIAMS: One of the other reasons we have lost so many of our export markets is as a result of the activities on the waterfront of people like the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services. For years now we have been trying to achieve some sort of unity on the waterfront. We have been saying that we have to get our commodities exported; we have to bring commodities into Australia at a reasonable price; we cannot afford the humbug of shipping being held up willy-nilly. Of course, nobody is taking any notice.

If one goes to Fremantle these days, one thanks the Lord for the American Navy, because, on occasions, it fills up the Fremantle Harbour. Apart from the US naval ships, there is only an odd ship here and there in Fremantle harbour. There could be a live sheep ship or the like in the port and, of course, the unions are doing their best to stop them as well. The Port of Fremantle has very little importing and exporting activity because of continual industrial disputes which have been occurring in this State and throughout Australia for a number of years.

Mr Parker: We have the best record for industrial dispute in Australia.

Mr WILLIAMS: That is bunkum!

Mr Parker: That is true.

Mr WILLIAMS: But what a shocking record!

Mr Parker: The member for Darling Range agreed.

Mr WILLIAMS: The Minister ought to wake up. He is saying the Port of Fremantle has the best record for waterfront disputes in Australia.

The Australian waterfronts have the worst record in the world. How does one argue in favour of the worst record in the world? The Minister is part of that worst record; he is doing his best to kill exports.

Several members interjected.

Mr Parker: Fremantle has a very good record.

Mr Blaikie: Western Australia is the best of the worst!

Mr WILLIAMS: Industry cannot carry on under circumstances like that.

Mr Parker: The member for Dale might also tell you the situation.

Mr WILLIAMS: When the Minister gets off his hobbyhorse—

Mr Parker: Ask the member for Dale.

Mr WILLIAMS: I ask the Minister. He is part of the gangster system which has done all the damage.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr PARKER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I object to that reference by the member for Clontarf which is an insult not only to me as a member of the House, but also to the trade union movement in Fremantle.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has asked for the withdrawal of the word "gangster".

Mr WILLIAMS: I agree to withdraw it.

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

In 1981—

Mr Bryce: Why look at the member for Vasse so affectionately if you are directing your remarks to the Chair?

Several members interjected.

Mr WILLIAMS: On one occasion in 1981, as a result of strike action, 81 ships were held up. The cost per day for those ships was \$6 000 each which amounted to a total daily cost of \$1.5 million. These are the sorts of costs which have been imposed on shipping companies and organisations throughout the world to the extent that insurance policies on ships coming into Australia demand the highest premiums in the world. Many countries are saying they will not send their ships to load and unload in Australian ports, because they are not dependable. They say that they cannot obtain a return on their investments; therefore, in consequence, Australia is paying the highest freight rates in the world and the whole country is suffering, because countries are not accepting our exports.



Germany will import only four per cent of our exports, because it is believed we are unreliable and the cost of our exports is too great. Farmers should be concerned about the position. Members may recall that, at one stage we were exporting 2 000 tonnes of chilled beef per month to Japan. Because of strike action over a period, Japan has now looked elsewhere and we have lost that market completely.

These are the sorts of things which create unemployment. Japan has a great capacity to consume steaming coal for its iron industry. As a result of strike action which occurred at Newcastle and elsewhere, Japan warned Australia that it would not tolerate the situation much longer. Of course, the people in control in Newcastle said, "Come on! They are only joking. We have cheaper freight costs than the Americans because they have much further to come. The cost of coal is the same. The Japanese are only pulling the wool over our eyes. We will carry on in the same disruptive manner".

Japan was not joking, because it ordered 10 000 tonnes of steaming coal from Colorado in the United States of America. The freight charges were nearly twice those from Australia, but the people in Colorado could guarantee supply and Australia could not, because of strike action. As a result, in one hit, we lost a 25 000 tonne order for steaming coal forever. We never learnt the lesson, because in the early 1960s we gained those orders from America because the same sort of strike action was happening there.

Mr O'Connor: We lost orders from Korea for iron ore for the same reason.

Mr WILLIAMS: I was about to make that point. We lost jobs for our young Australians in the north. This was as a result of the same strike action, but apparently this Government thinks that was a joke.

Last night the Premier read out a long list of the great things he discussed over the phone with Mr Hawke, matters which related to what Western Australia will get from the Federal Budget. The Premier said that we have got this and we have got that, but he should remember that he did not achieve those things for the State; it was our Government which did that.

Mr Bryce: Oh, I see, you take responsibility for the good things, but you don't for the mistakes.

Mr WILLIAMS: The Premier said he obtained all those things for this State. Yesterday morning I was at a breakfast at which the Premier discussed the Federal Budget. He said that he went to great lengths to take over the portfolio of Tourism because he knew what tourism meant to this

State. That is fair enough, and exactly how he should feel. However, I ask members to bear in mind that he is the Chairman of the Rottnest Island Board, and the member for Rockingham is a member of that board.

Mr Blaikie: There are no women on it.

Mr WILLIAMS: I think there is one. The Premier also wanted the portfolio of Tourism. A copy of a memorandum was sent to me yesterday from people at Rottnest. I ask members to remember that this Premier wants to keep costs down. The memorandum states—

#### LESSEES AND RESIDENTS OF ROTTNEST ISLAND

##### re Power Charges

As you are probably aware, that due to the rapid escalation in the cost of diesel fuel over the last few years, (if the Arabs don't put up the price, the Federal Government does)—

That is certainly true. To continue—

—the Island Power House has been operating at a considerable loss and it is the direction of the present Board that the operating costs must be covered.

To this end, the price of power will be increased to 18 cents per unit from 1st October 1983.

The Premier has more than doubled the price of power at Rottnest Island, but he has said his Government is concerned for small business. Not on your sweet nelly it is. This Government has the cost of leases compounded each year according to CPI rises, and as I told the House last year, one rent increase was from \$135 000 a year to \$150 000. Many other similar increases were made. To one firm, the increased price of power will represent a cost of \$12 000.

Rottnest Island has three of those whirligigs for the production of power. I have not told members about this.

Mr Blaikie: They are the turbines.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, the island has three of them, and they each require a certain amount of maintenance. Originally they cost \$100 000 to install.

Mr Wilson: Who put them in?

Mr WILLIAMS: The Government is responsible for them, and the Premier is the chairman of the board. Do members know what has happened to these turbines? They are not used in the generation system because the power, to use the expression of people on the island, is being buried; the turbines require a technician to be present at all times to read the meters in case there is a

surge of power and, perhaps, a generator will be ruined. The board cannot be bothered to pay for a technician, so the turbines are in disrepair. As a result of all this, the residents of Rottnest Island will pay 18c a unit from 1 October 1983. Shame!

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Leader of the Opposition) [3.34 p.m.]: I will speak briefly to support the amendment moved by the member for Narrogin. We ought to bring forward incidents, such as those explained by the amendment, to the notice of the Government as strongly as we can in this House. The points made by the member for Narrogin relate to economic growth, resource development, environmental management, Government taxes and charges, Aboriginal land rights, and Government intervention in public ownership. I am concerned as to where this State, and Australia as a whole, is heading today. Without doubt the actions of the present State and Federal Governments will inhibit economic development and any assistance to create employment. In due course their actions will create unemployment.

I have given consideration to the charges recently imposed by this Government and the Federal Government. If one considers the estimates of receipts, and the summary of estimated expenditure for the year ended 30 June 1984 calculated by the Hon. J. S. Dawkins MP, one has real concern for the effects of these increases in the costs of commodities and the increases in taxes that this country has had to bear over the past four or five months. I attribute these increases to the policies of this Government and the Federal Government. These increases will help to stop recovery in this State.

We have witnessed improved economic conditions in the United States, which have had an effect on Japan and other countries of the world, but I fear that, because of the imposition of taxes on the community of this country, we will lag behind those countries in achieving a satisfactory result for our economy.

From this document circulated by Mr Dawkins I will refer to the 1982-83 and projected 1983-84 *per capita* taxation on individuals in Australia. If one reads this document, one realises that, in 1982-83, the *per capita* taxation was \$2 912. In 1983-84, it will rise to \$3 280, an increase of \$368.50 per person.

An Australian household is regarded as having the equivalent of 3.4 people, and on that basis the increased *per capita* taxation imposed by the Commonwealth's mini-Budget and the latest Budget will run into more than \$1 200 a year, which is in excess of \$24 a week for each household. These figures are the Government's own fig-

ures included in a document it circulated under the hand of Mr Dawkins.

Not only will there be an increased cost of \$24 to each household each week, but also, this State Government has imposed further taxes. We must realise also that tax increases have effects on other things such as manufactured goods imported to this State. About 85 per cent of our manufactured goods come from interstate or overseas. In the last few days it has been said by truckies who come across the Nullarbor that the increased taxes will mean an increase of 15 per cent in our transport costs. We must consider areas of this State such as the Kimberley and the Pilbara to understand the amount of inconvenience we will suffer and the increased costs we will have to pay, costs which will be more than those in any other part of Australia. The \$24 a week per household will be only part of the hit to the average person in this State.

I ask members to consider also the charges imposed recently in Western Australia by the Burke Government. Electricity and gas charges have risen for the average householder by \$2.20 per week, and fixed charges for water plus the average excess, and the charge for sewerage, will cause an extra 80c a week to be spent by each householder. Bus fares for the people using buses will cost an extra \$2. Hospital insurance increases will cost \$3 a week; SHC rentals for those involved, \$4.50 a week; and the tobacco tax means an extra \$2.10 a week. The total is \$14.60 a week in those areas alone.

I ask members to consider further Mr Keating's mini-Budget. They will realise that for those affected the repeal of the mortgage rebate will cost about \$405 a year, or \$7.79 a week; telephone rentals will increase by 57c a week; the minor's income exemption reduction will cost \$3.68 a week; the lifting of block concessions will cost \$2.42 a week; and the dividend rebate repeal will cost \$5.90 a week. The total increase for those affected by those mini-Budget measures is \$1 058.82 a year, or \$20.36 a week. They are very substantial increases. When one looks at the Hawke Government's promises to cut taxation, one wonders what we in this country can believe. The following statement appeared in *The West Australian* of 14 February, which was a couple of weeks before the election—

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Hawke, yesterday committed a Federal Labor government to significant tax cuts for almost six million Australians in its first national Budget.

This sort of thing should not occur when Governments make commitments such as this to the community and then back-pedal on them. It shows the insincerity of those making the promises and it leaves people much worse off than they would otherwise be. To substantiate my comment one has to look only at this article in this evening's newspaper under the heading "Yearly Check on Pensioners", which reads, in part, as follows—

...about 170 000 pensioners will be worse off under the assets test system announced in Tuesday's Budget.

But up to 350 000 could be better off.

I venture to suggest that next year we will see the reverse of that position: 170 000 people could be better off, and 350 000 worse off.

We cannot believe statements made by Governments in this country in connection with financial matters. The Keating Budget and the mini-Budget that the Premier drew up for this State together took well over \$35 a week out of the average householder's pocket. I am not referring to the householder as an individual, but to the average household. The document put forward by Mr Dawkins stated that on one issue alone they agreed that *per capita* the increase was over \$24 per week. We can see the difficulties facing people in this country and the difficulty we face in improving the economy with industry presently suffering in so many ways; and increases in electricity, water, and fuel costs will further reduce profitability. If there is anything left, it will place employers in a position of needing to further reduce employment, and this will create greater unemployment in this country.

Mr Keating, in the Federal Budget speech, said that his Government would create work for 300 000 people through training and employment programmes. This would cost \$958 million. If we took the wages for employing those 300 000 people alone, on average it would run into \$61 per week less than the dole payment. If we look at the \$958 million on the general basis throughout the State of 30 jobs per \$1 million, it would result in about 30 000 jobs, or one-tenth of the work that Mr Keating states his Budget will provide. It will do nothing more than provide jobs for individuals for something like six or eight weeks during the year. Mr Keating's statement is very misleading.

The State Government has done very little since it has been in office to improve the job situation. I will not comment to any extent on unemployment in this State for the first three months that the Government was in office, because I believe that over that three-month period the effect of our Government's policies would have been felt

and, good or bad, the previous Government must accept the blame, or the accolade for them. One can see what is happening. now. *The West Australian* of 8 July quotes an article under the heading "States defrauding the job losses" and, in connection with Western Australia, it reads as follows—

The Western Australian Premier, Mr Burke, said the March State election had prevented final approval for wage pause projects until the beginning of April.

He was also unaware how much of his State's allocation of \$8.79 million has been spent although State Government sources have suggested the figure is as low as \$200 000.

I believe that to be the amount. Almost \$9 million is available in this State to create employment projects, and the State has spent something like only \$200 000. In this field, the Commonwealth cut off the funds for the time being until an explosion started. It worries me that the promises of Governments today are such that it is hard to know where we are headed in this country. In a full-page advertisement carrying the Premier's photograph, the Premier had this to say—

Our employment task force will create 25 000 real jobs we have already pinpointed.

I ask the Premier to tell me whether this is false. Were those jobs pinpointed? Where are they now? Quite frankly, unemployment in this State has increased in the last two or three months.

Mr Parker: That is not true. The unemployment rate has reduced since we have been in Government and the employment rate has substantially increased.

Mr O'CONNOR: I think the Minister should apologise for being wrong again.

Mr Parker: I am not wrong.

Mr O'CONNOR: He has rejected what I said again.

Mr Tonkin: Job bank!

Mr O'CONNOR: The Opposition must take responsibility, willingly or not, for unemployment in other areas during the first two or three months of the Government's term of office. I said that in the last two or three months there has been an increase in unemployment in this State.

Mr Tonkin: How long do you think it takes to turn an economy?

Mr O'CONNOR: I have the figures here, and I will quote them.

Mr Parker: The number of jobs has increased by about 4 500.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Government stated it had 25 000 jobs pinpointed and yet those jobs have been apparently pushed aside as was the \$8.79 million of Commonwealth funding which had not been used at that time. Unemployment for the month of July increased by 3 300, a very substantial increase. It rose from 59 600 in June to 62 900 in July, again a substantial increase of 3 300. With the actions of this Government, there is very little chance that the position will be improved.

I do believe that the Government has defrauded the public in the statements it has made. The increase in petrol tax imposed by both the State and Federal Governments will have a substantial effect upon this State. Another thing that will affect us very substantially is the six-month automatic increase imposed by the Keating Budget. This means that automatically every six months the price of fuel and other commodities may be increased by a particular percentage. While these increases are normally provided in Budgets, they will be imposed irrespective of the economy and the problems that we have in the country at a particular time.

Mr Brian Burke: That is not quite true, because they were indexed to the CPI.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, and they are not going to increase?

Mr Brian Burke: Well, no. You are saying that, regardless of the economy, such-and-such will happen. The CPI is a reflection of the state of the economy.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Premier is correct in his comments, I grant him that; but regardless of the problems of industry or individuals, this could happen every six months, and this measure will affect Western Australians substantially because of the large districts and territories we have to cover. When one travels to the Pilbara, the Kimberley, or places such as those, one realises it costs much more to get our commodities there, with the result that their prices increase.

Mr Brian Burke: We suffer a significant disadvantage—there is no doubt about it—when compared with, say, Victoria.

Mr O'CONNOR: We certainly do. I think both sides of the House agree on this point. I am not arguing with the Premier there. I am just pointing out that the Federal Government's action imposing the 2c increase in the price of fuel, together with the automatic adjustment, will be disadvantageous to Western Australia.

The pension means test is unnecessary, unkind, and unwelcome in this country. It affects mainly poor elderly people and I say "poor" not to talk in

terms of wealth, but to apply it to people in the last stages of their lives who have provided properly for themselves in an effort to make sure they have sufficient money to get the sort of facilities they want in the latter part of their lives.

I come now to the point made by the member for Narrogin in relation to our resources. A need exists in States like Western Australia for an ambitious Government to move and push and to make sure resources are developed. The Government is not doing sufficient to get the Ord River scheme going. It should be pushing the Commonwealth time and again to get a sugar industry on the Ord; it is an industry to which we are entitled. I saw in the latest Federal Budget that further assistance has been given to New South Wales and Queensland for the sugar industry, and yet an attempt is being made by the Federal Government to prevent us from getting an industry which could be more profitable. We get a better return per hectare here than do other States, and such an industry could help develop a partially undeveloped area of the State. The State Government should get wholeheartedly into that, pursue the matter, and insist on a fair deal.

I believe we have a chance of getting an aluminium smelter at Bunbury. I assure the Government that if there is anything we in Opposition can do to help, we will do it. It is a vital industry for this State. It is also a touchy issue because the Eastern States with their larger population would rather have the smelter there. We were able to attract a partner who was prepared to come in and take a lot of the commodity, and create a great deal of employment in WA. I assure the Government we would be strongly behind it in this field to ensure the industry comes to Western Australia. We have the bauxite, the coal, and the gas and I believe the aluminium should be produced in this State.

I take the Minister for Transport to task on the issue of Yeelirrie because he has been much less than honest in what he said about that matter. I refer to page 1944 of *Hansard* of 13 May 1982, where Mr Grill is reported as saying—

I have indicated the Opposition strongly opposes this Bill in terms of the attitude of the ALP in respect of the mining and processing of uranium within the boundaries of Australia.

He continues later on as follows—

Our policy on this matter has been clearly articulated: under a Labor Government, the mining and processing of uranium in Australia will be banned; a moratorium will be placed on the mining and processing of

uranium until such time as sufficient safeguards in respect of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and waste disposal have been implemented.

Later at Esperance he was reported as follows—

Shadow Minister Julian Grill said Western Mining Corporation was not an election issue as both parties wanted the project off the ground.

That is almost unbelievable. He said a State Labor Government would allow the project to go ahead after having made such a firm statement previously in the House.

Mr Grill: There has been a change of policy.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, the Government does it every day, particularly after an election. It is time it was honest with the electors before an election rather than behaving in the manner it does.

Debate (on amendment to motion) adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House).

[Continued on page 1636.]

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

## QUESTIONS: ON NOTICE

### *Closing Time*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Harman): As Parliament will be in recess for two weeks when the House rises, questions for Tuesday, 13 September will be received by the Clerks until 4.30 p.m. on Thursday, 8 September.

## HON. JIM SIMMONDS AND MR MAX McDONALD

### *Presence in Speaker's Gallery*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Harman): For the information of members I advise and acknowledge the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of the Hon. Jim Simmonds, Minister for Employment and Training in the Victorian Parliament, and Mr Max McDonald, the member for Evelyn in the Legislative Assembly of Victoria.

## LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR PARKER** (Fremantle—Minister for Employment and Administrative Services) [4.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Among other substantial amendments, the Liquor Act was amended in 1981 to allow licensed stores to trade until 9.00 p.m. on evenings when late-night trading was approved for stores generally.

The amendment did not provide for those occasions during the Easter and Christmas trading periods when other stores may open either in substitution for or in addition to the normal Thursday evening late trading.

The Western Australian Consultative Council of Retail Associations and the Licensed Stores' Association of Western Australia have requested that this anomaly be corrected.

The Bill now before the House will amend section 36 of the Liquor Act to allow licensed stores to trade to 9.00 p.m. on those evenings when other stores may remain open under section 84 of the Factories and Shops Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hassell (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## ACTS AMENDMENT (TRADE PROMOTION LOTTERIES) BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR PARKER** (Fremantle—Minister for Employment and Administrative Services) [4.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Recently the number of schemes promoting the sale of goods or services by inviting the public to participate in gratuitous trade lotteries has increased sharply.

While there is no risk to participants in these schemes because there is no direct cost of entry, they are by definition a lottery and therefore may be illegal where a permit is not issued.

Many well-known and reputable promotions could be caught by this interpretation. The recent prominence given to the Woolworths "Scratch & Match" scheme can be mentioned in this regard, as can be the *Daily News* "Bingo" games, many television promotions, and virtually every promotion run by traders' associations in virtually every shopping centre.

The Lotteries Commission does not wish to issue permits to commercial organisations to conduct gratuitous trade lotteries where no financial accountability is required.

The Bill now before the House will amend three Acts: the Criminal Code which contains a broad definition of lottery, the Police Act, and the Lotteries (Control) Act.

Clause 3 of the Bill will amend the definition of "lottery" in the Criminal Code to exclude trade promotion lotteries from the definition. The Bill will also define a trade promotion lottery in the Criminal Code.

Other amendments will exclude trade lotteries from the definition of "gaming" in the Police Act and from the definition of "Lottery" in the Lotteries (Control) Act.

The Bill will remove any doubt concerning the legality of schemes to promote the sale of goods or services.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hassell (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

#### *Amendment to Motion*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR BRYCE** (Ascot—Deputy Premier) [4.49 p.m.]: I urge members of this House to reject the nonsense which is embodied in the amendment moved by the member for Narrogin. I suppose we have to expect something like this in the first few weeks of the sitting, and I guess we could anticipate that it will be the first of a number of amendments to be wheeled out in fairly traditional fashion by members like the former Ministers who sit opposite, and who had an interest in and should today share responsibility for, the mess that was handed on to the new Labor Government in February of this year. It is a tragedy that some of these once great men who sit opposite have succumbed to the temptation of becoming myopic, negative, and defeatist. As I sat here today for not less than three hours on end listening to the substance of speeches made by members of the Opposition—

Mr MacKinnon: You did not sit for three hours on end, and you know it!

Mr BRYCE: I am really very wary about referring to their arguments as "substance", and that has become perfectly clear. They have hit onto this total negative mode and I suspect we can expect to hear plenty from them in the months and the years ahead. Might I remind the Leader of the Opposition and his front bench colleagues that the surest avenue out of Opposition is to become positive and to identify some of the solutions to society's problems.

Mr MacKinnon: Didn't you listen to what I had to say? I made some good suggestions.

Mr BRYCE: I remind members of the Opposition that in recent years I went to great pains to

draw the former Government's attention to the needs of the small business community, and on countless occasions members opposite rejected my pleas for action by the Government of the day to do something for the small business community. Members opposite in fact voted against propositions moved by me at that stage, simply because of the absolutely foolish tradition that suggests that all goodness comes from the side of the House which the Government of the day occupies. From that side of the House, I suggested numerous different actions that the Government ought to be taking concerning the needs of science-based industries in this State. The Government did virtually nothing, and we lost five valuable years, in my humble opinion, while the Government sat back in the knowledge that, in its point of view, the forces of the market alone should determine the shape of our economy and society.

Mr MacKinnon: Do you believe that Government knows best?

Mr BRYCE: They were quite happy to see important and valuable opportunities pass us by, because of lack of leadership from the Government. I also remind the House of initiatives in which other members of this side of the House and I participated in an attempt to draw to the attention of the previous Government the needs of this State in so far as downstream processing was concerned. All members opposite were then preoccupied with a tonnage mentality and they simply could not see outside the parameters of the change that was established by the great white knight of the 1960s and the early 1970s, the former Premier of the conservative parties of this State.

Mr Court: You know that is rubbish. He did a good job.

Mr MacKinnon: You take every opportunity to denigrate him.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I will now point out a few of the political weaknesses and logical pitfalls made by some members who sit opposite during the course of their contributions today. The member for Vasse made great play—God only knows how he found it relevant to the subject before the Chair—about this Government's determination to apply the loss of efficiency, competency, and accountability to QANGOs. He went to great lengths to substantiate his arguments.

Mr Court: You set up so many inquiries, industry does not know with which one to lodge an application.

Mr MacKinnon: The Minister for Consumer Affairs is going to appoint a number of QANGOs any day.

Mr BRYCE: His argument was that some individuals who have an affinity with the Government have been appointed as advisers and related positions in the Government since the change of Government. I do not intend to give it to him in one piece but I inform the member for Vasse that presently I have a very interesting list that outlines the names of 41 Liberal Party apparatchiki and defeated candidates between 1974 and 1983—

Mr Court: Why don't you go back to 1949?

Mr BRYCE: —who suddenly found their way into positions of prominence and importance on these QANGOs.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you going to tell us how that will improve the economic situation in Australia?

Mr BRYCE: That is only part of the process of opening up the cupboard to tell the member how members opposite ran the affairs of this State while they were in office.

Mr MacKinnon: Effectively!

Mr BRYCE: I do not intend to give the member for Vasse these names now; I will wait until we can round the number off and I will give him 50 at once!

Mr Laurance: You would be denigrating some outstanding citizens of the State.

Mr BRYCE: I see. They are outstanding citizens of the State if they happen to be Liberal apparatchiki—that is the implication made by the member for Gascoyne—but if they happen to be affiliated with the Labor Party, for some strange reason they are not acceptable for high office or to be appointed to a position of adviser to Ministers of the Crown.

Mr Court: If you were President of the ALP—

Mr BRYCE: The member for Gascoyne's hypocrisy leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr Laurance: If you trot out all those details, it will reflect worse on you than on the people you name; that is all.

Mr BRYCE: I intend to give the House the list. I hope the people of Western Australia somehow or other gain access to it. That will be only the first instalment.

Mr MacKinnon: Is Mr Justice Olney on that list?

Mr BRYCE: The decision to appoint Mr Justice Olney to the Bench by the previous Government was a stroke of genius.

Mr MacKinnon: Hear, hear!

Mr BRYCE: I cannot understand why members opposite fail to understand at this stage how it was not so different when they were in office. How quickly they have forgotten. How ready they were when in Government to adopt Liberal Party candidates and members, and appoint them to those original groups and benches.

Perhaps I had better move on to some of the arguments drawn in this debate. The member for East Melville went to great pains to express his concern about the Aboriginal land rights question. I think he half hopes that the Aboriginal land rights issue will be resolved here in Western Australia in the way it was resolved in the Northern Territory, and which will bring upon us the resultant problems. I think he half hopes that that will happen. I assure him that we on this side of the House do not intend to allow that to happen, but that is no reason whatsoever to ignore the facts or to shrink from the responsibility to investigate ever so thoroughly a resolution to this important question. I assure the House we have no intentions of shrinking from it.

Mr Court: How come you have taken an interest in this matter in recent years?

Mr BRYCE: We have a determination to do that and to discover exactly how it has been handled in other parts of the country, and to ensure that ground rules are laid down in Western Australia under which this Government will finish its work.

Mr Peter Jones: That is good.

Mr BRYCE: One other example of the fairly pathetic arguments proposed by members opposite was that the member for Cottesloe cried tears of blood about job opportunities, and the implications in this State due to the way the present Government is handling the economy. That member was party to one of the most cruel political hoaxes since World War II, or since most of us can remember. He knows that there was not one single permanent public servant appointed to support the hoaxes that he perpetrated prior to the election under the name of "job bank". When we came to office there was not one ounce of structured Government in existence, which demonstrated that there was not an ounce of sincerity behind the previous Government's last-minute desperate hoax on which to hinge its reputation in the minds of Australians.

The member for Cottesloe went on to talk about jobs for Western Australians from the mining sector. I wonder whether I could take this opportunity to point out to him some of the concerns expressed to me only yesterday by certain

very experienced professionals in Western Australia about how, during the 1970s—during the former Government's period in office—the professional consultant engineers in this State were effectively insulted. Between 47 to 50 of these organisations in this State were involved and they were talented—I blame the public sector every bit as much as the private sector for making the decisions to reflect the great Australian inferiority complex—but the then Government gave consulting jobs one after the other to large overseas consultancy firms. Yet, these people sitting opposite wrote agreements and presided over the economic development by simply turning their backs on the needs of those sorts of people who have the skills and ability to do the work, but all they lacked was the support of the Government of the day.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I wonder if I might just drop a few pearls of wisdom to members opposite and indicate to them that times are changing. Members opposite this afternoon have reflected their total hypnotic preoccupation with a tonnage mentality. One project after another, as long as rolls in the tonnes is all that concerns members opposite. May I suggest that members opposite should broaden their outlook a little and realise that from here on in, for the rest of this century, it should be a tonnage and technology mentality that will preside over the economic development of this State.

Members opposite have succumbed to this extraordinary temptation to be great knockers. They have been in Opposition for only a few months and have completely fallen into the great black hole. I estimate it will take two decades and a total rebuilding programme to drag them out. Let me give a few examples. Members opposite really have fun and games in this place during debates concerning industrial relations issues on iron ore industries. The present member for Nedlands, the previous member for Nedlands, and half a dozen others on that side of the House have done more damage to this State's reputation overseas than has any other handful of individuals in this country. They have enjoyed themselves; they have indulged themselves to such an extent that they peddle the lie that Western Australia is an unreliable supplier and it had done us a lot of damage.

My predecessor, the member for Narrogin, knows that when Ministers of the Crown represent this State in Japan, the Japanese dish up any giant-sized form of propaganda that has been generated by people like themselves.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: It is a deliberate form of treachery as far as our country is concerned. It is a disgrace and members opposite perpetrate it.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I will give a small chapter, with a few verses, to demonstrate it. At a meeting recently with representatives of all four iron ore industry companies, when the subject came up for discussion, great emphasis was placed on the fact that never once in the history of Western Australia has a steel firm in Japan looked for iron ore that did not arrive and, in fact, had been dislocated because Western Australian iron ore was not on the docks in Japan.

Mr Court: Do you say that justifies industrial action?

Mr BRYCE: Of course I do not. No fool would. Of course there are industrial problems, but the truth is that members opposite give credence to the lie that is pushed by the people who buy our iron ore that we are unreliable suppliers, when the truth is we are not. We know that as far as bauxite and nickel are concerned, not a single mill in the world has gone without.

Mr Peter Jones: That is not true.

Mr BRYCE: The leaders of industry do not agree with the member for Narrogin.

Mr Peter Jones: I know the companies did not say that to you. What they said was that no blast furnaces have had to stop because of the shortage of iron ore. We lost 13 to 15 per cent of the actual market because they did not have the capacity to move iron ore from one place to another as the Japanese companies have.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Narrogin was not at the meeting and does not know what was said. I assure him that that assurance was given to me. I give my assurance that, in fact, the industry knows and the industries know that Western Australia is suffering as a result of members opposite and others.

My greatest concern at this moment about the economic recovery of Western Australia is that my office has received expressions of concern from the United Kingdom in the last couple of weeks that a former Premier of this State is not doing the right thing by Western Australia at this present time.

Mr Court: That is a total lie.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Nedlands can say what he likes, but I am saying that my office has received these calls.

Mr Court: You had better talk to your Premier before you say any more.



Mr BRYCE: If he has decided that he is to be a one-man band to work towards this country's recovery—that man received so much from this State—and if he thinks he can go from boardroom to boardroom in the United Kingdom and have fun at this State's expense, he is suffering from an oversized dose of sour grapes and he ought to know in advance and publicly that we will discover exactly the fun and games in which he indulges. What is more, it will not do him any credit.

Mr Court: You check what you are saying with the Premier before you put yourself in.

Mr Peter Jones: Do not make such statements under privilege.

Mr BRYCE: I have received these expressions of concern and I am looking forward to the opportunity of meeting with a former Premier face to face to explain to him precisely from where those exclamations of concern have come.

Amendment to motion put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes 16

Mr Clarko	Mr Laurance
Mr Court	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Coyne	Mr Mensaros
Mr Crane	Mr O'Connor
Dr Dadour	Mr Thompson
Mr Grayden	Mr Trethowan
Mr Hassell	Mr Watt
Mr Peter Jones	Mr Williams

(Teller)

## Noes 25

Mr Barnett	Mr McIver
Mr Bateman	Mr Parker
Mrs Beggs	Mr Pearce
Mr Bertram	Mr Read
Mr Bryce	Mr D. L. Smith
Mrs Buchanan	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Brian Burke	Mr A. D. Taylor
Mr Terry Burke	Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Burkett	Mr Tonkin
Mr Carr	Mrs Watkins
Mr Davies	Mr Wilson
Mr Grill	Mr Gordon Hill
Mrs Henderson	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr McNec	Mr Bridge
Mr Old	Mr Troy
Mr Blaikie	Mr Evans
Mr Bradshaw	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Tubby	Mr Jamieson
Mr Rushton	Mr Hodge

Amendment to motion thus negatived.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed*

MR I. F. TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie) [5.13 p.m.]: May I say what a pleasure it is to be speaking from this side of the House. Even if the member for Cottesloe interprets an occasional smile as

smugness, I take some pleasure in thinking that in divisions such as the one which just took place on such a trite amendment, we have the numbers to make sure that it is not passed.

I join with other members who have expressed sincere congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on attaining your high and honourable office, and to the Chairman of Committees on his attaining that office. You have both in your deeds and actions to date shown you intend to undertake those roles with dignity and impartiality, and in a fearless manner. That is as much as the House could ask of you.

It is an honour and privilege for me to be a member of the first Burke Labor Government in this State. I am sure all members on this side and people throughout the State are aware that Western Australia is now led by a Premier who has courage and compassion and a deep understanding of the needs of the people. Brian Burke as Premier has offered to Western Australians a new hope, vision, and perspective of what this State can be if it is given the chance. I am sure the Burke Labor Government is setting about the task of making sure that Western Australia has the opportunity to be a State of equal opportunity, and which with his leadership and inspiration can become the most successful and enlightened State in the Commonwealth. I consider we are already on the path to making sure that the dream of the ALP to make this a great State under Brian Burke is achieved.

I wish the new members for Whitford, Pilbara, Scarborough, Gosnells, Mandurah, Mundaring, Mitchell, and Bunbury—and it is a pleasure to be able to read so many names—the very best in their career as parliamentarians. I hope they achieve as much satisfaction from representing the ALP in this House and their electors as I have done over the past two or so years. They will realise already how much pleasure there can be and how much satisfaction one can obtain in looking after electors at an individual level. Those electors come to us only when they are in desperate need of help, and it is part of our job to be able to help them in whatever way we can.

To new members on the other side of the House, I offer congratulations on their success, but it would be hypocritical of me to wish them long and successful careers.

I mention also the staff of Parliament House. In the two years or so I have been here they have gone out on their way on all occasions to make sure our life is a little easier. Their attitude and dedication to the task which is sometimes a rather tiresome one, is to be admired by all members.

One aspect of their task that has amazed me from the time I stepped through the door of this Chamber is the apparently unwritten law to call all members "Mr" or "Mrs". I find it a little strange and somewhat embarrassing that members of the staff who have probably fought in wars and have medals on their chests, and have done more in their lives than I have or can ever hope to do, should feel an obligation to call me "Mr" when I can call them by their first name. Some members feel the staff should be obliged to call members "Mr" or "Mrs", and that to call some members by their Christian name would be to discriminate. I would like to think that if a member said to members of the staff they should feel free to call him by his Christian name—in my case, Ian—the staff should be able to do so and not feel that another member will run to someone in authority and say that a staff member is being too familiar.

Mr Watt: I agree with you, but you will not change it.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: We can but try.

I would like to mention the success of the Labor Party in the eastern goldfields. The eastern goldfields has been a bastion of Labor support for many years. With members of the calibre of Graeme Campbell, the Federal member for Kalgoorlie, Julian Grill in Esperance-Dundas, and both members of South-East Province—the Hon. Jim Brown and the Hon. Mark Nevill—we have a team which can give people in that area a large degree of support in whatever they wish to achieve at State and Federal levels. We work as a team and it makes our job a lot easier to know that, in my case, I have four talented members to back me in whatever I choose to do.

I should also mention my good friend and colleague, Ron Leeson, who is no longer a member of this Parliament. He had a very great feeling and understanding of the people of the goldfields and I am sure he will be greatly missed. At the same time, I believe Ron Leeson has a good deal to offer the people of Western Australia given the right opportunity.

Mr Thompson: Why did the Labor Party take his seat?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The electors of Kalgoorlie, as I said before, have shown their faith and confidence in the Australian Labor Party. It is my intention to serve them to the very best of my ability—whatever ability I may or may not have—for as long as possible. I would like also to record my appreciation to the workers of the ALP throughout the eastern goldfields. These workers are owed a great deal of gratitude, not only by me

as a member, but also by other eastern goldfields members. For decades now they have worked in a tireless manner to ensure that the party succeeds in an area where we have always had strong support.

I would also like to thank especially my best friend and colleague, my wife, Sandy; my mother; my brother, Ron; and my 80 or so uncles, aunts, and cousins in the goldfields, as well as my friends there. Although it may sound trite to say this, without their support I certainly would not be the member for Kalgoorlie, and I owe them a great deal of gratitude for what they have given me over the past two or three years.

Of course the key industry in the eastern goldfields is mining. I consider that the mineral resources of Western Australia and of Australia have the capacity to stimulate our economy, to get it growing, and growing fast again. In the Federal Budget brought down on Tuesday night, it gave me some pleasure to see that the mineral industry remained substantially untouched by any of the imposts on the community of Australia.

The mining industry, by its very nature, and of necessity, is a relatively small employer. People are inclined to look at the number employed in the workplace so to speak, but, the mining industry, in terms of employment, goes a great deal further than that.

Everytime we turn on a light, pop in our car to drive down the road, or take some medicine, we have to thank the mining industry that we are able to do those things. It cannot be brushed aside as an industry limited in employment opportunities, and therefore, of little consequence to the future economic recovery of our nation. Without the continued development of minerals, metals, and energy-burning materials, modern society would grind to a halt.

It would do most of us well to realise the effects the oil embargo of the early 1970s had on society—in fact, the effect it had on western society as a whole. When we think about that effect, we realise the consequences of any slowdown in the development of our mineral resources. I believe we are inclined also to forget that minefields and petroleum fields are not like factories, banks, and Government offices. They do not go on indefinitely with just the need for some updating, refurbishing, or an occasional reorganisation. Mines are involved in the working of assets—assets which are really wasted assets because mines must close down in due course when the assets are no longer available or no longer economically profitable to mine.

Therefore, it is necessary for Governments, and for the community as a whole, to encourage the search for new and replacement mineral resources in our community and to ensure the expansion of mineral output.

A further consequence of the wasting nature of mines is the increasing time spent to maintain such output. We must remember that as a mine keeps being used, it is more and more necessary for additional funds to be spent to ensure that the operation is an economical proposition.

Another aspect to be considered is the high cost of finding minerals. In these days it is just not a matter of going out and scratching around on the surface to see if minerals are there. Mineral exploration is a costly and high-technology business and one that must be encouraged if we want people to go out and spend multi-millions of dollars to ensure they have a chance of success in the finding of minerals, that they are given the right opportunity—

Mr Hassell: Do you think they will be encouraged by Aboriginal land rights?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I will get on to that later. It is interesting to see that a large number of goldmining deposits are being opened up in the eastern goldfields now. Decades ago small prospectors scratched the surface of these deposits and they are now being taken over by companies with multimillions of dollars. These companies have looked 100 and 200 feet below the surface and they have found economic gold-bearing deposits. In the next two or three years I am quite certain we will see many such deposits being opened right throughout the eastern goldfields and this will be to the great benefit of this State.

Mr Hassell: You obviously think that is a very good thing.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Of course.

Mr Hassell: Your Deputy Premier does not. He seems to think that should go by the board and we should be getting into high technology.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: That is nonsense. The Deputy Premier has realised the great benefits of high technology, not only to Western Australia, but also to Australia as a whole. We are trying to ensure that Labor Governments, both State and Federal, catch up in this sphere because Liberal Governments, such as the one of which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was a member, completely ignored high technology. Given the opportunity, the high technology industry can add greatly to the development of our mineral industries. We can ensure that we supply the technological resources to the mineral industry to encourage its development.

Mr Hassell: We have always said that high technology is essential.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: "Said" is the operative word.

Mr Hassell: And encouraged it.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: But the previous Government never did anything about it. The Deputy Premier has taken it on board to make sure that it does happen.

Mr Hassell: Your leader was against this because he said it would cost lots of jobs. Don't you remember all the boring amendments to the Address-in-Reply?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The Deputy Premier is one Minister who will ensure that Australia will be able to hold its own in the high technology world we will be in by the end of the twentieth century.

I would like to return to the eastern goldfields and to mention some of the many deposits that will be opened up in the near future. It has been suggested that, given the right opportunity, a capital investment of about \$500 million can be made in the eastern goldfields in goldmining alone. Of that capital investment, approximately \$200 million will be spent in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder area—right throughout the Golden Mile. The remainder of the money will be spent in the gold-bearing areas surrounding the towns of Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

Mr Mensaros: Do you reckon that will be all local capital?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The way it is developing at the moment, it would seem that the greater part of it will be local capital. That is certainly the impression I gained in talking to the many people in the mining industry who move through Kalgoorlie. Certainly they are seeking local capital to develop these areas. I hope from the point of view of the State that it is local capital that is injected into the development of the new gold-bearing areas.

Kalgoorlie Mining Associates are injecting millions of dollars into the Golden Mile. The development of the old Chaffer shaft is under way at a cost of \$3 million or \$4 million. KMA has also shown faith in the area and the industry by putting down a \$70 million shaft called the Cassidy shaft in the Mt. Charlotte area. That itself is a technological achievement and one of which the people of Western Australia can be very proud. North Kalgurli Mines, Perringa, and, CSR are spending tens of millions of dollars to ensure the future development of their areas. In addition, Pan Continental and Black Hills have a development on the outskirts of Kalgoorlie. BHP

has a large project which it seems will get off the ground at Ora Banda, and Norbury Resources is engaged in a development on its land at Randles on the Transline. Kalgoorlie Commodities has another prospect at Karonie, also on the Transline. In addition, the town of Leonora—and it is a pity the member for Murchison-Eyre is not here at the moment—is the other boom town of the eastern goldfields. Some of the old areas are being redeveloped in a very positive manner and a new development, called Harbour Light, quite remarkably lies alongside the town of Leonora itself. This project is in the process of being developed.

My comments will indicate the moves being made in the eastern goldfields. I am certain I would not be wrong in saying that Kalgoorlie and Boulder are probably the boom towns of Australia at the moment. An indication of the move taking place can be seen in some of the headlines in the local paper. I collected these the other day. The first appeared on 20 April and the headline states, "KMA started work on the Chaffer shaft". Another one is dated 23 February, and it reads—

Treatment plant at North End site.

And another—

Treatment plant to be built.

In *The West Australian* of 20 May the following appeared—

Black Hills defines prospect.

That relates to a site on the outskirts of Kalgoorlie. On 2 June the following appeared—

First stage of upgrading of North Kalgurli finished.

On 2 August—

Gold production trebled in 1982-83 by Western Mining Corporation.

Another one on 2 August read—

Western Mining's gold operations perform to plan.

It is pleasing for me as the local member to see boom times in the eastern goldfields; but that does not mean that everything relates to the mining industry and that we will concentrate on the mining industry alone. In years gone by, during the ups and downs of the mining industry, people realised that there is more to Kalgoorlie than mining. Perhaps we should think more about tourism, because after all it is one of the great industries of the world; and certainly it is one of the great employment industries in the world.

I am pleased that the people in the eastern goldfields realise that tourism and mining can go side by side; and they can be of great mutual ben-

efit. It was with pleasure that I heard, in relation to tourism, that the Burke Labor Government has taken the action of reopening the two-up school on the outskirts of Kalgoorlie.

Earlier today the Deputy Premier spoke about sour grapes in respect of a previous Premier of this State. I think it was sour grapes on the part of the former Minister for Police and Prisons who, on two or three occasions, suggested that the two-up school should not be reopened and that if it were reopened women should not be permitted because the game was to be played in the customary manner. In fact, the former Minister for Police and Prisons is a lawyer, although it would be open to question whether he was a good one. However, the former Minister did not realise that the regulation referring to "Customary manner" related to the actual playing of the game, and not who could attend the game.

The admission of women to the two-up game has an additional facet. It means that when a tourist bus is moving through the eastern goldfields, the operator does not have to decide whether to stop at the two-up school. Everyone on the tourist bus can alight from it and, if they want to, play a game of two-up.

I now turn to housing, which is a great problem in the eastern goldfields. About every second or third person who comes into my office is looking for housing of some quality—not necessarily State housing. Rents in Kalgoorlie have risen to \$200 to \$250 a week for a reasonable standard of house. Some people are making a killing in the rental area; and I would like to think that we could do something about that in the near future.

I have spoken to the Minister for Housing about the 75 State Housing Commission homes at Koolyanobbing, and suggested that they could be transported from Koolyanobbing to the eastern goldfields. Those houses are of timber construction; and even if they are not transportables, certainly they are transportable. I am sure that if people are given the opportunity to have the houses in Kalgoorlie, they would be very well used. It is not necessary for the houses to go to Kalgoorlie alone. They could be used also in Norseman and Leonora—other places which have a desperate need for additional housing.

Members would be aware that I was involved in the Murchison-Eyre election campaign. I am sad to say that we did not win that campaign; but there were very good reasons for our not winning it.

Before I go any further, I indicate that I expected the member for Murchison-Eyre would be in the House. He was here when I started speak-

ing. Perhaps members on the other side would go and drag him from wherever he might be so that he can hear this part of my speech.

Questions should be answered in relation to the Murchison-Eyre campaign. They deserve answering in one way or another. The Australian Labor Party candidate for Murchison-Eyre (Mr Frank Donovan) has prepared a report entitled "Liberal Counter Strategy" and it deals with the Murchison-Eyre campaign in 1983. It is my intention to quote in part from Mr Donovan's report in an effort to find some of the answers to the questions to be asked relating to the Liberal Party's treatment of the Aborigines in Murchison-Eyre.

Some people would be aware that, for many years, the Aborigines in Murchison-Eyre have been ignored by Liberal Governments. It was our intention to ensure that the Aboriginal people were given the opportunity to be enrolled and to vote; and it appears that they took that opportunity. In fact, in the central reserve, some 330 Aborigines were enrolled; in Cundeelee, there were 60 or 70; and in Wiluna the number was 115. Those Aboriginal people took it upon themselves to become involved in the political process. They should be praised for becoming involved in that process, rather than be hindered for taking part. However, in Murchison-Eyre, they were hindered.

First of all, the Liberal Party decided that one way around the problem would be to ensure that the Aborigines of the central reserve were moved away at the time the voting was to take place. Therefore, a Christian revivalist meeting was arranged in Alice Springs; and the Aborigines of the central reserve were told that they should do the Christian thing and go to that revival meeting. Only 50 to 80 of the electors in that area decided to go to that meeting and, therefore, missed the opportunity of voting in the Murchison-Eyre election.

That was not good enough for the Liberal Party as it wanted to make certain that it won the election. With the co-operation of one particular member in Laverton, Leonora, and Kalgoorlie, they hired the team of the Leonora Aboriginal Fundamentalists, as they are described, for a reported fee of \$1 500. Those people were supplied with a vehicle and all necessary equipment, and were authorised to purchase fuel and stores.

Members of the team have been identified in statements given to the Labor Party investigators after the election.

The instructions given to the team members were quite clear. They were to travel through the

Central Desert communities during the 10 days to two weeks prior to the election day; and they were to destroy the credibility of the Australian Labor Party and Frank Donovan on spiritual and religious grounds. They were to depict the Labor Party as communist and, at the same time, they were to suggest to the people that the ALP was committed, in a fundamental manner, to the removal of their children, their land, their religion, and any financial support that was forthcoming from the State and Federal Governments.

The team succeeded in impressing on the people that a vote for the ALP was a vote for communists and a vote against God, and that they would never be forgiven for casting a vote in that manner. They described the Liberal Party and its candidates as the Christian party of God; and they were told it was the duty of every Aboriginal elector—if he or she voted at all—to vote for God and God's people.

That did not happen in the central reserve only. A team was also sent out from Kalgoorlie into the Cundeelee area to employ exactly the same tactics. In fact, in a remarkable paradox, the people sent to Cundeelee by the Liberal Party went to the National Aboriginal Congress delegate in Kalgoorlie (Aubrey Lynch) and complained that the Liberal Party had not paid them the wages it had promised.

These questions in relation to Murchison-Eyre should be answered, and by one person—the member of the Legislative Council for the Lower North Province (Mr Norman Moore). Norman Moore took it upon himself to become involved in this campaign. In fact, the member for Murchison-Eyre stood aside and was quite prepared to see Norman Moore taking these steps. The member for Murchison-Eyre had to be convinced that he should run for that seat, because he thought he had no chance of winning.

Of course, Norman Moore knew better than that, because he knew that, given the right tactics as far as the Aboriginal people were concerned, he could make sure that they did not have the opportunity of voting. That is an abysmal act on the part of a member of this Parliament.

If people think that is not beyond the pale, I should like now to show to this House the sort of action the Liberal Party is prepared to take to influence Aborigines and influence them in the most despicable manner one could think of. I have here a copy of a pamphlet put out in the central reserve by people associated with the Liberal Party. This pamphlet says, "Your own land becomes your own State". It is suggested that, if Aborigines are given land rights, as a result, they

will have no policemen, no medicine, no aid in the form of unemployment benefits, no pensions, no child endowment, and no maternity allowances. It is suggested that, if the Aboriginal people are given land rights, they will be left to themselves and ignored by the State. As far as I am concerned, that is about as low as one can go in terms of trying to divide black and white in our community.

The Liberal Party is seeking to divide black and white in our community. The Liberal Party is trying to make sure that the white people in our community do not understand, in the most fundamental manner, the relationship between the Aboriginal people and their land and the fact that Aboriginal people, particularly in the central reserve area, have a right to some sort of land rights as far as this Government is concerned. As long as the Liberal Party is prepared to issue unauthorised pamphlets such as this despicable pamphlet, a great gap will exist in our community.

Mr Hassell: Who put out the pamphlet?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: As I understand it, this pamphlet was put out with the knowledge of the Liberal Party in this State. It is responsible for the contents of this pamphlet and it is quite outrageous.

Mr Hassell: Do you have any evidence of that?

Mr Wilson: You support it!

Mr Tonkin: Who benefited from it?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Only one party could benefit from that sort of breaking down of the re-

lationship which could exist between blacks and whites.

Mr Hassell: Land rights will break down relationships!

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Land rights will not break down relationships.

Mr Hassell: Land rights are racist!

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: In 1982 we saw in the Claremont Showgrounds a group of Aboriginal people from the central reserve who showed the people of the Perth metropolitan area their close ties to the land. Those people were as genuine as anyone could be. They felt as much for that land as we feel for our own backyards, and certainly as much as we feel for Karrakatta Cemetery where our ancestors are buried or a churchyard where we may go to church, and that should be recognised by the people of Western Australia.

Mr Hassell: No-one has denied that, but it has nothing to do with land rights.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House).

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [5.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 13 September.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.43 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

652. *This question was further postponed.*

### EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

#### *Wickepin*

800. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) With reference to question 707 of 1983 respecting Wickepin school oval, why was not the topsoil provided by the contractor J. J. Archibald and Company sampled by an officer of the department to ensure it met with the specifications of the contract?
- (2) Is he aware that although the base fill dumped by Co-operative Bulk Handling was confined to a limited area of the oval, the stones are spread over a much larger area indicating they were contained in the topsoil fill?
- (3) What does the Government intend to do to correct what is obviously a case of poor supervision of a Government contract?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) Unnecessary.
- (2) No.
- (3) Officers of the architectural division of the Public Works Department will immediately visit the school and arrange with the Parents and Citizens' Association a programme for providing further topsoil and seeding in suitable season conditions.

### FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY AND GAS

#### *Charges: Increase*

804. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Did the Commissioners of the State Energy Commission vet and approve all of the recently announced rises in gas and electricity charges?

Mr BRYCE replied:

The commissioners did vet and approve the recent increases in charges.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

### *Budget: Administration*

805. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is it a fact that some of those gas consumers transferring from the now deleted S3 tariff to the L3 tariff or negotiated contract rate for gas have a clause within their contracts which states:

"The customer shall not without the consent of the Commission at any time divulge or suffer or permit any of its servants or agents to divulge to any person any of the content of this agreement . . .?"

- (2) If "Yes", was this clause included in contracts previously held by the companies on the S3 tariff?
- (3) What is the reason for the inclusion of this clause in contracts by the commission?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Yes, other than that L3 customers have no contract.
- (2) Confidentiality was irrelevant as S3 was a published tariff.
- (3) The form of contract has been used by the commission for about 12 months.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

### *Budget: Administration*

806. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Referring him to this answer to question 691 of Wednesday, 17 August, what are the six major costs, by classification and amount, which made up the administration expenses of \$32 597 767 as published in the 1978-79 accounts of the commission?
- (2) What are the six major costs by classification and amount, which made up the administration budget estimate for 1982-83 of the State Energy commission?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Because of major changes in the structure of the commission's accounting system, the breakdown of administration

expenses of \$32 597 767 for the 1978-79 year is not readily available.

- (2) The information the member is seeking is available in the 1982-83 financial statement tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 30 September 1982.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: COAL AND OIL

### *Price: Increase*

807. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What price increase in—

(a) coal; and

(b) oil,

supplied to the interconnected electricity system has the State Energy Commission budgeted for in the year ending 30 June 1984?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (a) and (b) Fuel costs are notoriously mobile and accordingly estimating the likely increases for the next financial year involves making assumptions about the movement in overseas and local fuel prices and about the outcome of commercial negotiations between the commission and its suppliers.

An allowance for fuel costs was included in the Budget which was a 19 per cent total overall increase on the previous year.

## MINING: COAL

### *Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd.: Third Shift*

810. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines, and Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What progress has been made in discussions between the Griffin Coal Company and the State Energy Commission regarding the introduction of a third shift in the Griffin coal operations at Collie?
- (2) Is the subject of a third shift referred to in the 5-year engineering study report?
- (3) What is the attitude of—
- (a) the State Energy Commission;
- (b) the Griffin Coal Company;
- (c) the Collie Coal Miners' Union;
- to the introduction of a third shift?

- (4) If there is no third shift introduced, will the coal company be required to purchase additional equipment in order to deliver the State Energy Commission's coal requirements in two working shifts?
- (5) If the company purchases additional equipment is any such purchase reflected in the price of coal?
- (6) Has it been suggested that the introduction of a third shift at Collie would result in a lower coal price to the State Energy Commission than continuing with the present two-shift arrangement?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Several discussions have taken place.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) to (6) This is the subject of current discussions. The parties have been prepared to enter into these discussions. The matter has not been resolved and further examination of the issues is required before final positions are taken.

## WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY AND COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLIES

### *Amalgamation: 3 per cent Levy and Subsidy*

842. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

With the proposed amalgamation of water authorities, if the form of the new authority is going to be a Government instrumentality, is it proposed to—

- (a) charge the three per cent levy on the turnover of the country water undertakings which so far has been free from this additional cost;
- (b) retain about the same proportion of subsidy (approximately 50 per cent) for country water undertakings as prevailed so far?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (a) This matter is under consideration, but no decision has yet been made.
- (b) Country water undertakings will continue to be suitably subsidised. The extent of the subsidy is yet to be determined.



## MINING: COAL

### *Collie: Calorific Value*

857. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) With regard to coal mined in the Collie basin, what is the average calorific value?
- (2) How does this compare with coal used for steam generation in the Eastern States?
- (3) What is the comparative ash and water content with Eastern States steaming coal?
- (4) What is the U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> content of Collie coal in parts per million by weight?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) to (4) The information sought by the member refers to a range of materials and will require some detailed comment. I will arrange for the information to be sent to the member by letter in the near future.

## HEALTH: NURSES

### *Registration*

885. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Do the State Government controlled hospitals give preference to members of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation when employing nursing staff?
- (2) Is there a "preference clause" included in the relevant industrial legislation award for nurses?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), is this applied in current practice?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes, but it is not put into effect because the Industrial Arbitration Act provides that there will be no discrimination between unionists and non-unionists.
- (3) No. (See answer to (2)).

## FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS AND OIL

### *Exploration: Offshore*

886. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Adverting to questions 697 and 766 of 1983, why is the Government not objecting to the review of off-shore legislation, when the existing legislation and ar-

rangements protect Western Australia's position in these matters?

- (2) What changes, if any, would the Government like to see considered?
- (3) Does the Government consider the present arrangements satisfactory?
- (4) Does the Government accept the view of Senator Walsh that the offshore legislation and management arrangements are purely a matter for a Canberra-based Federal Government?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The Government will take appropriate action to protect the State's position during the course of consultation with the Commonwealth Government.
- (2) \*The State's position with regard to royalty clarified in line with the original intention of the legislation.
- (3) See (2) above.
- (4) No.

\*Relates to royalty being treated as the "prime impost" rather than the present position whereby the Commonwealth excise levy is treated as the prime impost.

## BUILDING INDUSTRY: BUILDERS' REGISTRATION BOARD

### *Complaints*

887. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Further to the reply given in question 781 of 1983, will he detail the nature of the 33 complaints against owner-builders lodged with the Builders' Registration Board in 1982?

Mr TONKIN replied:

In order to reply to this question each of the 33 complaint files will need to be examined in detail. Clearly this work will take some time and we cannot interfere with the board's operations to the detriment of its statutory functions. However, I will discuss the matter with the registrar to see to what extent I can comply with the member's request.

### WATER RESOURCES: RATES

#### *Outstanding: Amounts and Recovery Action*

888. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What was the amount of outstanding rates and charges to the Metropolitan Water Authority at—
  - (a) 30 March 1983; and
  - (b) 30 March, 1982, respectively?
- (2) What was the number of individual recovery actions during the first three months in 1983 and 1982 respectively, detailed according to the kind of recovery such as restriction of supply, warning letters of impending legal action, summonses, warrants, etc.?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) As at 30 March 1983 \$9 078 421 overdue;
- (b) as at 30 March 1982 \$13 029 482 overdue.
- (2) The recovery actions in the first three months of calendar 1983 and 1982 are as follows—

	Summons issued	Legal Action Letters issued	Restriction of services
Jan-Mar 1983	Nil	Nil	Nil
Jan-Mar 1982	433	1 770	1 330

With the introduction of new payment options, including the charging of interest on overdue payments, the authority is prepared to allow customers increased flexibility in the timing of their payments. Recovery action is now directed to minimising hard-core debts.

### WATER RESOURCES: RATES

#### *Outstanding: Amounts*

889. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What are the presently outstanding rates and charges to the Metropolitan Water Authority?
- (2) Could he detail the amounts according to groups of different rates and charges (e.g., domestic water, domestic sewerage, non-domestic water, etc.)?
- (3) Would he list the names of individual/company debtors over \$50 000?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) As at 24 August 1983—\$10 162 207 overdue.

- (2) and (3) Unfortunately this information is not readily available in this form.

### WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY

#### *Capital Projects: Advanced Funds*

890. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Could he please inform the House in detail about the existing policy of the Metropolitan Water Authority regarding terms for the payment of developers' advanced funds for capital works?

Mr TONKIN replied:

The MWA policy covering the payment and repayment of developer advances for capital works is set out in its publication "Developer Contributions for MWA Services Applicable at Subdivision and Building Stages".

A copy of the document is tabled.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 246).

### WATER RESOURCES

#### *Population Growth*

891. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

From the point of view of forward planning with the Metropolitan Water Authority, what is the currently predicted population growth for both short term (say 5 years or so) and long term (up to the end of the century)?

Mr TONKIN replied:

The MWA is presently using expected growth rates in the order of 2.4 to 2.5 per cent p.a. for predicting metropolitan population increases over the next five years. By the turn of the century however, the growth rate is expected to gradually decrease to around 2 per cent. These rates have been determined from projections supplied by Treasury for the "Perth Statistical Division Population".

Because the population served by the MWA is not the same as that within the "Perth Statistical Division" it is necessary to compensate. It is expected that based on current information the metropolitan population served by the MWA will increase from about 0.9 million 1982-83 to 1.02 million in 1987-88 and 1.34 million by the year 2000.

## WASTE DISPOSAL

### *Waste Water Treatment Plant: Woodman Point*

892. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Regarding the extension number one with the Woodman Point waste water treatment plant, what was, if any, the over-run in contract price compared with the original tender?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Accepted tender in July 1981 \$10.5 million.

Final cost in July 1983 \$13.3 million.

The increase is due to extra work and escalation in labour and material costs provided for under the contract.

## WASTE DISPOSAL

### *Waste Water Treatment Plant: Beenyup*

893. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What is the progress with extension 2 of the Beenyup waste water treatment plant?
- (2) How does this compare in time with the original estimates?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The Beenyup WTP Extension 2 is 78 per cent complete overall.
- (2) The project consists of a number of stages which are being progressively brought into operation.

The total project will now be completed in December 1986, which is one year later than initially estimated in 1977.

## WATER RESOURCES: GROUND WATER

### *Australind-Mandurah*

894. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Could he give some information about the present situation and that expected for the next 1983-84 dry season, regarding ground water for both public supply and private bores on the coastal plain between Mandurah and Australind?

Mr TONKIN replied:

The present situation in respect to groundwater being utilised by private bores appears to be similar to that of previous years, but needs to be closely

monitored because in some areas there are signs that the resources may be over utilised by irrigators.

There is also evidence of developing salinity problems in some areas, probably as a result of the concentration by re-circulation of groundwater salts and fertilisers.

Public supplies use relatively minor quantities of water drawn from a different aquifer. No problems are expected in respect to these supplies.

## WATER RESOURCES

### *Bores: Policy*

895. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

What is his Government's policy regarding private bores, particularly in respect of unrestricted use in not declared areas, and regarding (if any) charges in both declared and not declared areas, under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act?

Mr TONKIN replied:

The Government's policy is that a groundwater area is only proclaimed under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act when it is established that the existing and/or potential demand on the groundwater resource in a particular locality is likely to exceed the safe annual yield. All private bores within a proclaimed area have to be licensed.

There are also public water supply areas declared under the Metropolitan Water Supply Sewerage and Drainage Act within which private bores have to be licensed.

There is no charge associated with obtaining a licence, nor for the water abstracted under either Act.

Outside of the declared areas there are no restrictions on the construction or use of non-artesian wells. Licences for artesian wells are required statewide.

The Government regularly advises the public on the need to use water wisely.

## FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

### *Policy: Guidelines*

896. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology:

- (1) As it is of vital interest to the State of Western Australia, would he say

whether he has knowledge of any endeavour by the Commonwealth Government to change the previous Government's guidelines regarding foreign investment policy?

(2) If so, what are the changes?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) The foreign investment guidelines are currently under review by the Commonwealth Government.
- (2) Changes have not yet been determined.

## REGISTRATION AND LICENSING BOARDS

### *List*

897. Mr MENSAROS, to the Premier:

Could he please give a list of those statutory registration or licensing boards (under whatever name or description) with which individuals and/or companies have to be registered and/or licensed in order to exercise a particular trade, profession or occupation?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

This information will be compiled and advised to the member in due course.

## HOSPITALS: STAFF

### *Replacement Policy: Complaints*

898. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have any Government hospitals complained in writing about difficulties which they are experiencing as a consequence of the Government's staff replacement policy?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) what is the nature of the complaints;
  - (b) which hospitals have expressed such reservations?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) I have received no complaints regarding actual problems arising as a direct consequence of the staff replacement policy.
- (2) Not applicable.

## HEALTH: ABORTION

### *Suspension of Nurse*

899. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Was a nurse suspended from a Perth hospital for three days because she had objected to taking part in an abortion?
- (2) If so, from which hospital was she suspended?
- (3) Has King Edward Memorial Hospital refused to employ as midwives, nurses who objected to helping perform abortions?
- (4) If so, what action will be taken by the Government?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Not to my knowledge.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No.
- (4) Not applicable.

## HOSPITAL

### *Bethesda Hospice*

900. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the Government financially assist the building of a hospice for terminally ill patients at the Bethesda Hospital?
- (2) If so, to what extent?
- (3) Are there any similar facilities to cater for terminally ill patients presently available?
- (4) If so, which are the facilities and where are they located?
- (5) Will the new hospice's initial capacity to cater for five patients be sufficient to meet requirements?
- (6) Do most terminally ill patients tend to remain at home or in hospitals?
- (7) Is there a demand for facilities such as the new hospice?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) No request has been made for assistance for the Bethesda Hospital.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No exactly similar facilities exist, but direct access to palliative care services is available in ward V6 at Fremantle Hospital. All hospitals provide some form of terminal care.

- (4) See answer to (3).
- (5) Insufficient experience has been available to date to assess whether capacity is adequate.
- (6) In the area where palliative care services have been able to be introduced, the proportion of terminally ill patients who elect to remain at home has increased.
- (7) Yes.

901. *This question was postponed.*

### SAFETY CLUB

#### *Establishment*

902. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will he initiate the formation of a children's safety club as has been proposed by psychology researchers at the University of WA?
- (2) If so, when will such a club be formed?
- (3) Would such a club be funded by the State Government?
- (4) Would the club operate through schools and kindergartens?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) I do not believe the promoters expect the Government to initiate the formation of a children's safety club. The project is a very worthy one and anything which will lead to a reduction in accidents in childhood deserves wide community and Government support.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No. Unfortunately funds for health services at present are scarce and fully committed.
- (4) I believe so.

### HEALTH: DRUGS

#### *Marihuana: Fines*

903. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) In light of the suggestion made by the Chairman of the NSW Drug and Alcohol authority that marihuana users should receive on-the-spot fines, has this means of dealing with minor drug offences been considered for use in Western Australia?

(2) If so—

- (a) is it intended to introduce this system;
- (b) if "Yes" to (a), when will the system be introduced?
- (3) If not, will such a system be considered?
- (4) Is it considered that on-the-spot fines will trivialise the crime and thereby encourage the more frequent use of marihuana?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Not at this stage.
- (4) Answered by (1).

### DRAINAGE

#### *Como, East Victoria Park, and South Perth*

904. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) On what criteria is the new stormwater drain catchment area in South Perth, Como and East Victoria Park defined?
- (2) What action is available to residents to have the outlined area changed?
- (3) Have any protests from residents who find their homes to be in the new area and thereby face increased rates?
- (4) Will any protests be given full consideration by him and his department?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The catchment area of the extended Collier Pines main drain include portions of the mentioned localities. The catchment area was determined as being the area which will benefit from or contribute to the need for the drainage. The boundary is the catchment watershed, as determined by interpretation of surface contour information.
- (2) The main drain declaration took effect on 25 May 1983. Before the catchment can be rated for main drainage, action must be taken under the MWA Act to declare a drainage area. Persons aggrieved by the proposal to declare the drainage area, or who allege that any land is not land which will benefit from or contribute to the need for the main drain will have one month in which to object by notice in writing to the Minister.
- (3) The MWA has no record of any such protests.

- (4) Any objections to the proposal to declare the drainage area will be given full consideration. Notification of the proposed declaration is expected to be published in the *Government Gazette* in about two months' time.

#### HEALTH: TOBACCO

##### *Smoking: Campaign*

905. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What response has the Government received as a result of its "Give Kids a Chance" antismoking campaign?
- (2) Does this response indicate the campaign has been successful?
- (3) What response does the Government expect to receive from the "Quit for Life" campaign which was launched on 17 August?
- (4) How many "Quit for Life" kits have been prepared for sale?
- (5) (a) Are the kits produced in WA;  
(b) if so, by whom?
- (6) If not, where are they produced?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) There has been a very positive response from health professionals, members of the public and reports in the media—both newspaper and television.
- (2) The Government is pleased with the response so far, but it must be emphasised that the campaign is only in its early stages and the real effectiveness of the campaign cannot be quantitatively evaluated at this stage.
- (3) On the basis of success in New South Wales, a strong public response to this campaign is expected—in fact, sales through pharmacies and mail orders have been better than was initially expected and it appears that the campaign will be extremely successful.
- (4) 5 000.
- (5) (a) No. They are produced in New South Wales;  
(b) not applicable.
- (6) Department of Health, New South Wales. It is planned that further kits which are made available will be produced in Western Australia.

#### HEALTH: MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

##### *Doctor-patient Ratio*

906. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

What is the doctor-patient ratio in the—

- (a) metropolitan area;
- (b) State?

Mr HODGE replied:

The doctor-population ratio is—

- (a) 1:449
- (b) 1:560

#### HOSPITALS: STAFF

##### *Leave: Replacements*

907. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it a fact that staff in Government hospitals are not replaced when they go on annual, long service or sick leave?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) has he received complaints about this aspect of the Government's staffing policy;
  - (b) if the answer to (a) is "Yes", what is the nature of the complaints;
  - (c) does the policy aggravate the difficulties some Government hospitals are experiencing in coping with the pressure which is increasingly being placed upon them?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) to (c) Not applicable.

#### HEALTH

##### *Federal Budget: Allocation*

908. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Commonwealth Government been in contact with the Western Australian Government in respect of aspects of Tuesday's Commonwealth Budget?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) what proportion of the \$1 185 million outlay for health which was provided to the States and the Northern Territory is to be allocated to WA;

- (b) what other details are available in respect of Commonwealth budget outlays to WA for health purposes?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.  
 (2) (a) The Western Australian proportion of the Identified Health Grant of \$1 185 million is \$150.7 million.  
 (b) Details of all grants are contained in the Commonwealth Government's 1983-84 Budget paper No. 7.

#### HEALTH: DENTAL

##### *Fluoridation of Water Supplies: Bunbury*

909. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Approximately how much would plant installation to fluoridate Bunbury's water supply cost?  
 (2) Does the Government feel that fluoridation of Bunbury's water supplies is an important issue?  
 (3) Will moves be made by the Government to fluoridate Bunbury's water supply?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Correspondence received from the City of Bunbury advised that the estimated cost to fluoridate the Bunbury water supply was \$211 000 in February 1981. In current values this is equivalent to approximately \$260 000.  
 (2) and (3) The fluoridation of public water supplies advisory committee, at its last meeting held on 25 February 1982, expressed concern over the non-fluoridation of the Bunbury water supply and the effects of this in respect to dental health. The Government is currently considering this position.

#### HOSPITAL: ROYAL PERTH

##### *Staff: Number*

910. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many personnel were employed at Royal Perth Hospital in each of the last five years?  
 (2) What was the average bed occupancy at Royal Perth Hospital in each of the above years?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The only way in which this question can be answered from available records and

within the time limit is to give the full-time equivalent numbers of staff employed at 30 June each year for the past five years.

These figures should be interpreted with caution because numbers can fluctuate significantly with incoming and outgoing student nurse intakes, employment of temporary staff, inpatients fees as charging arrangements change etc.

The figures are—

30/6/79	30/6/80	30/6/81	30/6/82	30/6/83
3 837	3 792.2	3 695.9	3 612	3 677

- (2) Average bed occupancy at Royal Perth Hospital over the last five years has been—

	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83
	%	%	%	%	%
RPH Wellington St.	88.57	90.20	89.02	89.39	89.47
RPH Group (incl. RPRH & M.L.A.)	84.24	86.32	86.03	86.97	87.45

911. *This question was postponed.*

#### LAND

##### *Tax: Submission*

912. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government received a submission from the Urban Development Institute of Australia concerning land tax?  
 (2) What is the Government view of the submission and the recommendations?  
 (3) In particular, what is the Government view of the proposal that Government instrumentalities involved in trading in land should be subject to the same tax as non-Government companies involved in trading in land, and required to account accordingly?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) A submission has just been received from the Urban Development Institute with advice that a copy has also been forwarded by the institute to every member of Parliament.  
 (2) and (3) The submission will be considered and the Government's view conveyed to the institute in due course.

#### TOWN PLANNING

##### *Urban Lands Council*

913. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) What are the Government's proposals for the establishment of the Urban Lands Council as a statutory body?

- (2) In broad terms, what legislation is proposed?
- (3) When will it be presented to Parliament?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (3) Details relating to the Urban Lands Council's establishment as a statutory authority will be made available when the relevant legislation is introduced into this Parliament. This matter is currently under consideration and the Government has not made its final decision.

## LAND: ABORIGINES

### *Pastoral Land*

914. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Have any Aboriginal communities, or groups of Aborigines, currently made claim or registered an interest in any pastoral land in the Kimberley region?
- (2) If so, what land is the subject of any claim or interest?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I am aware that interest has been expressed in excisions of varying sizes from the following pastoral leases—

Christmas Creek  
GoGo  
Louisa Downs  
Sturt Creek  
Old Argyle Downs  
Cherrabun  
Ivanhoe  
Carlton  
Fossil Downs  
Bow River  
Mt House.

## LAND

### *Subdivision and Sale: Government Agencies*

915. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the progress of the Government's review of the overall situation in which various Government agencies are involved in the subdivision and sale of land?

- (2) Is he able to indicate any action the Government proposes for amalgamation or co-ordination and to reduce unfair competitive opposition of Government agencies in relation to private companies?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) This matter is currently under consideration by the relevant Ministers.
- (2) Any action to be taken will be announced at the appropriate time.

916. *This question was postponed.*

## PUBLIC SERVANTS AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

### *Wages: Increases*

917. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

When does he expect that the information originally requested by the Hon. G. E. Masters, M.L.C., on 2 August 1983, and referred to by the Treasurer in answer to his question 625 on 16 August 1983, will be available?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

It will be available when collation of information is completed.

## WATER RESOURCES

### *Hyden*

918. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What is the charge made by the department for connection of a water supply to each of the residential and commercial lots in the new Hyden townsite?
- (2) Is the cost of upgrading the main from the Wave Rock dam to the old townsite included in the total cost of reticulating the new townsite lots?
- (3) Can he provide information which will demonstrate where the costs for provision of reticulated water can be attributed?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The charge to the subdivider (Lands Department) for the connection of all the lots in the subdivision for the new Hyden townsite was \$90 051. This represents an average charge of \$3 915 per lot for the 16 residential, six light industrial and one commercial lots involved.



- (2) Yes. The upgrading of approximately 470 metres was necessary.
- (5) The estimated costs paid by the subdivider for this subdivision provided for—

	\$
Upgrading of 470 metres of supply main	21 600
Reticulations mains	52 650
23 lot charges at \$687	15 801
	<hr/> 90 051

## HOSPITALS

### *Boards: Membership*

919. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Why is it proposed to limit the membership of hospital boards?
- (2) How many hospitals have a board membership in excess of that recommended by the department?
- (3) Which hospitals are they?
- (4) What is the expected benefit from the decision?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) It is considered a hospital board of nine persons chosen on the basis of management ability and appropriate attributes is an adequate number to effectively and efficiently manage a non-teaching hospital.
- (2) There were 15 non-teaching hospital boards that had in excess of nine members, and which were required to reduce their membership. Following the recent appointments made in respect of the terms of appointment of the members of the abovementioned boards which expired on 31 July 1983 there are now six boards that currently have a membership in excess of nine persons. From 1 August 1984 it is proposed that the membership of these boards will reduce to nine persons. Recommendation to the Governor is yet to be made in respect of one non-teaching hospital board.
- (3) The six hospital boards referred to above are—

Cunderdin Hospital Board  
Kondinin Hospital Board  
Kununoppin Hospital Board  
Manjimup Hospital Board  
Three Springs Hospital Board  
Wyalkatchem Hospital Board

- (4) Effective and efficient management without the involvement of boards with excessive numbers.

## HOSPITAL

### *Kellerberrin*

920. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have staffing levels at the Kellerberrin Hospital been reviewed?
- (2) (a) If so, what changes have been proposed;
- (b) can any justification been given for the proposed changes?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes. In July-1983.
- (2) (a) The hospital has been employing more nursing staff than its permitted financed establishment level. The review indicated that the workload required an increase of 32 hours over the previous establishment level, but was still below the actual number employed.
- (b) The establishment increase resulted from an analysis of staffing needs based on current workloads. The hospital staffing establishment level compares satisfactorily with other country hospitals of similar workloads.

921 and 922. *These questions were postponed.*

## ROADS

### *"Jobs on Local Roads" Programme*

923. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

Will he provide details of the funds that have been made available, and actually paid, to local authorities in Western Australia for the jobs on local roads (JOLOR) programme?

Mr PARKER replied:

\$7.118 million has been specifically earmarked for the JOLOR programme from the State's allocation of \$22.986 million under the community employment programme.

No funds have been actually paid to local authorities under this programme because no formal applications have as yet been received for assessment and approval.

Whereas funds have been allocated by the Commonwealth for this purpose, they have not, as yet, been passed to the State.

#### TRANSPORT: TAXIS

##### *Multiple Hiring and Share-riding*

924. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When is it intended that share-riding and extended multiple hiring will be introduced for the taxi industry?
- (2) What other measures are being considered to assist the taxi industry?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) As the member would know, I have initiated a transport strategy committee to advise me on the best practical ways of extending multiple hiring or introducing share-riding. The committee, which will meet next week, includes representatives of all major sections of the taxi industry. The committee has been asked to report no later than 30 November, and preferably earlier. I do not propose to act until I have the benefit of the committee's advice.
- (2) A range of suggestions for changes in policy and legislation are being considered, with a view to assisting the taxi industry to develop and promote new commercial opportunities and attain a higher level of financial help. I am consulting closely with the taxi industry itself. If the member should have the slightest useful thought on the matter I would be happy to receive it.

#### RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT: REVENUE

##### *Levying and Collection: Study*

925. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

When does the Government expect to be able to announce the members of the mineral resources study group referred to in his answer to question 699 of 17 August?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

As indicated in my response to question 699, an independent director will be engaged to direct the mineral revenues study group. Research support will come from the Departments of Resources Development, Mines and Treasury. The

position of director will be advertised widely, and the appointment will be announced when finalised.

#### "WESTERN AUSTRALIA"

##### *Publication*

926. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Government to continue to publish the magazine "Western Australia"?
- (2) If so, what is the estimated cost to the Government of its production during the year ending 30 June 1984?
- (3) To whom is the magazine now distributed?
- (4) Is it possible that copies of the magazine can be made available to members of Parliament?
- (5) Who handles the production of the magazine?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) As the member should be aware, the previous Government approved the termination of the publication after the December 1982 issue.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) A limited number of copies are still available for distribution.
- (5) Not applicable.

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

##### *Contributory Extension Scheme: Election Promise*

927. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

In relation to question 745 of 23 August concerning Cascades farmers, on what terms and conditions are the customers in the Cascades scheme being provided with State Energy Commission services?

Mr BRYCE replied:

The customers in the Cascades scheme are being supplied under the terms and conditions of the contributory extension scheme "package deal" as confirmed at a meeting between the farmers' representatives and the State Energy Commission at the Lake Grace Shire Council on 14 April 1983.

# LIQUOR: DISTILLERY

## *Swan Valley: Government Assistance*

928. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology:

- (1) Referring him to the question without notice asked on Tuesday, 23 August relating to the Government's assistance to the Swan Valley grape growers, what amount of funds will the Government either be providing or guaranteeing, for the project?
- (2) What contribution will the grape growers be making towards the project?
- (3) Who will manage the distillery once it is completed?
- (4) What amount of interest rate subsidy is the Government providing on the guaranteed loan?
- (5) How much will the new still cost in total?
- (6) What is the estimated cost of the subsidy over the next five years?
- (7) What is the estimated profit, or loss, that the distillery will make in each of its first five years of operation?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) State Cabinet has approved financial assistance for the creation of a distillery in principle only. Consideration is presently being given to decide the most effective level and configuration of assistance for the purpose. Several options are open to the Government.
- (2) to (7) Answered above.

# FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

## *Budget Estimate*

929. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines, and Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What is the estimated operating surplus or deficit for the State Energy Commission for the year ending 30 June 1984?
- (2) If this differs from the answer given to question 91 of 26 July, what is the reason for that difference?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The answer to question 91 stands.

# FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

## *Pipeline: Revenue*

930. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

How much revenue was received by the Government, during the year ended 30 June 1983, from fees, levies and charges raised by authority of the Petroleum Pipelines Act 1969-75?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Revenue received during the year ended 30 June 1983 from fees etc. under the Petroleum Pipelines Act amounted to \$6 810.

# FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

## *Power Poles*

931. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What number of jarrah poles does the State Energy Commission purchase each year?
- (2) What is the average lifetime of timber poles?
- (3) What is the estimated number of poles which have blown over and required replacement as a result of storm damage for each of the last three years?
- (4) What programmes of inspection, repairs and maintenance of wooden poles are undertaken by the State Energy Commission?
- (5) What are the cost comparisons, over a 20-year period between—
  - (a) wooden;
  - (b) concrete;
  - (c) steel poles?
- (6) What accidents and/or damage have been caused by collapse of wooden poles in the last three years?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) 25 000.
- (2) 25 years approximately.
- (3) Accurate figures are not readily available without conducting a detailed analysis.
- (4) Full time programmes include—

Inspection and treatment of wood poles.  
Rural wood pole reinforcement programmes.

Wood pole replacement programmes.

- (5) The present cost ratio between the materials quoted are such that the wood pole is the most economical over a 20-year period for most applications.
- (6) As per (3) above.

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

##### *Pipeline: Compensation*

932. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines, and Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Referring him to questions 748 and 750 of 23 August, were the majority of compensation agreements with property owners affected by the Dampier-Wagerup natural gas pipeline verbal agreements?
- (2) If so, why was it that the commission did not commit these contracts to writing?
- (3) Were the six owners south of the metropolitan area, referred to in question 748, contracted verbally or in writing?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) Initial agreement to the level of compensation paid to a property owner is verbal. This verbal agreement enables formal documents to be drawn up for signing. This process normally takes one to two weeks.
- (2) Five verbally and one in writing.

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

##### *Charges: Overcharging*

933. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Referring him to question without notice 24 of 26 July 1983 was the complaint he received from the tenant in the Southlands Shopping Centre respecting overcharging for electricity written or verbal?
- (2) What action did he take to check out the facts, as presented to him by the tenant?
- (3) When did he receive the complaint from the tenant?
- (4) What action has been taken by him since this matter was drawn to his attention to further examine this supposed "exploitation"?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Complaint lodged by telephone.
- (2) Inquiries were made with the State Energy Commission to establish actual rates.
- (3) 26 July 1983.
- (4) The managing agent for the centre has been asked in writing by the Prices Commissioner to provide certain information and to date has not responded. Further discussions have also been held with the complainant. I might add that a copy of a letter the managing agent has sent to me leaves no doubt that the amount collected for electricity from tenants exceeds the accounts paid by the centre. The application of this amount and ethics in charging the higher rate is what is in question.

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

##### *Charges: Managing Agents*

934. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Why is it that under section 245F of the Electricity Act regulations that landlords may charge tenants the same meter rental as charged to him (i.e., landlord) and the same tariff for electricity used as the tenants would pay, if supplied directly by the State Energy Commission and not at the rate paid by the landlord, assuming that he (i.e. the landlord) is a sufficiently large consumer to obtain cheaper energy rates?
- (2) Is it a fact that if managing agents were to choose not to collect electricity charges from their tenants and they (the tenants) were then to be charged directly by the State Energy Commission that—
  - (a) the State Energy Commission would carry all tenants' bad debts for electricity accounts; and
  - (b) each tenant would be required to pay to the commission a deposit before receiving supply from the State Energy Commission?
- (3) How does the commission calculate the deposit collected from business customers?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) The member is referred to the regulations for its effect.

- (2) (a) and (b) Managing agents are not referred to in the regulations.
- (3) The deposit to be collected from business customers is assessed, according to section 62(11) of the State Energy Commission Act.

935. *This question was postponed.*

## EDUCATION

### *Reading Clinic: Busselton*

936. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he received a request for the expansion of the reading clinic in the Busselton district?
- (2) If so, when was the request received?
- (3) Has he given any consideration to the appointment of the extra staff?
- (4) If so, could he advise how many new staff members are to be appointed and when they are due to commence?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Within the last eight weeks.
- (3) Yes—the organisation of the Busselton Reading Clinic is currently under review and the matter of staffing is receiving specific consideration.
- (4) Staffing is being considered within the total context of special education branch priorities and the final decision will depend on the total staff allocation received by the special education branch.

## HOSPITALS

### *South West*

937. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the—
- (a) bed capacity;
- (b) daily bed averages;
- (c) staff numbers,
- at the—
- (i) Augusta;
- (ii) Margaret River;
- (iii) Busselton;
- (iv) Nannup;
- (v) Donnybrook;
- (vi) Bunbury Regional;
- (vii) St. John of God, Bunbury;

(viii) Harvey;

(ix) Yarloop,

hospitals in the two most recent years?

- (2) What steps is the Government taking to ensure that local hospitals, including the Bunbury Regional Hospital and St. John's Hospital, are adequately staffed to provide a high standard of medical service and health care?

Mr HODGE replied:

(1)

Hospital	Bed Capacity		Bed Average		Establishment Staff (F.T.E.)	
	81/82	82/83	81/82	82/83	81/82	82/83
Augusta	11	11	7.91	7.10	16.77	19.32
Margaret River	27	26	15.39	11.80	24.02	24.18
Busselton	61	61	47.89	45.20	102.50	101.73
Nannup	18	18	15.60	15.99	21.63	22.16
Donnybrook	20	20	14.28	13.00	20.72	23.95
Bunbury	164	164	125.34	129.10	278.08	280.41
Bunbury Regional						
St. John of God*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Harvey	32	32	18.29	20.00	39.30	40.30
Yarloop	26	26	9.45	10.60	28.37	26.42

- (2) All hospitals' workloads are examined periodically to assess the fluctuations occurring and revise the staff establishment to reflect workload changes.

St. John's Hospital Bunbury is a private hospital which is responsible for its own operations including staffing levels.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### COMMUNITY WELFARE: ADOPTIONS

#### *Register and "Relinquishing Mothers"*

195. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

- (1) Does the Minister have in hand proposals to legislate to give rights to people who are referred to as "relinquishing mothers"? If so will he advise the House in broad terms what are the proposals?
- (2) In relation to the proposals announced to establish an adoption register, does he propose that these arrangements will be supported by appropriate legislation?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (2) No proposals for legislation are currently before me in relation to relinquishing mothers.
- (2) It is proposed to implement an adoption contact register as soon as the administration of such a register can be set in place. It is also envisaged that some legislative backup will be needed

subsequently, and arrangements for that are in process.

## EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

### *Greenwood*

196. Mrs WATKINS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the pressures that will apply to the Greenwood Senior High School if a high school is not built in the near future?
- (2) Can the Minister give an undertaking that another high school will be built in the Kingsley-Woodvale area by 1985 to relieve those pressures?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member has been quite assiduous in drawing to my attention the problem of overcrowding in the area to which she referred. As a result of her efforts I am aware of the difficulties there. I give an assurance that an additional high school will be built in the Kingsley-Woodvale area for the beginning of the school year in 1985.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE: DEPARTMENT

### *Attitude and Operations*

197. Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

- (1) Has the Minister seen and read the article on page 32 of yesterday's *Daily News* headed "Girl's use of drugs condoned by dept"?
- (2) In view of the seriousness of this and other claims in this article, some similar to complaints I have received from distraught and caring parents, will the Minister instigate a full inquiry into the attitude and operations of the officers of the Department for Community Welfare, preferably by an outside body?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes, I saw the article to which the member refers. I have asked for a high level inquiry to be made into the claims made in the article. I am very concerned about the style of journalism adopted by the journalist responsible for that article. Very sincere attempts have been made in respect of that journalist, the newspaper, and another newspaper that has seen fit to make wild accu-

sations about certain of the department's activities.

An attempt was made to try to give some information to the journalist concerned to enable that person to understand the sensitivities involved in the type of cases referred to. I have every reason to believe that many of the claims made in that article are false, but I have asked for a high level inquiry into it.

I believe the department's officers in many cases are being placed in a very difficult position by these wild and unsubstantiated claims. I am fearful of the effect these claims are having on the morale of departmental officers. I am concerned at the attempts to sensationalise a very sensitive area, and I am concerned about the effect these claims are having on the people involved in these cases; the effects are very serious. However, the matter will be thoroughly investigated, as have been articles in the past, many of which have been found to be based on very slim evidence. I reiterate my deep concern about the general effects of this article. All necessary steps will be taken and no stone will be left unturned to ensure that these claims are thoroughly investigated.

I have every confidence in the officers of the department and I am very concerned on their behalf at the seemingly irresponsible way in which these articles are being published.

## TOURISM

### *Tourists: Number*

198. Mr BURKETT, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the Department of Tourism maintain figures on the number of tourists coming to WA and the value of the tourist industry?
- (2) If so, do the figures demonstrate the impact of the economic recession on the industry and to what extent?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The department does keep such figures.

The latest figures which became available only a few days ago demonstrate the industry in WA has done remarkably well despite the recession. Tourist spending in WA in 1982 is esti-

mated to have been about \$920 million—an increase of 30 per cent on the previous year. The number of interstate visitors increased by 11 per cent and the number of overseas visitors by 5 per cent. In the current economic climate, the figures are quite remarkable and most encouraging.

The Government believes that the potential for growth in the industry has hardly been tapped and that the industry can make a far greater contribution to economic growth than it has in the past. The figures I have just quoted support that view. However, I do not believe that the existing State Government structures to promote tourism are as streamlined as they might be and I expect that I will be able to announce some major government initiatives in this area next week, hopefully on Monday.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE: ADOPTIONS

### Register

199. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

Does he agree that the question of an adoption contact register is at least as sensitive and important to members of the public as the allegedly incorrect report to which he referred in answer to a previous question? If so, does he not believe that this matter should be handled by appropriate legislation debated by Parliament, and not by administrative action?

Mr WILSON replied:

In order to ensure that the contact register works effectively, it is necessary for the adoptions centre to have access to full records of background information on adoptees, their biological parents and relatives. Certain records in the past have been destroyed or are available only through the Registrar General's Office, and the Registrars of the Supreme Court or Family Court. In approving of the establishment of a contact register, it is recommended that amendments be made to section 11 of the Adoption of Children Act to require the Registrar General and the Registrars of the Supreme and Family Courts to provide information to the Director for Community Welfare on adopted children and their natural relatives. It is

intended to implement the adoption contact register as soon as possible using current information available in the department and once legislation is passed, information from the courts and the Registrar General's Office will also be used.

I say that because it is my belief that is the only legislation necessary. The implementation of the adoption register is a recognition of the fact that the community has now reached the stage where it is prepared to recognise the genuine human concern that exists for people to discover details about their backgrounds as they reach adulthood. Generally, that should be made available. Legislation is not required other than in the areas to which I have referred.

## EDUCATION

### *Swimming Lessons: In-term*

200. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Education:

Bearing in mind the previous Government's decision to reduce the in-term swimming lessons from 11 weeks to seven weeks, what plans if any are in hand to amend or improve the situation in any way?

Mr PEARCE replied:

Obviously the question is the subject of Budget discussions; but I can indicate that we propose to increase the length of in-term swimming classes in the next year from seven weeks to 10 weeks.

## FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

### *Rosewood Cattle Station*

201. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Regarding Rosewood Station in the Kimberley, has his Government approved of or indicated its approval for the sale of this station to an overseas organisation, despite local offers having been made? The information I have—and I seek confirmation—is that approval has been given to a group called Sarawak Economic Development Corporation from Sabah in Sarawak.

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Following Cabinet consideration, Rosewood Station will not be sold. The station property's area extends only

partly into Western Australia, and the majority of the station is in the Northern Territory.

An application to purchase the station was made; but I understand the application made by the company referred to by the Leader of the Opposition did not meet the requirements of the Foreign Investment Review Board in any case. Regardless of that, the station has not been sold, and I understand it will not be sold.

The Government was not aware of any alternative proposition, probably because such propositions would not have come to our Government, but they would have gone to the Northern Territory Government.

#### EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

##### *Enrolments: Charges*

202. Mrs BEGGS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he outline the changes in the system of enrolment for pre-primary children?
- (2) What action will be taken if the enrolments at any pre-primary centre indicate that the places required are far in excess of capacity, to ensure that all five-year-olds will have the benefit of a pre-primary education?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government is concerned to ensure that all people should have access to pre-primary education; and it is our intention to bring this situation into being at the beginning of the 1984 school year. Members will recall that in previous years it was the custom to limit enrolments for pre-primary schools which resulted in parents queueing, sometimes from 6.00 p.m. on the night before the enrolment day, in order to enrol their children for pre-primary education.

The changed system for enrolments next year is that the formal enrolments will take place from the beginning of the first day of the third term; but it will not be necessary for parents to queue as the order in which names are placed on enrolment papers will play no part in the allocation of places, as was the practice in the past. Instead, once we have clear

information on the number of pre-primary places required, every effort will be made to provide a place for every child within the immediate area in which they live. If too many places are required, we will provide temporary facilities until we can make more permanent arrangements.

If a problem arises, I will meet with the parents involved in each of the areas with a problem, in order to reach a local consensus on what needs to be done about what. In this way, we will be able to provide a place for every child in pre-primary education in the State next year.

Government members: Hear, hear!

#### CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: LESCHENAULT INLET

##### *Laporte Australia Ltd.: Effluent*

203. Mr MENSAROS, to the Deputy Premier:

I address my question to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister in charge of State agreements, and I ask—

- (1) In view of the reported decision of the Australian Labor Party State Executive regarding recycling of Laporte Australia Ltd. effluent, how will the effluent be disposed of until recycling is a viable possibility?
- (2) Is the Government considering amending the existing State agreement with Laporte unilaterally, as far as the disposal of the effluent is concerned?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) The expression of opinion by the State executive has no bearing whatsoever on the negotiations that have been carried on over the last 18 months by members of the department administered by the former Ministers opposite and by me.
- (2) We are having discussions with representatives of the company and the Public Works Department with a view to discussing the rearrangement of responsibility so far as the future cost of disposal of Laporte effluent is concerned.



## BUILDING INDUSTRY

### *Builders' Registration Board: Jurisdiction*

204. Mr P. J. SMITH, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Does the Government intend to extend the jurisdiction of the Builders' Registration Board beyond the metropolitan area and Shire of Mandurah boundaries?
- (2) If "Yes", does it intend to extend the jurisdiction of the board to the Bunbury area?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), can the Minister indicate a likely timetable for this?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Members will be aware that when the Australian Labor Party was last in Government in 1971-74, legislation was introduced into the Parliament to provide protection to Bunbury, as well as to other places; but the legislation was defeated in the Legislative Council which, then as now, was undemocratically elected and therefore did not reflect the wishes of the people of Western Australia.
- (2) The extension to the Bunbury area is complicated by the fact that the Builders' Registration Board is self-funded, and it has been so ever since its inception in 1939. If we do not want it to become a burden upon the taxpayers, we have to see how it can digest the new area—the complete metropolitan area as defined by the MRPA boundary, and the Shire of Mandurah.

I have received requests from all over the State—not from all regions, but from many of them—to have this facility extended to their areas. Of course, I have received representations from the member for Bunbury. I am aware that a great desire has been expressed, not only by the consumers in Bunbury, but also by the members of the building industry. Therefore, I am considering this question sympathetically; but I have two qualifications to consider. The first is that we must see how the board adjusts to its enlarged boundary before we move any further. The second is that we must weigh up the claims of other parts of the State as against those of Bunbury.

- (3) I hope the board will be able to extend its jurisdiction to Bunbury next year.

## WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY AND COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLIES

### *Amalgamation: Consultations*

205. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Water Resources:

In part (5) of the answer to question 865, he referred to the operations or administration of the Bunbury and Busselton Water Boards. He said that he and his officers had raised a number of issues with each of the boards. I ask—

- (1) What are the issues that have given rise to any concern?
- (2) Are any matters known to him that are likely to cause concern to the health of the communities of Busselton or Bunbury?
- (3) Are any economic matters known to him which are likely to cause concern to the ratepayers of either of those communities?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) to (3) I am not sure what the member means by "economic matters". Perhaps he means "financial"; but I am not sure in which way he means it.

Mr Blaikie: I am asking what are the matters which led you to give the answer you gave when you said there were matters which were causing you concern, which you were going to discuss with both boards. I think both of those boards and the community have a right to know.

Mr TONKIN: The discussions between the boards and me are proceeding amicably, which should be no surprise to the House. We will meet with them again in the near future.

Mr Blaikie: The question is: What are the matters causing concern?

Mr TONKIN: The discussions will not be advanced by the member's trying to alarm the people of Vasse, Bunbury, or Mitchell by trying to suggest that there is something of great concern.

Mr Blaikie: Is there any concern to you?

Mr TONKIN: When a Government decides to develop a State-wide water authority and some boards have traditionally been in place—we have the three boards in the south-west—it is the Government's

concern to ensure that the people of the State and the people of the area are not disadvantaged. That is why I am having discussions with the boards.

I am not about to inflame public opinion, or to allow the member for Vasse to inflame public opinion by suggesting there is a matter of great concern. We are having discussions, and I have no reason to believe that outstanding matters will not be settled amicably between us.

Mr Blaikie: What are the matters that caused you concern and gave rise to your answer?

Mr TONKIN: Those matters are for me to discuss with the boards; I would rather not discuss them publicly at present.

Mr Blaikie: But you have, in a public answer.

Mr TONKIN: The member for Vasse wants to make political capital out of it; that is not in the best interests of the people of Bunbury or Busselton. We should not use it as a political football.

Mr Blaikie: You are hiding.

## EDUCATION

### *Reading Clinic: Mandurah*

206. Mr READ, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that because of the growth in school numbers the reading clinic presently located in a demountable classroom at Glencoe Primary School appears likely to be relocated in a withdrawal area in 1984?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that this reading clinic is supervised by the special education branch of the Education Department of WA and provides a service for the four Government primary schools in Mandurah?
- (3) Will the Minister give some assurance that a classroom will be provided for the reading clinic in 1984?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Mandurah reading clinic was set up as a temporary centre with a planned life of two terms. In view of the need it has been continued and will also operate for at least the first part of 1984.
- (3) Planning branch estimates indicate that there will be sufficient accommodation at Glencoe in 1984 to provide adequate

housing for the reading clinic which deals with a maximum of six children at a time.

I give the member the additional assurance that the reading clinic will continue as long as the need is there.

## EDUCATION: TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

### *Fees: Increase*

207. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he advise the details of any increases in fees for students enrolling in technical and further education courses in the third term of 1983?
- (2) Have administrative problems in collecting the higher fees been experienced?
- (3) What effect is that likely to have on student numbers and courses?
- (4) How much additional revenue is expected to be raised by the increases?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (4) The hourly fee for technical and further education students has been increased for students in the leisure further education area, but not in the vocational area. The fees have been increased from \$1.25 to \$2 per hour, and they will apply in third term.

The exemptions have been tightly defined in that people who are unemployed or who are holders of the pensioner health benefit card will continue to enjoy access to classes free of charge. The increase has been made to cover the cost of the classes because, as they are optional extras to the education system and involve people doing small leisure-time activities, the attitude prevails as has prevailed in the past that the classes should be self supporting, and the fee of \$2 an hour is needed to cover the costs involved. I cannot indicate the amount of revenue expected to be raised by this measure, one reason being that I expect a fall-off in the numbers attending these classes as a result of the increase. The alternative is that the State, from its Budget, could subsidise the classes or could institute a user-pay system. We have decided to follow the previous Government's policy of a user-pay system.

Mr Clarko: That is not correct, because the previous figure did not cover it.

Mr PEARCE: But the cost has been eroded by inflation.

Mr Clarko: We deliberately refused to put it up.

Mr PEARCE: I will take the previous Minister's word for that.

Mr Clarko: So in regard to classes, you are indicating that you are not sure what will happen.

Mr PEARCE: We do not expect any administrative difficulty to be involved, but we do expect a fall-off in class numbers because of the increased fee.

#### HOSPITALS: OSBORNE PARK AND WANNEROO

##### *Clinical Services: Co-ordinator*

208. Mrs WATKINS, to the Minister for Health:

Is it a fact that the Government has recently taken action to further upgrade the health-care services offered to residents of Wanneroo, Osborne Park, and surrounding areas, through the Wanneroo and Osborne Park Hospitals?

Mr HODGE replied:

Yes. I am pleased to advise the member that a senior and very experienced doctor has been appointed to co-ordinate clinical services and to give assistance to doctors who will provide medical services through these hospitals.

Dr A. H. Duncan is the appointee. He has been the Deputy Medical Superintendent at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital since 1976. Dr Duncan's qualifications include: Bachelor of Medicine; Bachelor of Surgery; Fellow of the Faculty of Community Medicine; Fellow of the Royal Australasian College of Medical Administrators; and Diploma of Public Health. He has had considerable experience in the United Kingdom in the co-ordination of medical services and was particularly responsible for setting up the well known Livingstone scheme.

This is a significant step taken by the State Government to enhance the standard of medical attention provided to the public through non-teaching Government hospitals and is in accord with our election undertaking in this regard.

(53)

#### RECREATION: FOOTBALL

##### *Sandover Medal*

209. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

Because of his close connections with the Western Australian Football League I ask him if he would ask the WAFL to abandon the present countback system when awarding Sandover Medals.

##### *Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: Order! This question is out of order.

##### *Questions Without Notice Resumed*

#### HOUSING: RENTAL

##### *Tenants' Rights*

210. Mr WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) With reference to State Housing Commission homes, does he propose to introduce legislation to strengthen tenants' rights?

(2) If so, what specific areas require legislation?

Mr WILSON replied:

(1) and (2) There is certainly nothing before my department about strengthening the rights of tenants in State Housing Commission homes.

#### CONSUMER AFFAIRS

##### *Video Recorder Industry: Allegations*

211. Mr GORDON HILL, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

(1) Is the Minister aware of an article in the consumer magazine *Choice* alleging that people who used to be involved in the shady side of the secondhand car market are moving into the video market?

(2) What is the basis of the allegations made by *Choice* magazine?

(3) Has the Minister received any complaints about the video industry in Western Australia?

(4) Will the Minister take action to have this matter investigated?

Mr TONKIN replied:

(1) Yes, I am aware of comments in *Choice* magazine reported in the *Sunday Independent* on 7 August this year. The article largely applies to New South Wales, but I am afraid it has some application to Western Australia.

- (2) It has been alleged that people are often tempted into rental arrangements which purport to provide quite reasonable daily rates but discover that the rates apply to a four year minimum rental rate with very high bonds. People then may be told that they may be better off buying what is called a "video package" involving a small cash deposit. The purchase agreement associated with this package is in fact a blank application for a personal loan for the full cost of the package. Purchasers are then threatened with legal action if they indicate that they wish to cancel the deal. The finance company's name is not revealed to purchasers. There have been cases where the equipment has been delivered to the purchasers but the promised video library proves non-existent and the whole deal may end up costing twice as much. Some companies have in fact collapsed after signing people up on long-term agreements and people are left with debts to a finance company for years without getting the so-called video package. There are also problems with the availability of advertised titles, life membership deals, and the quality of tapes available in some video libraries.
- (3) Since the industry commenced in Western Australia there have been a total of 319 complaints against the video industry. The complaints are broken up as follows—

84 complaints have concerned video tapes and/or libraries;

235 complaints are relevant to the hardware or machinery side of the industry.

- (4) Statistics reflect that the industry is already becoming more stable and the so-called "shady dealers" are being forced out. I believe this is through the fact that the public are much more educated in video matters and therefore they are in a position to protect themselves from so-called bad deals. I will certainly have this matter more thoroughly investigated.

#### TRAFFIC: CODE

##### *National*

212. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he yet in a position to outline any proposals he intends to put forward as part

of a national traffic code, something he was directed to do by the ALP Executive on Monday night?

- (2) Can he answer in terms that are not classically bureaucratic?
- (3) Is it true to say that the Minister has difficulty in accepting the centralist policies of the ALP?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) In basic principle very little disagreement exists between the ALP State Executive and me. However, the practicalities of bringing about a national traffic code—which is very largely the responsibility of the Minister for Police in this State—involves some slight disagreement between the State executive and me. That stems from the fact that members of the executive take a more idealistic view of the sort of opposition we might come up against. I can imagine the sort of opposition that might come forward from States such as Queensland—

Mr Brian Burke: That is only because you must be a Communist.

Mr GRILL: —and to a lesser extent Tasmania. The practicalities of convincing some of the hidebound conservatives in those States that some merit exists in a national traffic code would probably be hard to overcome. I think most people would agree with that.

#### SHIPPING: STATESHIPS

##### *East-West Trade*

213. Mrs BUCHANAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Can the Minister advise the extent of Stateships' participation in trade between Western Australia and the Eastern States?
- (2) Can he advise whether Stateships makes a positive contribution to the State's economy by operating in this east-west trade?
- (3) Has the Government taken any initiatives to improve the economies of Stateships' participation in this trade?

Mr MacKinnon: I hope he knows more about this than about the ships available at Port Hedland.

Mr GRILL replied:

In reply to the question asked—

Mr MacKinnon: He didn't know they were bypassing the place.

Mr GRILL: Members of the Opposition can denigrate the industrial capability of Western Australia if they wish, but if they want me to join with them I tell them that I will not do so.

Mr MacKinnon interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: You are the greatest knocker in this House.

Mr GRILL: Members opposite send emissaries around the world who do the same thing. I suggest that members opposite should distance themselves from those people. I think they know who they are. I provide the following information to the question asked by the member for Pilbara—

- (1) Stateships operates a modern liner service which links Fremantle and Bunbury to Hobart, Burnie, Westernport, and Melbourne. During 1982, Stateships moved about 143 000 tonnes of general cargo and bulk cargo on this east-west service. Earnings from the cargo totalled \$9.8 million in 1982. All of this cargo was carried in the MV *Kimberley*.
- (2) As it is presently operated the Stateships' east-west service just about breaks even financially.

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: Are you unhappy about Stateships?

Mr Clarko: We are supporting it.

Mr Brian Burke: You are concerned that we will make Stateships work. Don't you think it can?

Mr Clarko: You are arguing with yourself.

Mr MacKinnon: And losing.

Mr GRILL: It has a vital role in providing a direct transport link with Tasmania. It provides an alternative mode of transport for people involved in transcontinental trade. Consequently, it adds a healthy element of competition to the east-west freight transport market.

- (3) Two decisions made by the Burke Government have enhanced the viability of this trade. It has decided to replace the MV *Kimberley* with a larger vessel of around 22 000 dead-weight tonnes. Stateships will take delivery of this

vessel on long-term charter in a few months.

Mr Rushton: That is not a Burke initiative, so don't tell untruths in this place.

Mr Brian Burke: You are not even the Opposition spokesman on transport.

Mr Rushton: That doesn't worry me.

Mr GRILL: To be fair to the alternative Opposition spokesman on transport—

Mr Brian Burke: You mean "second-wicket-down" Rushton.

Mr GRILL: To be fair, during the period of the previous Government some investigation took place into this matter, but it did not come to a head until the new Government came to office.

Mr Rushton: About two days.

Mr GRILL: Just after that a decision was made by this Government to replace the motor vessel *Kimberley* with a larger vessel of about 22 000 tonnes dead weight.

Because of the impact of the worldwide recession on the shipping market, Stateships will be able to charter the new ship at a lower rate than the rate now being paid for the *Kimberley*.

It is estimated that acquisition of this vessel will improve Stateships' financial position by at least \$23 million over the next five years.

Mr Rushton: It should break even within five years, on a trading basis.

Mr GRILL: The member for Dale is absolutely amazing. The other day when the member for Gascoyne asked a question about delays in processing of ABRD funds by the Commonwealth Government, the member for Dale sat by mutely while the member for Gascoyne endeavoured to castigate and blame me for the delay. When I pointed out that there was no delay and that we had the best record in the Commonwealth in that area, the member for Dale jumped up and tried to claim credit for it!

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: "Never spoil a good story for lack of facts Rushton".

Mr Laurance: Not one dollar paid to any local authority in this State, and he announced it five months ago!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call on the Minister to wind up his answer.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr Brian Burke: He is winding up the Opposition.

Mr GRILL: Another area of ignorance displayed by the Opposition—"Jolor" has nothing to do with the State Government.

The Government has been astute enough to take further advantage of the depressed shipping market by renegotiating the charter agreements for the other two Stateships, MV *Koolinda* and MV *Pilbara*.

It is estimated that this decision will save Stateships and the Government more than \$7 million over the next eight years.

A side effect of this decision is that it allows Stateships to make modifications to the two vessels, which could improve the service given to the North-west. In particular, modifications can be carried out which would allow Stateships to carry diesel fuel and other liquid petroleum products as paying cargo.

---