

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, 11 April 1984

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### BILLS OF SALE AMENDMENT BILL 1984

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion without notice by the Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and read a first time.

### PUBLIC TRUSTEE AMENDMENT BILL 1984

#### *Report*

Report of Committee adopted.

### VALUATION OF LAND AMENDMENT BILL 1984

#### *In Committee*

Resumed from 10 April. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. P. H. Lockyer) in the Chair; the Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3: Section 24 amended—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after the clause had been partly considered.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Yesterday I gave an undertaking to check the position relating to a question raised by Hon. Margaret McAleer. She asked whether the second part of clause 3 might raise the prospect that land which is entirely separate from other land might be aggregated for purposes of valuation. I have checked this matter with the State Taxation Department and I am advised that it is not proposed in this respect that there should be any change from existing practice. This practice applies solely to the aggregation of contiguous land and not land which is separated in the way that Miss McAleer yesterday thought might be involved. I think I did make the point yesterday that no new practice was proposed as a result of this amendment.

It is sought only to remove any element of doubt about longstanding practices. These have been brought into question by the terminology of the present Act. It is true that the Act does not define the word "conjointly", but the past and intended future practice is that that should be understood as relating only to contiguous land.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: I thank the Attorney General for his explanation and I indi-

cate that it is satisfactory, but it is always unfortunate when loopholes remain, whatever the present practice or the intention of the future practice might be. We are satisfied to leave it at that for the time being.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and transmitted to the Assembly.

### SUPPLY BILL 1984

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 10 April.

HON. FRED McKENZIE (North-East Metropolitan) [2.21 p.m.]: I want to comment on the railway industry in particular and on underground powerlines.

When we were in Opposition I often rose to my feet warning members of the dire consequences that would result from a change in the transport policies of Western Australia. I note the recent activity of members opposite in country areas in respect of the downturn in employment, and particularly regarding the future withdrawal of Westrail employees and those who have been withdrawn in recent months, and I trust members opposite realise that what I warned them about at that time is now taking place.

However, I think it is unfair for members opposite to capitalise on the problems that this Government faces in respect of employment within Westrail. Those problems are nothing more than a legacy that has been left to it by the former Government.

It is very disconcerting to hear members from country electorates trying to make capital out of the position which the Government faces. The downturn in employment has been brought about simply by the fact that Westrail no longer has the business in the country areas. It has lost its business to metropolitan based road trucking firms. It would not have been so bad had the former Government not deliberately caused the problem with which we are faced today by the implementation of its policy. The problem was caused by the former Government discriminating

against Westrail by not permitting it to compete by way of deregulation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw honourable members' attention to the fact that audible conversations are not only unparliamentary, but also out of order.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: It would not have been as bad if we had considered a different transport policy which had been aimed at bringing about a change in the transportation of smalls traffic—less than carload traffic. However, the Government discriminated against Westrail by not permitting it to enter into the door-to-door area of the transport field. This type of business was carried out by private road operators. Of course, this meant that the private road operator had the advantage because he could pick up the goods and deliver them door to door. Westrail was prevented from doing this because the former Government would not participate in that form of delivery.

The Minister for Transport is going through a difficult period with the unions, and I have a great deal of sympathy for him. It is very difficult to explain to unionists that the problems they face, and will face in the future, have not been brought about as a result of the Labor Government's policy, but because of the policies of the Liberal Government. It is also very difficult for the Minister to change the pattern that was laid down very clearly during the early 1980s. Once the die has been cast it is a difficult task to turn it around. Members would appreciate that many people who have bought trucking rigs in which to convey these goods are small business people and subcontractors who have moved into the field of transport simply to buy a job. The Government cannot bring in a policy that would seriously affect those people. It is a long-term process to change a policy which was a radical change made by the former Government early in 1980.

I would like to ask members—I suppose it is difficult to do so, particularly as they are in the game of politics—to remember that the problems being faced today in the country have been caused by a downturn in employment in areas like Narrogin, Katanning, Bunbury, and other places where large numbers of people were employed by Westrail. The problems in those towns are not a result of the actions of this Government, but of the former Government's policies.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Come off it!

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is the same as when the Tonkin Government was in power and you know

what happened in Bridgetown. It had no interest in the employees at all.

Several members interjected.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: If the Hon. Sandy Lewis wants to go back to the days of the Tonkin Government I am willing to do so.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: It had a total disregard for employees.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The problem with which we are faced today is the same problem we inherited when the Tonkin Government came into power. Over the years the Liberal Party has systematically dismantled the railway system. I know that the Hon. Sandy Lewis is active in trying to make political capital out of this situation and I regard his comments as being unfair. That is the point I am trying to make today.

Before I was interrupted by that untimely interjection, I was pointing out that it is very difficult in the short term to change the course that was adopted during the early 1980s.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Mr McKenzie, do not lead the House astray. The Tonkin Government would not look at a review of the situation to please the Opposition.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The Hon. Sandy Lewis will have his chance to speak.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: I will.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The Hon. Sandy Lewis has a short memory.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to cease their interjections and I ask the honourable member addressing the House to direct his comments to the Chair and to ignore the interjections.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr President, I know you will not interrupt me and that perhaps it is wiser for me to do as you ask.

Mr President, you were in this House during the term of the last Government when, on many occasions, I tried to warn this House what would happen in respect of Westrail employees in country areas if the then proposed policy, with which we are now faced, was adopted by the then Government. One often reads about the heartache that is now taking place in the country because of the drift of employment seekers from those areas to the metropolitan area.

It is not pleasant to say to members of this House, "I told you so", but I feel it is my right because a perusal of *Hansard* will show I vigorously opposed the change at that time.

I am unable to give any hope for the future to those people who have been affected by the im-

plementation of the policy. However, I inform members that I am doing all within my power to ensure that people remain in country areas. We can do something about ensuring the return of those people who were previously employed in the country areas, and the Government will pursue that avenue.

I now refer to the question of underground installation of electricity supplies. Successive Governments have failed to grasp the nettle in respect of underground power. It can be noticed throughout the metropolitan area that various suburbs have electricity poles on one side of the road and on the other side the power lines are underground. It is time that Governments through their departments determined that henceforth all power supplies to newly developed areas will be underground. For example I refer to Ocean Reef Road; on one side in Heathridge underground power is supplied but recently the Urban Lands Council sold some blocks which have the pole system.

All that is necessary is for the Government to legislate to compel developers of new areas to supply underground powerlines. It is not an expensive item.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Of course, in some areas there are difficulties.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Certainly in Kalamunda it would be difficult because of the rock in that area which would need blasting. However the bulk of the metropolitan area has sandy soil.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Some limestone areas around Fremantle may have problems.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: There are a few but even in limestone it would be possible.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I agree with you in principle but blanket cover could be a little difficult.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I quote from a letter from the deputy commissioner, Mr Marwood Kingsmill, which was published in *The West Australian* on 2 April, as follows—

On the other hand, if the charges were absorbed by individual customers, each customer in a newly developed area within the metropolitan area would need to pay an extra \$600 a building block if he or she chose to install underground rather than overhead lines.

To replace existing overhead lines in builtup areas would cost even more—about \$1 200 a block and even higher in some cases.

In a newly developed area underground power could be provided for the sum of \$600 a block. Surely this must mean a lower maintenance bill for the State Energy Commission in the long term. In addition we should consider the amount expended in continually cutting back street trees. It must cost local authorities considerable amounts each year to cut back the trees in their districts. Therefore, not only would underground power be more advantageous but also it would be cheaper.

It is time the Government tackled this question and no longer allowed developers to opt for the cheaper alternative. Developers should be required by law to install underground power lines.

Another relevant point on this question relates to storm damage which can occur with overhead lines. We had a storm in the metropolitan area last night and many areas were left without power, even though only for brief periods. If the supply had been underground we would not have had that problem.

Apart from the aesthetics of underground power there are other advantages. Periodically people who live in the Belmont area where I reside complain about the way trees have been hacked about when cut away from powerlines. If the power supply was underground none of these things would occur. Some initiative is required on the part of the Town Planning Department or the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority to insist that developers in new areas provide underground power.

Hon. P. G. Pendar: How much extra does it cost per block?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: An average of \$600 in the metropolitan area. It is not a large sum when one considers the price paid for a block of land. It is disgraceful that the Urban Lands Council is selling blocks and is not required to provide underground power. It would be a simple exercise to compel that body to provide underground power to any blocks sold by it.

In some parts of the northern suburbs development is like a patchwork quilt; some streets have power underground at both ends of them and one then finds poles in the middle. The poles are unsightly, unnecessary, and in the long term prove more expensive.

I raise the matter in the hope that the Minister will take note of my comments and instruct the Town Planning Department to introduce some regulation or change to the Act to require developers opening up new areas to provide underground power. I repeat that I am not talking of existing areas which have overhead lines.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Have you given any thought to that? It may be a possibility.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I would like to do that but the cost is estimated by the State Energy Commission to be an average of \$1 200 a block. I believe this problem must be tackled somewhere and perhaps we can at a later stage consider progressively introducing underground power in other areas. However, it is crazy to allow new developments to be established with overhead power lines.

It would be a simple exercise for the Urban Lands Council to provide underground power and it would also be simple for any developers to be required to do the same. If we do not start somewhere we shall have a higgledy-piggledy system all over the metropolitan area, some areas with underground power and some with overhead lines.

Hon. N. F. Moore: I hope the Government takes up your excellent suggestion.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Thank you Mr Moore. It is not often I receive support from the member for Lower North and I appreciate it.

Hon. N. F. Moore: We are only here to help.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: You have one thing on your side; sincerity. I hope you can spread it to your colleagues.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I am glad Mr Lockyer is onside, too. It is funny that one can always find friends when one is in Government; but when the boot is on the other foot, it is very different.

I thought I would raise that matter because the Minister for Planning is now in the Chamber. His department is responsible, and I repeat it for his benefit because he is a man of great concern. He knows I am speaking with sincerity.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You are now spoiling your speech.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The Minister is inclined to listen to me. I do not know about other people, but I have had a great deal of success with him. I simply say that he should require the developers to put power underground in new developments. If he does not give a positive answer, I will rise again, and again, and again until he is forced to abandon his Ministry and move to another. He has had fair warning!

The Minister for Planning is one of the Ministers who listens to suggestions, and he is a very innovative man. I know that what I am saying is not falling on deaf ears. I know I have made a very good point in respect of underground power. That is one reason I rose to speak on the Supply Bill.

I remind members about the other matter I raised. I hope they have noted what I said, and when they return to the country areas they will not be harsh on the present Government. I trust they will realise the problems suffered in the country and what the Labor Party is attempting to do for them.

I support the Bill.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [2.52 p.m.]: I shall put a few points concerning my own electorate. Debate on the Supply Bill provides an opportunity for members to speak on any matter that they wish; that was proved by the Hon. Fred McKenzie who gave us a few bars of his personal views on various matters. I appreciate his views, and I have noted them.

I bring to the attention of this Parliament the fact that certain parts of my province have not received attention from any Government as far as development is concerned. I bring to the notice of the Parliament the lack of any wharf or jetty facilities in Exmouth. The Exmouth Gulf area, as honourable members will be aware, is the prince of the prawn fishing industry in Western Australia. M. G. Kailis Gulf Fisheries Pty. Ltd. and Nor-West Whaling Co. Pty. Ltd. operate boats successfully out of Exmouth. They are enjoying one of the best years ever there.

I find it a source of extreme amazement that no Government has seen fit to make provision for wharf areas. It would be a surprise to members to learn that M. G. Kailis transports the prawns caught the night before to the processing factory in a 12-foot aluminium dinghy. It is almost scandalous. In fact, when one considers the developments that have taken place at places like Jurien Bay, Dongara, Carnarvon, and other coastal towns in our north—Port Hedland, Dampier, and the area called Sams Creek out of Wickham—it seems that Exmouth has been left out totally.

I am happy to say that the present Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife was persuaded recently to inspect the lack of facilities in Exmouth, together with a committee that makes decisions on wharves and fishing jetties. It seems there is a possibility that by about 1987 Exmouth will be considered. I make it clear to the House that I do not reflect any criticism on the present Minister or any of his predecessors; I am just saying that the pure practicality of the matter is that something should be done long before that.

Last year, unfortunately, a seaman on one of the prawning boats at Exmouth lost his life between the fishing boat and the little 12-foot dinghy because of rough weather. It is imperative

that immediate steps be taken to offset this ridiculous situation.

It is my view that the Commonwealth Government has a role to play in this. Funds must be found immediately to make a substantial start on a facility in an area that supports tourism and fishing. It is ridiculous that tourists are encouraged by our Premier to take advantage of the facilities further north when this sort of thing can happen. It is quite right that they should be encouraged to travel to the north; but if I were a tourist who trailed a boat to Exmouth and found when I put it in the water that there was no way I could bring it beside a jetty to unload my belongings, let alone the enormous load of fish one would normally catch in the area, it is quite ridiculous. It is an urgent matter that needs to be considered.

I know that the Government departments and the Minister concerned are taking it into consideration, but bigger and faster steps should be taken. Fishing companies like the Kailis group, Nor-West Whaling, and others, must be encouraged to employ more people and to expand their businesses. They can do that only if facilities are available.

It is rare for me to offer a bouquet, but while I am on the subject of fisheries I offer one to the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife for its decision to close the scallop fishery at Shark Bay for six months. This was a very difficult decision to put over to the fishing industry; but the decision was taken on the advice of the present Director of Fisheries and Wildlife (Mr Bernard Bowen). In consultation with the department, the decision was made to close the fishery for approximately six months and to re-open it on 1 March this year. Closing it for that time has had a marked impact on the fishery. Not only is there an improved supply of scallops, but also they are well grown and of export quality. The improvement is such that the Shark Bay fishery can become profitable because, as everyone in this Chamber knows, export dollars are very good dollars. I hope that the decision for closure is accepted by the various parts of the fishing industry, and in particular by the snapper industry which is concentrated on the Shark Bay and Exmouth-Onslow area in my electorate.

I have said in this House before that it is my belief that the fishery cannot be fished using the present method of open slather. I am happy to say that, once again, decisions have been taken to prohibit rock lobster fishermen from entering the snapper fishery prior to 1 July 1984. This is a temporary step. I wrote to the Minister (Mr Evans) and said I believed it was a very good first

step. His decision to close it came as a result of the first information received from a review of the fishery which was started by the Hon. Gordon Masters. This is probably the first occasion on which I have patted Mr Masters on the back for his efforts in the fishing industry.

Politics aside, it is very important that we maintain a viable industry. That can be done only if fairly abrupt decisions are taken. It is difficult to stop fishing people from going into an area, and closures of fishing areas are never popular. I understand the decision taken by the present Minister has been very unpopular with the rock lobster people in Geraldton.

I imagine the Hon. Margaret McAleer is getting some flak from her own constituents. Snapper fishermen are not allowed to enter the rock lobster area to fish for rock lobsters because the rock lobster industry is a closed industry. It is a very successful and profitable industry. As most members will know, this year the rock lobster catch State-wide is down; but the dollar return is up, because the price of rock lobster is related to the amount caught.

The people in the industry need to take stock of themselves and understand that the snapper industry cannot absorb the amount of fishing they would perhaps like to see. The time is almost apparent when rock lobster fishermen should be banned from going into the Shark Bay fishery. This area should be reserved for professional snapper fishermen, people who make their living out of the industry 12 months of the year. For those who do not understand the snapper industry, I make the point that the best months are from April to October. The weather in the other months prevents the fishermen from going out.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You are not talking about guaranteeing an income for fishermen, but about managing the fishery.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Precisely. Obviously the member's experience as the Minister responsible for this area has stood him in good stead. The management of the fishery is very important. Members have heard me speak in this House and criticise the use of snapper traps. Late last year, because of information gained from a snapper survey, it became quite apparent to me that one of my arguments about the damage done to the fish was wrong. I argued that fish caught in snapper traps were damaged when the traps were being brought up to the boat and therefore the fish were an inferior product when reaching the shops.

I was quite wrong. The people who undertook the survey showed me a film which they took in the first 18 months of the survey and it slaugh-

tered my argument. I take cognisance of that. If the fish are not damaged in the traps, obviously I need another argument. Snapper traps are acceptable to the industry and they are an efficient way to catch the fish. For that very reason they should be restricted in number. Obviously fisheries as small as those at Shark Bay and Carnarvon need only a few traps. The number can be decided only by the technical people, and I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Bernard Bowen and his staff. Without these people, the necessary advice cannot be found. The onus will rest on the Government of the day, and sometimes it is absolutely necessary that a Government of the day bite the bullet. If it is necessary to close a fishery or to impose severe restrictions on it, so be it.

I use as a blueprint the rock lobster industry, and I was reminded by the Hon. Graham MacKinnon last year when I was making a speech in this House, that the rock lobster industry in Western Australia is the most successful of any such industry in the world. I hope that when I make a speech here in 10 years' time I will be able to say that our snapper industry is the most successful of its kind in the world. If the people in the snapper industry continue to fish it as they presently are, it cannot continue to exist.

I know members of the House take the opportunity when on holidays to visit the various tourist spots in the north of the State, and one little gem is Shark Bay. Tourism in the area has been restricted in recent years because of the lack of a completed sealed road into the township. The previous State Government gave an undertaking to complete the road into Denham by the end of 1985. I am pleased to say that with some encouragement the present Government has agreed to do the same thing.

One problem that has reared its ugly head involves a top team of roadmakers who are working on the road at present, and who, through their own efficiency and roadmaking ability, have got in front of themselves. I was horrified the other day to find that the Main Roads Department was considering removing the team and placing them elsewhere because they had expended the funds set aside for the 1983-84 financial year. It would cost perhaps \$30 000 or \$50 000 just to shift the camp. I have taken steps to contact the Minister for Transport to ask him to consider bringing forward funds allocated for the 1984-85 financial year, bearing in mind that the Government has agreed to complete the road by the end of this year, and the fact that to shift this team would cost as much as \$50 000. This would have a two-fold effect: It would solve the present problem of what to do with the team of roadmakers and it

would win friends in Denham for the Government, because the people of Denham are waiting for the road to be completed. I sincerely hope the Minister for Transport will accept my proposition. I would hate to see an area like Shark Bay being disadvantaged when a very simple solution exists to the problem.

A Government member (the Hon. Graham Edwards) heads a Government committee inquiring into boxing in Western Australia. I might add that I am sure this subject is somewhat dear to your heart, Mr President, being an ex-State amateur boxer. The Hon. Graham Edwards just had to be misquoted on the front page of *The West Australian* last week when it was reported that, after his committee's first meeting, its members had decided that no more boxing should be conducted in hotels in Western Australia. The member will probably take the opportunity in the adjournment debate tonight to put this matter straight. I would be very disappointed if the article represented his views on the matter. The inquiry has enormous merit and I do not want to take away from its task, but I am concerned that his reported comments are just another assault on the hotel industry.

I have said before in this House that we should be starting to help the hotel industry to earn a few dollars to make up for the ones it has lost because of pressure placed on the industry by the lack of people patronising hotels. No-one wants to drink and drive any more. The campaign against drinking and driving must be the most successful campaign of this sort that I have experienced in my life. I know of no other similar campaign which has had an effect on so many people, people who five or 10 years earlier would have had no hesitation to drink and drive. These days they are making their corner bottle shop owner very rich.

Quite frankly the hotel industry cannot stand up to this pressure. If it is possible for boxing to bring more patrons to the hotels, let us give this question the closest possible scrutiny. If the Hon. Graham Edwards tells us after the committee has concluded its findings that it has considered the problem very closely and subsequently cannot condone boxing in hotels, I will go along with its recommendation because I respect the ability of the honourable member.

I respect his ability, but I was very disappointed to note that after one meeting it was said it had already been decided that there would be no more boxing in hotels. I know it brought an outcry from the hotel industry, and from the promoter concerned of it. Surely that will be cleared up, and I am sure the honourable member will have the op-

portunity later, perhaps in the adjournment debate, to discuss the matter.

I would like to have a little sideswipe at the electoral reform that has been mooted. I understand it has not been introduced into either House, which gives me *carte blanche* to say what I like this afternoon. This is my first opportunity and it will certainly not be my last.

I cannot be anything but amazed if what the Press has put forward to us is correct. Australian Labor Party country politicians would be lining up at the door of the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform—and I am talking of Mr Ian Taylor, Mr Julian Grill, Mrs Buchanan, Mr Carr, Mr David Evans and Mr Ken McIver. They would be absolutely mortified at the possibility of their seats, their representation in the bush, being slaughtered. Already, amazingly enough, I believe that there are some country Australian Labor Party members of Parliament saying "Thank God for the Legislative Council, don't you blokes accept what our mob is going to put up to you". They are hoping we will not accept it. You would not believe that, Mr President, they are hoping we will not accept it.

The metropolitan members need a lemon to take the smile off their faces; they are not worried about it. There is no concern for people in the bush, none whatsoever. Once again we get comments from the people—

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: One who just spoke had an epic trip to Gingin and that was his first trip north! As chairman of a committee I have finally got him to go further north. He has been to all the leading shops in Perth, such as the Army disposal places, buying hats with corks on them so that I can take him and present him to the people in the north.

With some training I will get him to see my point of view. He will see that very remote place.

Hon. Garry Kelly: You say the present system is perfect and that there is no room for change?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am saying nothing like that at all. I have not seen the legislation. Perhaps the member has had a preview because he is in Caucus.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I can tell members that from what I have heard it will not suit the people in the bush. If the legislation is presented to this House as is mooted, it will be treated in a similar fashion to previous legislation.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: In this House of Review, before you have seen it?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I must get from the member the date of her wedding anniversary so I can send her husband a sympathy card, if that is the sort of comment she has about the people in the bush.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member not to continue on that tack at all.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Thank you, Mr President, I shall not. I am winding up my comments because I want to make it quite clear it is no good trying to hoodwink people in the bush about matters like that. Suddenly instead of proposing 22 members, members opposite propose to have 32 members. They are going to split it up four ways.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I thought that that was what Mr MacKinnon was suggesting the other night. He surprised me, because I thought he was speaking with the full backing of his party.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am sure Mr Dans, for whom I have an enormous amount of respect, would not have missed the comment made by Mr MacKinnon that night when he said it was his personal opinion. One of the things we in the Liberal Party are allowed to have is personal opinions. We are allowed to express our personal opinions in this place, but the honourable member has to express his quietly. That is not to say that he has expressed his opinion privately or publicly on that matter. While the people in remote areas are not getting a say in the matter they will be disadvantaged.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Aren't you being representative?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Yes, and that is precisely what I am doing, Mrs Hallahan. I did a little bit of adding up on the member the other night and I found that 57 minutes is all she has given to this House since she has been a member.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Mr Edwards should not talk, because his time was 37 minutes.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I will disregard comments from people of such insignificance as that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! Order! When I call for order honourable members ought to know now that that means that members ought to come to order and to cease whatever they are saying.

It was my intention when I called "Order" to protect members, but those people whom I

intended to protect continued to interject so that I was not able to achieve any order. I say again to the honourable member who is speaking that he is as entitled as anybody else in this Chamber to express his point of view. However, I do not believe that he is entitled any more than anybody else to cast aspersions on any other member, on any matter at all, including the time they take to make their speeches.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I will take that into consideration. I am sorry if I touched a tender spot.

The interesting thing about the proposal mooted in the paper was that the north of the State will have two members; one Liberal and one Labor. It will be interesting to see who they will pick—Mr Stephens, Mr Dowding, Mr Moore or me.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You would not expect to survive with electoral reform would you?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Of course Mr Stephens' reputation in the north has gone before him.

Hon. Tom Stephens: So has yours.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Mr President I shall disregard—

Hon. Tom Stephens: They will be glad to get rid of you.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: There will be no electoral reform Mr President, because certainly I will be encouraging members on this side to reject it—

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Before you have seen it?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: —if as I have constantly said—even the member should be able to hear it—it is unacceptable to people in remote areas. I am surprised at people like Mr Stephens' who has obviously sold out his constituents while he has yet to speak in this House on their behalf. It is true, because one of the beautiful things about being a member of Parliament is that things are recorded in hansard and the electors are able to finally find out precisely what their members do.

Several members interjected.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You are perjuring yourself as you did in court, that is what it is. You are just a flaming perjurer!

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is out of order and I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I withdraw, in deference to the Chair.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Is it correct that it should be withdrawn with deference to the Chair?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I make the decisions. I want to say to the honourable member, with due respect, that I have been very tolerant in regard to invoking Standing Order No. 84 in respect of his subject matter, because when the honourable member commenced his speech I took the view that I did not necessarily know of any impending measure that may come before the Legislative Assembly.

I allowed the member some extreme latitude. However, the more he speaks the more he convinces me that there is some impending legislation, in which case he is out of order if he pursues the matter any further.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: With due respect to the Chair, as I always have, I understood the Standing Order which I have studied closely in my new position was—

Hon. Tom Stephens interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no room for a debate on the interpretation of the Standing Order at this stage. I have not made a ruling. I am simply suggesting to the honourable member that he had a pretty fair go.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I will get off that subject.

It is quite obvious that the Government is about to make a decision on a casino. I do not want to place myself in a position of being committed to one argument or another. I hope that if the Government makes a decision to place a casino on Burswood Island it will not renege on an undertaking it gave electors in the country that there will be two casinos in Western Australia. I will not pre-empt that decision by saying that the second should be at Exmouth, but I want that area taken into consideration. If it is not at Exmouth, it should be somewhere like Kalgoorlie, for lots of reasons. Kalgoorlie has some traditional experience with gambling, sometimes legal and sometimes not.

It is almost 12 months since the Government decided to legalise the two-up game at Kalgoorlie. I applauded that decision at the time but it is still my view that it is discriminatory. I was appalled to find in the *News of the North* last week that a fellow in Port Hedland had been charged with running an illegal two-up game. Frankly, it reeks of absolute hypocrisy when one can go to a town in the goldfields 360 miles east of Perth and play two-up legally, but at Port Hedland where the



population is larger and it is a mining-type population, one cannot play the game.

I again challenge the Government to go to any country race meeting and if one has any nous it is not hard to find a two-up game afterwards. I challenge those responsible for the liquor and gaming laws to knock off one of the clubs. I am speaking of arresting people for playing two-up illegally. The wrath of pure hell will be brought down around the Government. It is time the Government got off its collective backside and made a decision on this matter.

Obviously two-up games take place after race club meetings. Those members who go to country race meetings are well aware of that, certainly some of the older members are. If the problem is one of legality I will give the Government a way of allowing such games to take place. At present if one wants to have liquor at functions such as are held at race clubs, one has to go to the police and get a permit. I do not know how much the current fee is.

Hon. Garry Kelly: It is about \$7.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I think you can get one for \$5.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: A fee must be paid for the permit. What would be wrong with a race club going to the police, because they are the obvious people to control it, and saying, "We want a permit to run two-up after the Leonora races", to use an example. The permit might apply between the hours of 6.00 p.m. and midnight and the permit might cost \$100. The State would be richer by \$100 and the Leonora two-up game will expand by 700 per cent because people like me will be able to go and have a game instead of considering the headlines about a local MP being charged for playing two-up. I would be keen to have a game; it is lonely sitting in the hotel when everyone else has gone to the two-up.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I had that experience at Dampier when everyone else went to the game.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: They would not want the Minister at the game after he had thrown six heads in a row!

Joking aside, it is a ludicrous situation. If we do not address this properly the problem will get worse. Perhaps Mr Dans can pass it on to his Cabinet colleagues and tell them that people in the country are sick and tired of Kalgoorlie being able to run a two-up game. It is not right, and it should be put right. I implore Mr Dans, who understands these practical matters, to tell the Premier about the idea of a permit.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I know about two-up.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: It could be done on a 12-month trial basis. We had daylight saving on a trial basis and it was thrown out the door at a referendum. Let us have a 12-month trial of country people being able to play two-up legally.

Whatever the Government does it will never stop people playing two-up. They will gamble on two ants climbing up a tree, and they will find some way around the law. It is embarrassing for the police to arrest such people and it is embarrassing for the race clubs. I can tell members that it is embarrassing to be caught. The funniest aspect on the last occasion people were caught in Carnarvon after the race meeting was that a sergeant of police told me, "We arrested 47 blokes last night and nine of them were Bill Smith". People are not silly; they pay their \$20 and get it estreated. We can laugh now, but it is no laughing matter when one is caught.

Hon. Garry Kelly: It is a common name.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: It is an important matter for people of the north. Some country race clubs cannot exist without two-up. They get a sling from the two-up—every country race club does that—or some sort of rub off which keeps them afloat. I would be mortified if anyone were arrested and I would fight tooth and nail for him. It is better to make it legal and for the State to get some dollars. There must be a way of doing it; there are ways around everything else.

I put that proposal forward because, as the lady reminded me, this is a House of Review and perhaps that is one rule we should review. I support the Bill.

HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [3.26 p.m.]: I support the Supply Bill as I have done every year I have been in this House. It deals with the provision of funds for running the State of Western Australia, and traditionally gives members of Parliament an opportunity to raise a variety of issues if they wish to do so.

The first matter I want to mention is the result of the referendum on daylight saving last Saturday. It was no surprise to me that daylight saving was resoundingly defeated and that the "No" vote prevailed. I was surprised by the increased margin in favour of those who opposed daylight saving. In my area of the south-west I was indeed surprised at the increased "No" vote compared with the support for daylight saving. When I looked at last Saturday's figures and compared them with those in the referendum eight or nine years ago it was clear that people in the south-west corner of the State had hardened their view that daylight saving is not for them. The Hon. Phil Lockyer has referred to people who

live in country areas. Those people resoundingly rejected daylight saving, and they had every right to do so.

It has been stated in the Press that the country vote was responsible for defeating the move for daylight saving. That may be so; the final figures have not been published and may not yet be available. My guess is that when the final votes are counted the metropolitan vote will be close to 50 per cent each way. I get rather upset when it is inferred that country people are to blame for denying metropolitan people something they want. I do not see from that vote that the metropolitan area has a clear view one way or another; the population is divided down the middle. It is quite within the compass of country residents to vote according to their wishes. They should not be regarded as second-class citizens for doing so. That was the inference in the Press and I deplore it. The cost of the referendum was about \$1 million; this Supply Bill provides funds for the running of the State.

I am on record in this House and in other places outside the House as having said daylight saving is not for Western Australia, and I have voted against it every time it has come up in the House and in referendums. I have done that every time on my own convictions, and I have strong convictions that the people do not want it. We were inflicted with several months of daylight saving during the hottest part of the year. In my judgment the people of Western Australia are not against daylight saving as such, they are against having the extreme heat inflicted on them. The crux of the matter is the extreme heat that we have due to our geographical situation. That is what causes people to reject the extra hour of daylight. That \$1 million could well have been used in many other ways.

One area to which I have referred before, and to which I will refer again, is the need to reinstate student driver education. Student driver education is a most worthy objective. By this means a number of students of the appropriate age attending secondary schools could have the benefit of learning to drive a motor vehicle under competent supervisors, and thereby they would become more responsible citizens with a more responsible attitude to life generally, because it would reflect not only in their behaviour on the road, but also in their characters right throughout their lives.

It has been said that this would be impossible to implement. I say it is necessary to implement student driver education in Western Australia. I have spoken on this matter before and I will con-

tinue to implore the Government to give some of its funds to this very worthy project.

We have a number of job creation schemes for a whole range of reasons—some of them very dubious; just to create a job for somebody. In some instances they are not terribly worthwhile jobs. Student driver education would benefit the whole community and lessen the cost to the community in the long term. One cannot prove this, but it is likely to result in fewer motor vehicle accidents, less damage to vehicles and to people, and indeed one would hope fewer deaths resulting from those accidents.

Another matter which is very much in the Government's court is the provision of an adequate State Emergency Service regional headquarters in the Bunbury area. Here again this has been the subject of my address to this House on another occasion, and I continue to raise it. The south-west region desperately needs appropriate headquarters to service its area, which includes the upper great southern. This is in addition to the voluntary emergency services. I refer to the regional co-ordinator and his headquarters. In Bunbury only one man has this exalted position, but he has precious little to work with.

I think the days of bricks and mortar have gone. One does not need to put up a magnificent edifice to provide a headquarters; there are other ways and means of doing this. I suggest it is possible to have a portable building made available. Land is available in Bunbury where the Bunbury voluntary emergency group operates. The regional co-ordinator's headquarters could be placed on that land without interfering with the existing operations, and the Bunbury voluntary operation and the regional co-ordinator's operations would complement each other.

I implore the Government not to delay that sort of provision. In addition, of course, I make the plea for appropriate equipment and for at least one additional staff member to help the co-ordinator. This co-ordinator not only has responsibility for the south-west, but also under the present regional structure he operates in the great southern area.

Quite obviously this gentleman is attending to his lawful and appropriate obligations in serving the people of that region. While he is based in Bunbury he has no-one directly responsible to him to assist him in the work that he does. He has assistance, of course, from Government officers in Bunbury, but that is an adjunct to his service rather than somebody directly responsible to him which would create a more efficient operation.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without making reference to the Government's decision to establish another SEC power station at Muja, at the Collie coalfields. I do not begrudge the Collie coalfields having such a power station established in the region at all, but it was freely mentioned that this new power station would be on the coast at Bunbury, and the new Government has decided it will be placed at Muja. That presents a number of difficulties. I am not convinced that Muja is the optimum site. I realise the new power station requires a vast quantity of appropriate water for its operation. In addition a lot of effluent, particularly saline water, must be disposed of. Surely that cannot be disposed of in the Collie region; water is too precious there. Already the Wellington Dam is well known for its high salinity, and we cannot pollute the catchment area in any way. I am not suggesting that this will happen, but these are the problems of an area which is a growing one. It may be suggested a pipeline should be constructed to discharge the effluent from the power station to the coast.

I would be interested in looking at the environmental review and management programme for this undertaking. We have yet to see that. I do not believe it is available at the present time. When it is available, I am sure everyone will be particularly interested in it.

I come back to the point that the people of Bunbury are extremely disappointed at being denied their expectation of having a further industry associated with their city. It means that the Bunbury area will be denied further employment opportunities. Indeed, the existing power station at Bunbury, which has been operating for some years, is due for scaling down in the next 10 years or so. It will reduce from three shifts to two. There will be a lessening of work opportunities in the area. This is extremely disappointing because under the Government's provision for the "Bunbury 2000" strategy, one of the greatest things was to promote Bunbury itself.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would remind honourable members that the reading of newspapers is considered out of order in this House.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Government has embodied the south-west region in the "Bunbury 2000" concept, but that concept was aimed at Bunbury itself and that is why it was called "Bunbury 2000". Had that not been the case, it would have been called something different, such as "South-West Development". The Government has let down the people of Bunbury on this issue. It is not too late for the Government to change its mind. It is possible for the Government once again to change the site from Muja to Bunbury.

The point is that the Government has bungled the whole issue.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you want a stack that is 20 stories high on the Bunbury Harbour?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The previous Minister for Minerals and Energy, who was demoted, should really be rather silent on this issue.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Is that what you want?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Minister is trying to distract me; the proposition was that the new power station was to be sited on the coast at Bunbury, and that proposition was to be examined.

Hon. Peter Dowding: The stack will be 20 storeys high.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: That was the understanding many of the people had.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You were in favour of its being sited there, were you?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I was certainly in favour of the Bunbury site, provided all the environmental safeguards were in place. That applies to any site; it applies to Muja, Bunbury, or anywhere else.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you know how big it is?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: We have yet to see the ERMP for the Muja proposition. I do not think the Minister was in the Chamber at the time—I do not blame him for that, because he cannot be here all the time—but I referred to this matter previously and I do not intend to go back over that speech. The people in Bunbury feel let down about this and they will be looking closely at the Government's performance in the Bunbury region.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you know how big it is?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Another matter which affects the south-west is the Government's thrust in respect of the development of the tourist trade, and I shall refer to some Press statements in this regard. The first is an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of 12 November 1983, under the headline "Millions for more hotels in WA". It says—

A \$60 million holiday resort is planned for Rockingham and an \$18m. hotel for Terrace Road, Perth.

It goes on to say—

The Garden Hotel group of Singapore is renewing efforts to attract local investment in its 200-room hotel project in Terrace Road, Perth.

It continues—

Three new hotels worth about \$236m., are in various stages of construction in Perth city.

They will add about 880 rooms to Perth accommodation.

At least four other big hotel projects are planned in the metropolitan area.

Members should reflect on that for a moment. At least four other big hotel projects are planned for the metropolitan area. I do not knock that; it is marvellous, provided those hotels can be filled.

In *The West Australian* of 6 December 1983, under the headline "Plan for 5 luxury hotels in S-W"—the "S-W" stands for the south-west—an article appears which reads, in part, as follows—

**BUNBURY:** The State Government is considering plans for five luxury hotels in the South-West as part of a major tourist drive.

It proposes a key role for the WA Development Corporation in marshalling capital for the scheme through a regional office in Bunbury.

The Premier, Mr Burke, and the Minister for Regional Development, Mr Grill, revealed the plans at a news conference in Bunbury yesterday.

Mr Grill said five-star hotels were proposed at Bunbury, Dunsborough, Busselton, Manjimup and another in timber country south of Manjimup.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.*

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Prior to the suspension I was referring to the Government's announcement, with a great flourish, of the plan to build five luxury hotels in the south-west of Western Australia. I refer to the Press statement which appeared in *The West Australian* on 6 December 1983, and to a similar article which appeared in *The Australian* newspaper on the same date which was headed "Western Australia set for a world-class hotel chain". It was no accident that when the article was published in *The West Australian* a similar story appeared in the national Press. That article read—

THE West Australian Government is set to become a cash investor in a series of multi-million dollar projects to build five international-standard hotels.

The article continued in the same vein as the article which appeared in *The West Australian*. It was no accident that the Government had been projecting that five-star, high-class hotels be established throughout the south-west. I would wel-

come that sort of development if it were possible, but I will demonstrate to members that it may not be possible.

An article in the *Daily News* on 5 December 1983 was headlined "Tourist boom ahead for S-W", and I quote as follows—

A bold new plan to boost tourism in the South-West was announced by the Premier today.

And up to 800 public servants will be sent to country areas as part of the State Government's decentralisation programme.

One of the first Government departments which will be affected is the Department of Tourism.

A big tourist-development plan for the South-West is one of the State Government's reasons for transferring part of the department and staff.

The Minister for Regional Development, Mr Grill, said projects worth many millions of dollars would bring hundreds of thousands of tourists to the South-West.

I repeat that—hundreds of thousands of tourists to the south-west! The article continues—

The plans included:

The construction of five, five-star hotels. Work on one of the hotels for Bunbury would start immediately, worth \$8 million.

A marina-fishing harbour at Dunsborough.

The establishment of a "boating seaway" between Perth and Dunsborough, with facilities for boat owners to stop along the coastline. Coastal surveys are now being done.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Excuse me, Mr Ferry—is the boating seaway like a tramline?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I have not seen it. The article continues—

Mr Burke said the Government wanted to boost the percentage of public servants in Bunbury from three to eight per cent in the next five years.

He said the public servants would not be forced to leave Perth.

Here again the Premier is projecting this boost in tourism for five-star luxury hotels and transferring a number of public servants to Bunbury. It is interesting to note that this article refers to some of the ideas which will attract hundreds of thousands of people to the south-west. I refer again to the five hotels, which is a great idea—one could stay at them at great cost! Another point is the marina fishing harbour at Dunsborough. That concept has been mooted for a long time and there is nothing new about it.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Mr Ferry, you would heap scorn on creation.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Minister is with us again and I extend a warm welcome to him.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You do not approve of any developments.

Several members interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The marina fishing harbour at Dunsborough will be more than welcome. I have advocated it for a long time and it is not a new concept. However, will it bring hundreds of thousands of people to the area? I am sure it will bring many, but people will not come from overseas just to see the marina.

I refer to the establishment of the boating sea-way between Perth and Dunsborough, and the facilities for boat-owners to stop along the coastline. If people were to stop along the coastline, they would not use the five-star hotels. Those types of people would not use five-star hotels very often; they are more likely to camp.

In regard to the move of public servants from the metropolitan area to Bunbury, I applaud the idea that more Government services should be provided in Bunbury to service the south-west—I will come back to that point in a moment.

I asked questions in this House on Tuesday 3 April concerning the proposed hotels. I asked what commitments the Government has made to build facilities in the south-west. The following answer was given—

Developers of an office complex for Government have undertaken to build an Atrium style high class hotel for their own resources as a condition of their agreement.

I also asked, what were the expected commencement and completion dates for each project. The answer was as follows—

Bunbury project has now commenced. Completion is due in October 1985.

In fact, the site works have commenced and they are there for all to see.

Let us refer to the other places which the Premier and the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000", Mr Grill, in association with the South West Development Authority, which is based at Bunbury, have been advocating. I asked about their commitment to build facilities for five-star hotels in Bunbury, Busselton, Dunsborough, and other localities in the south-west. The answer was, "None". The official response from the Government was "None", yet the Premier and the Minister, Mr Grill, and the South West Development Authority have been advocating this and brainwashing the people into

thinking they will bring hundreds of thousands of visitors to the south-west to set them up in that environment and thus get the spin-off.

All members in this House know that is not a practical proposition for a very long time. I would welcome this volume of visitors to Western Australia and I would welcome the trade to Perth and the south-west. However, it is so much humbug by which the Premier, as Minister for Tourism, and his Ministers are trying to project their grandiose ideas—on their own admission—with a mythical base. There are no projects on the drawing board for any place other than Bunbury and it ill-behoves them that they should project this development.

Several members interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Let me refer to the question of decentralising Government departments. A question was asked in this House by my colleague, the Hon. W. M. Stretch, of Tuesday 3 April 1984, as follows—

- (1) Is it yet decided which Government departments will be decentralised from Perth to the new Bunbury Government Office complex?

The answer provided by the Minister was, "No". The matter had not been decided. Mr Stretch also asked the following question—

- (3) How many employees is it envisaged will be involved in such a change?

The answer was "Approximately 400 in stage 1". Once again there was no time constraint on stage 1 and no departments were mentioned. The Government does not know which departments will be involved or when it will be done. It has plucked a figure out of the air. The Government was probably doing its Lotto coupon and decided upon a lucky number which was 400. It sounds marvellous, but performance is the name of the game and this Government is not performing except as in a vaudeville act. It ill-behoves the Government to adopt that attitude.

I now touch on a subject raised previously, without collusion, by the Hon. Phil Lockyer; the question of establishing a casino or gambling place in Western Australia. The Government has bungled the whole issue. It invited applications for casinos and after the applications were received it said, "That is fine but now we have decided to put the development in the Burswood Island area and you can start again". The Government has decided to develop on what I think is Government-held land. It has decided to take a share of the action.

Several members interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It would seem the Government would have been better advised to state so at the outset if it was its intention to use Burswood Island as the place on which to build a casino. It could have invited applications on a world-wide basis for establishment on that site.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Government has reneged on those people who have an interest in constructing a casino, those who want to have a slice of the action, who prepared submissions in good faith for development of the project in different parts of Western Australia. It has reneged in other circumstances; I refer also to the south-west and tourist development. The talk of a five-star hotel tourist development takes us to a fantasy age. This Government is blustering its way through its term of office hoping to reach the popularity polls. However, more and more the people are realising that the Government is insincere and it cannot produce the goods. It is high time that was understood.

I refer also to the comments raised by the Hon. Phil Lockyer with regard to authorisation of the two-up games at Kalgoorlie.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. V. J. FERRY: If it is good enough to legalise two-up playing in one spot it is good enough to do it in other parts of Western Australia in a controlled manner. I concur with the comments made by the Hon. Phil Lockyer; the Government is inconsistent in its handling of this issue.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is fascinating to realise there are so many echoes in a place which has acoustics as good as this one.

The Government will be held responsible for its bungling, because the people of Western Australia do not deserve such treatment. The establishment of the casino is supposed to attract hundreds of thousands of tourists to this country. Maybe it will and maybe it will not; only the fullness of time will show whether that becomes reality. The point is that this Government needs to be squeaky clean in the establishment of any form of casino or licensed club. At the present time it is raising many doubts in the minds of people and those doubts are not of a positive

nature. The Government is falling into disfavour and disrepute.

Several members interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Government members are blinded by their own rhetoric, they believe they can do no wrong. However, the public will see through their smoke-screen and vote accordingly in the fullness of time.

Several members interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I now refer to reported comments in *The West Australian* on 11 April 1984 in an article headed, "Council is again target for Government". I refer to remarks attributed to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform, Mr Tonkin. I do not think that title "Parliamentary and Electoral Reform" is adequate—I think "Minister for parliamentary matters" might be more appropriate. It is not necessary to have reform when handling this portfolio. Mr Tonkin is quoted as follows—

No politician will be able to get his grubby little fingers on a map and draw a line just to save his own seat.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I remind honourable members that the person who has the call has the right to speak. One section of the Chamber is getting rather unruly, and I ask members to co-operate.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I think it ill-behoves the Minister, Mr Tonkin, to speak in such disparaging terms. It casts aspersions on all members of Parliament.

Hon. Peter Dowding: They were grubby weren't they?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I hope that interjection is recorded in *Hansard* because it reflects the type of thinking of this Government. Perhaps because of its own actions it thinks everyone else is of that ilk.

This morning while driving my car I had the misfortune to hear a talkback programme on one of the commercial radio programmes. Mr Tonkin was commenting on his proposals. I cannot recall his words verbatim, and as I was driving at the time I had no opportunity to write them down. However, he implied that 17 members of the Legislative Council drew the lines for their own electorates.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Who said that?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Mr Tonkin, on a talkback programme this morning. I believe if that is not contempt of this House, it is very close to con-

tempt. I think Mr Tonkin is again showing his gross deficiency by resorting to this tactic. It is an attack on the Electoral Commissioners—

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I now remind honourable members that I will go to the next step if there are any further interjections. I request the Hon. Garry Kelly in particular to control his interjections for the time being.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is an attack on the Electoral Commissioners—the Chief Justice, the chief Electoral Officer, and the Surveyor General—who were charged under an Act of Parliament to draw the boundary lines of provinces. Mr Tonkin was referring to the members of this House who represent provinces. For him to suggest we had any say in the drawing of those lines is extremely insulting and degrading towards those commissioners and he should apologise. The comments I have attributed to Mr Tonkin can be checked if one goes to the commercial radio station and requests a transcript. Members are subjected to these comments under the guise of parliamentary reform and the people of Western Australia need to understand what the Government is about.

I support the Bill.

HON. KAY HALLAHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [4.19 p.m.]: I support the Bill. I thought the members of the House would be interested in the question of emergency relief to people in disadvantaged circumstances and the growth of those needs to the point where emergency relief is now taking the guise of income supplements.

At Federal level we have a Government which enormously increased funding in the last Budget. In 1981-82, annual funding in this area was \$500 000; in 1982-83, funding was lifted to \$2 million; and in 1983-84, under the first Labor Government Budget, funding was lifted to \$5 million.

That response was made to inordinate needs in the community which had struggled for recognition under previous Governments. The traditional view of emergency relief is that it provides one-off assistance to overcome financial crises. What has tended to happen is that one-off assistance occurs with increasing frequency, and the demands of many people and families mean that it has become a need for material assistance as well as financial assistance. The old concept of a food parcel getting people through for two or three days is not meeting the need any longer.

Many workers in the non-Government sector are severely affected, if one puts it in terms of stress and jobs, because they are confronted with

people in very needy circumstances. They have too many needy people and too few resources. Their job is an unenviable one. I have worked in that area, and I know the stresses associated with it.

It can be said that we can apply broad generalisations to this problem and say that inadequate incomes, with benefits and pensions well below the poverty line, are among the causes of the problem; we can also say that the economic recession is a generalised cause of the problem. However, the welfare sector realises its responsibility to identify specifically the needs of people seeking emergency assistance, to identify the groups needing it and the circumstances in which they need it, and to ascertain whether emergency relief has become an income supplement. We can only act as policymakers when we have firm data to go on.

Today I had the pleasure of opening the Western Australian Council of Social Service seminar on emergency relief and data collection. I pay a tribute to the non-Government agencies which are members of WACOSS for the inordinate amount of work they do in this community. It is good that they are now receiving greater recognition for their delivery of services; but it is a dilemma that the people who are most under stress in the delivery of the services are the only ones who can gather the material needed to provide the database for any project. In fact, WACOSS set up the project to collect emergency relief data from the welfare sector. When the initial project was set up, the following indicates the points that WACOSS had in mind—

Information collected during this survey will be used to

- (a) provide estimates of the total emergency relief expenditure in Western Australia
- (b) provide comparisons with expenditures in other States
- (c) contribute to a national picture of emergency relief expenditure
- (d) indicate geographic areas of high need for or high use of emergency assistance
- (e) indicate key regions for requiring emergency relief.

That project was already under way when the "Welstat" system was introduced. That refers to the standardisation of welfare statistics which had to be accommodated within the project, and some workers had problems accommodating the needs that arose. No doubt members will be very pleased to know that a simplified form has been devised, and we are told that the data needed can be col-

lected in 30 seconds. The disadvantages of having to work with that system have been minimised slightly.

The seminar today was an attempt to iron out the bugs in the system and to find an acceptable tool for the measurement of the needs in our community. WACOSS is to be commended for setting up the new project. When "Welstat" became involved at the Federal level, WACOSS received more funding. At present, the ongoing funding of that project is being considered by the Minister. The indication is that the State Government will give favourable consideration to the need for that project to continue.

To give members the historical background of this matter, I refer to the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare entitled "Through a Glass, Darkly—Evaluation in Australian Health and Welfare Services". On page 59 of volume 1, the following appears—

A current running through evidence before the Committee was that very little was known of health and welfare needs in the community.

Further down the same page the following appears—

The Committee gained the impression that a large amount of data is collected but not collated or used by agencies owing to lack of time, staff and expertise.

That is recognition by a committee that set out to learn and that discovered matters of which it was previously unaware. Two of the recommendations from chapter 4, "Need", I have taken in an arbitrary fashion; but all of the recommendations in that chapter are worth noting. Recommendation 1 reads as follows—

That all levels of government make a commitment to identify and declare the state of need and of unmet need in Australian health and welfare, and to assess these factors continually.

Recommendation 4 reads—

That the non-government welfare sector be given specific grants for the collation and publication of data already collected by agencies with programs designed to answer need.

In chapter 7, the committee considered the question of data collection, and one should keep in mind that data collection in the health and welfare field is under developed in Australia. In fact, we trail behind other advanced countries. Apparently we have very good indices for economic indi-

cators, but our social indicators still need much development.

The first recommendation relating to data collection is as follows—

That the Australian Bureau of Statistics be directed to accord an immediate high priority to the development of a continuing set of social indicators in conjunction with State authorities and the non-government health and welfare sector.

Members who are interested in the field should refer to that report.

There is now liaison between the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the State Department for Community Welfare, and the non-Government welfare sector, and in fact all three levels were represented at the seminar today. During my address to the seminar, it was my intention to make quite clear that Government policies should be based on hard data, and that good information would result in the adoption of the policies wanted by those present. From the point of view of the Government, it may well prove that that information will be very difficult, if not impossible, to ignore. We might have to look quite significantly at programmes which in the past have not met the needs which exist in the community.

In Western Australia we have 68 non-Government welfare agencies distributing emergency relief from the Department of Social Security. This financial year an amount of \$440 000 was allocated to Western Australia and \$30 000 of that was to be made available specifically for Aboriginal people. All those 68 non-Government agencies are collecting data, which is being entered into the system. In addition, other agencies which are not in receipt of cash from the Federal department are monitoring on the same questionnaire what they provide in emergency relief. So the most comprehensive picture will be gained of the groups in the community who depend on agencies to get through particular crises.

I refer now to three agencies which are either within my electorate or are peripheral to it. I wish particularly to commend the agencies and their executive officers. At Communicare, which is based at Bentley and which services many families in my area, the executive director is Norm Williams. Those members who have represented that agency in the past and who continue to do so would know the very good service given by this non-Government agency. Southcare also provides a remarkable service, and its executive officer is Robert Watson. At the Goswells District Information Centre, Rona Okely heads a great team.



Those three persons, and others, head remarkable teams of dedicated and energetic people who work under very difficult and stressful conditions in continually having to find ways of meeting the real emergent needs of people in and peripheral to my electorate. Their initiative to move towards some regionalisation of their services is very commendable because the welfare sector really does have to look at the size of the problem it faces and must come to terms with the whole notion of local government bases and of State Government and Federal Government levels of operation.

The welfare industry must start to see itself in that way and to be seen by the rest of the community in that way. The job is so big that to do it in a fragmented, small, and isolated agency-by-agency way really must mean that clients do not get the best of services available and indeed the agencies themselves are not able to avail themselves of existing resources. The direction being taken by the welfare sector is very commendable.

The question of the standardised form is one in respect of which we can understand some difficulty might arise in its construction. The OECD in its attempt to construct a standardised form identified 52 items which could be measured for health and welfare indicators. Over a quarter of them have been identified as being in need of major adjustments and amendments in order to make them acceptable across the board. So in our community we are looking at something which is evolving right at this time, and evolving in a way which will mean more specific assistance to groups in need. It will mean a much more effective welfare sector for those of our constituents who have particular need.

I commend the Bill.

**HON. A. A. LEWIS** (Lower Central) [4.35 p.m.]: I commence my remarks by congratulating the Hon. Kay Hallahan for a very lucid address. Although my philosophy does not necessarily agree with hers in some of the areas on which she touched, she did talk on things about which we all ought to become far more aware. Hers was a most interesting address.

This is probably the last time I make a nice comment about anyone. Earlier this afternoon we heard the Hon. Fred McKenzie make some shocking statements about previous Governments and railways.

#### *Leave to Continue Speech*

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

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

## SUPPLY BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**HON. A. A. LEWIS** (Lower Central) [4.55 p.m.]: Earlier I was about to speak about the hit-and-run Burke Government and to refer to railways. Because Mr McKenzie saw fit to talk about the performance of the previous Government in relation to railways, I thought perhaps I should put the House right on where the previous Government stood with regard to railway personnel. One would think the Labor Party had some interest in workers, given the background of the Labor Party in representing working people. Of course it does not represent them now; it does not represent any working people. It represents cliques of people, on the right, centre left, centre unity, and the left, and any other description one might give them; but it never seems to worry about working people.

It is interesting to follow the Westrail debate back into history. When I first was elected to the other House a Minister in the then Tonkin Government was forcing on railway unions and workers the closure of a goods shed and the transfer of workers from one town to another with absolutely no consultation at all. As a matter of fact the Minister got very upset with me—he was an elderly man—for saying that he could not care less about the workers. What happened in 1974? The Tonkin Government was tossed out because it had come into power with everybody thinking that it would do something for the workers and the people.

This Government is going exactly the same way. It is interesting to note that in Bridgetown in those days there were some very good union representatives, a Mr McKenzie and Mr Les Young, who seemed to agree with my view that Governments ought to consider the members of unions and do something about consultation.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: Which Mr McKenzie is that?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He was then assistant union secretary, but he has gone up in the world. Today he sits here as the Government Whip and has the hide to get up in this debate and belay the previous Government over its attitude to employees. Let us look at what the previous Government did.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: The previous Government was the Court Government.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The previous Government was the O'Connor Government if the honourable gentleman wants to be accurate, and the one before that was the Court Government, and before that was the Tonkin Government; and I have been here right through.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Some of us go back further.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, they are old and grey and wear spectacles.

Hon. P. G. Pental: What was John Forrest like?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Ask Mr Gayfer.

This nice fellow, Mr McKenzie, who worked as a union secretary and a bloke called Les Young from the engine drivers' union were in Bridgetown. The Tonkin Government set up a Caesar to Caesar inquiry which Mr McKenzie and Mr Young said was rigged and they would not have a bar of it. When the Court Government came to power Sir Charles Court decided to hold an open inquiry. John Knox, Colin Pearce, and Martin Webb went out and ascertained what we should do in the future. They took evidence and listened to people, as one would have expected the Labor Party to do. Unfortunately only Liberals listen to the people. The Labor Party fights amongst itself and loses Government after three years as a regular occurrence. Labor Governments are hit-and-run jobs.

The report came out and it was hailed by everybody—unions, employees, and people working in Bridgetown. It set a guide for approaching industrial relations, and perhaps we should recommend it to the Leader of the House because a little more consultation on some matters he has attempted might be of some help.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Hon. Mr Piantadosi will shiver in his shoes when we deal with that, because the Labor Party does not have a clue about what is going on.

Let me get back to Bridgetown and this consensus. I will come back to industrial relations and members will be sick of hearing me on that subject. Again, we will prove that the Labor Party has no idea about workers and their feelings and thoughts. Its dogma has taken it away from the workers. The Labor Party is in an airy-fairy land of caucuses. It has forgotten those people who have blisters on their hands. Members sit podgy in the front seat, but never get out and swing a shovel. Members of the Labor Party have been

like that all the way through. I remember a former Deputy Premier, the late Herb Graham. I asked him to show me his hands; there was not a blister on them. Members opposite do as they are told. They have never laboured in their lives.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I know that it is wrong to answer interjections, even if they are quietly made. I should not refer to Bills before the House. There will be a whole State of policemen in action if the proposed industrial arbitration laws are brought in. There will be more nonsense.

Let me get back to Bridgetown and deal with the labour committee of the railway union. When the Webb report was made, everybody was happy. The Court and then the O'Connor Governments used that as a blueprint to deal with the management and the staff of Westrail. We now have the Burke Government. It is called a "Government," but it is a hit-and-run sort of job.

The Minister came to Wagin. We asked him how many people would be made redundant in Katanning and Narrogin, and what would happen to Wagin. Mark my words, we asked what would happen to Wagin, because there was a rumour that some people would be taken away from Katanning and some from Narrogin and that Wagin would have a little increase. What did the Minister say? He said, "I am sorry, Katanning, Wagin and Narrogin will all lose out".

Westrail has not consulted with the unions or the men. At a small meeting at Wagin, where the local representatives of the Katanning, Wagin, and Narrogin shires were present, with the Narrogin Town Council, the Minister and his departmental people gave us the figures of how many people would be moved or made redundant. I was not going to talk about the railways or about the disgraceful efforts of this Government in respect of the railways—efforts which should make any decent railway union man dive under the counter for shame. This Government could not care less about the towns of Wagin, Katanning, or Narrogin, or the Westrail employees in those towns. This has been shown by the Minister's visits and his off-hand way.

I walked in here today and was asked to join a working party which will meet for the first time on Monday. The member for Narrogin had heard a rumour; he asked a question in the other place yesterday to find that the Minister was even going into his electorate to discuss 100 jobs in Narrogin, and 20 or 30-odd in Katanning and Wagin. That does not matter in the Labor Party.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: The jobs are not there, and you know why. I told you earlier and you did

not want to listen. You want people to sit around doing nothing. It is your party which made those jobs redundant.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Now our policies are making people redundant?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Yes, and you know it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Now, Mr Deputy President (Hon. P. H. Lockyer), you understand what I am talking about. I am talking about management which is, something the Labor Party does not understand. Mr McKenzie raised that subject. We are not talking about the policies of past Governments, whether they had advisers, and whether they took 17 storeys in the CML building. The Budget manager of this Government must be shivering in his shoes because of what happened there. I will deal with that a little later. Just let us deal with the railways and the mismanagement by the Government. We have gone on long enough.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: We are talking about failures.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If it is a failure, why has this Government not made a decision and got rid of it? It is no good snapping at the heels like a barking Pekinese. One cannot run a State or a country without making decisions, as the member knows, and he will realise it more and more as he sits in that position.

I thought it was 19 February 1983, that the Burke Labor Government came into power. That is 15 months or so ago. But still, like its big brother in Canberra, it is complaining that everything is the fault of the previous Government. That sounds very good, as long as the people will believe it. This Government has not made one decision on any subject except the casino, and it has mucked up that.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Bunbury Foods!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It did not make that decision, the department made it. The Government will not make decisions. Inquiries are instigated, but the Government is not prepared to make a decision.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. P. H. Lockyer): I ask the member to please address the Chair.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It gives me great pleasure to address the Chair. The whole crux of the matter is Westrail, or the railways. This Government cannot make a management decision.

The Government Whip knows I am right. He knows that, if a Liberal Government had been in power, the matter would have been handled with

some compassion. People would have been spoken to and suggestions would have been made. We would not have had this heavy-handed, rumour situation where the worker does not have a clue what is happening.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Tell me who has lost his job and who has been transferred. You are making lots of noise.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. P. H. Lockyer): Order! The member will address the Chair and ignore the interjections.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will, Sir, but I may answer them as I go along. The Minister has made the statement that, by the end of the year, 101 people in Narrogin will either be redundant or out of a job. The interjector asked who had lost his job. Does he want me to name those who will lose their jobs? Does he want me to put their positions on a piece of paper?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Yes.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is exactly the sort of thing the Labor Party would want. The Labor Party does not give a damn unless it is on a piece of paper!

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You have no evidence.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Labor Party just throws out these people. It could not care less about their families. It could not care less about the wives and kids of these workers. It throws them out as a result of mismanagement; as long as the Labor Government has the names of those people on a piece of paper, that is all that matters. We have to have the names of Fireman Jones and Guard McKenzie on a piece of paper.

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have an interjection from the doyen of transport experts, the Hon. Garry Kelly, who thinks he knows just about as much as the Hon. Fred McKenzie in respect of this matter. I would rather take the Hon. Fred McKenzie's advice on union matters than that of the Hon. Garry Kelly. The knowledge of the Hon. Fred McKenzie of union matters is quite good, but it is not so hot in respect of management matters.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is only from the Labor Party that we hear about experts, advisers, and the like. My management skills have enabled me to run businesses very successfully for a number of years. If the Hon. Garry Kelly wants to challenge me on aspects of management, he or his friends can do so at any time, because my record in respect of management stands up rather well throughout some fairly tough experiences.

Hon. Garry Kelly: So you are an expert on it?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, I did not say that, but I am prepared to back myself.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Your rhetoric would indicate that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, it may; but it is accurate rhetoric which, with all due deference, is more than can be said for the Hon. Fred McKenzie. I am telling the real story behind the people who are losing their jobs; I am telling the stories of the wives and children who will be disadvantaged by this Government.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Due to the former Government's policy.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: As I said 20 minutes ago, I have a speech prepared which will take two and a half hours to deliver and I did not intend to talk about railways—

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Or industrial relations.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: —or industrial relations because you, Sir, would not allow me to do so as we have a Bill on the Notice Paper which relates to that issue. We shall debate industrial relations at length at a later date and the member will then probably learn something about the other side of the coin.

Hon. Graham Edwards: He won't learn anything from you.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That sort of interjection indicates the person who made it has a very closed mind, because even if I were as silly as some of the people in this Chamber act, they might still learn something if they listened and did not try to be so smart.

Let us return to those poor railway workers and their wives. The fact that this Minister and his Government have bungled their jobs has nothing whatsoever to do with the previous Government or the Government before that, because the Court and O'Connor Governments consulted with people. They did not let people hear rumours; they issued instructions that people be told the position. Those Governments were not like this Government which has a Minister who attends a high-powered meeting and issues four different sets of figures on the same subject.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Your Government told people nothing; that is the difference. We tell them something.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. P. H. Lockyer): Order! The member will address the Chair.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am doing so. I am sorry if you, Sir, thought I was not looking at you. I did

not think I was as cross-eyed as that. The interjector indicated that his Government informs people on these matters, but I ask him to which of the four stories should the men listen?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: The one put out by the Minister. That is the official one.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: On one day the Minister issued four different sets of figures. Which set do we accept?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: That is impossible.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: One would think that, if there were any management skills in the Government, it would be impossible, but I suggest the member talk to the people who were at that meeting. Not only were four different sets of figures issued by the Minister, but also, when we received written confirmation later, a further different set of figures was included. I do not think that engenders confidence in anyone. It certainly will not give confidence to the people who look like losing their jobs.

This Government has bungled the whole business, because it does not understand management. The Government has too many advisers and it does not know how to use its staff.

We noticed another aspect of that during question time today when a number of questions were postponed by the Government. I believe that occurred because too many people are interfering with the answers. So many people give their versions of the answers that it is impossible to check the position. This Government has treated the Public Service like dirt. Apart from imposing pay cuts on the upper echelon of the Public Service, the Government has employed advisers over the top of experienced private secretaries. Sometimes those advisers answer questions and at other times the questions are sent to the department.

Later this evening I shall give evidence to members of the way in which this Government has misled the House. I hope it sinks in that this Government has misled the House, because a year or two ago when the Hon. Peter Dowding was sitting on the back bench in the Opposition, he would have screamed from the roof tops if he thought the House had been misled. The Minister who was thought to be responsible for that would have been put through an inquisition and the Hon. Peter Dowding would have screamed, yelled, and ranted. We know the way he carries on, because we have seen it frequently. I do not intend to do that; I will simply point out to the Minister and the House exactly what happened to me.

Two top public servants can verify this, because they were told about it on the day it occurred. However, the Government returned with an

answer which was totally inaccurate. I shall deal with that at a later stage, because there are other issues about which we should talk.

Funnily enough, what I am talking about now has nothing to do with the original context of my speech and it is only because people have helped me during the afternoon by making comments—

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I tried not to, but you ruined my resolve.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I agree that the Hon. Fred McKenzie was only doing his job as Government Whip. He was doing a very good job except that he was inaccurate. He is an old friend of mine, so I will not hold that against him. The position has now been corrected, because he is not allowed to interject. The Hon. Vic Ferry talked about the South West Development Authority. That authority does not exist. The Bill has not been brought before the House. I am sure that is the previous Government's fault. It must be, because this Government never blames anything on anything but the previous Government. It does not make mistakes. It is the previous Government's fault.

Looking at this South West Development Authority which is known as "Bunbury 2000" it is extremely interesting to note that, in the past, seminars have been held and certain groupings of development authorities and others have met to discuss the future of the south-west. Under previous Governments all members of all political parties were invited to take part in the South West Development Authority. Apart from the great launching of "Bunbury 2000", the Liberal members outside Bunbury itself have not been invited to anything.

The Labor member for Collie has not been invited to anything; in fact he was so mad he spoke to a Dr Manea and gave him his views on what should happen to this most important part of the south-west. We know it is the most important part of the south-west because this Government moved the powerhouse from Bunbury to Collie. We know Collie is the most important part. We have a new Minister to do it because the previous one, who was sacked or demoted, could not make the decision. We needed a new Minister to put the thing on the rails and to do what the members from Collie, both upper and lower House, have successfully told Governments to do.

Let us get back to this business of our not being included in anything. It is interesting to look at the "Bunbury 2000" concept. Who will get all the little perks and jobs? The rumour—I am not saying it is correct—is that the member for Mitchell (Mr David Smith) is being groomed to take Dave

Evans' place when he goes to London as Agent General.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Ian Taylor has that job.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I would hope Dave Evans will get the job because of his long service and his disgrace before the nation in letting the Shannon Basin be ruined by this Government when he represented the area. I will get onto the Shannon Basin a little later on.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How is the book going, Mr Berinson?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I hope the Attorney General will take back to Caucus my advice to it. I suggest that the Government make Mr Evans the Agent General because he and his wife would do a very good job. Think about making Mr David Smith the next Minister. I hope this advice will be taken back to Caucus. Please think about it; because the way Mr Evans has been let down, with a little bit of his own help, in Bunbury and the Shannon, Mr Smith might go the same way with the smelter. I would be very careful because loud chuckles have come from certain Government members about some of our Ministers being beaten. I am sure this Government will make Mr Evans Agent General so it does not lose a Minister in the election.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They might offer it to you, Sandy!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. P. H. Lockyer): Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am open to offers.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Have you still got your office in Boyup Brook?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is the sort of uninformed comment I would expect from someone who does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mark Nevill: The sign has been removed.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If the member really wants to know, I have shifted to the office next door and the sign has been shifted. If he had eyes he would see it—it is only 10 yards up the street—but that is the Labor Party all over. That is the narrow vision of the Labour Party members coming out. Is it not typical of them?

Hon. Mark Nevill: Your office is important.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: They cannot open their eyes; their vision is so narrow. Because a sign is not where it was the last time, they think I have moved out of my office.

Hon. Mark Nevill: I thought you might be preparing to become the Agent General.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is typical of the honourable member.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: When the Government changed, you had to get on the other side.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. P. H. Lockyer): Order! I ask the Hon. Sandy Lewis to direct his comments to the Chair.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am falling over backwards to address you, Mr Deputy President, and to forget about all those horrible interjections from both sides of the House. Mr Deputy President, you should be addressed all the time. We will eventually get to my original speech. We will get there when I want to get there. I will just quietly go along—

Hon. Kay Hallahan: What?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Deputy President, can you hear me? I would hate to have to speak up.

Hon. Graham Edwards: How long do we have to wait for the intelligent bits to come out?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not think it would matter to the Hon. Graham Edwards when they did, because he would not understand them. It is disgusting that this Government's "Bunbury 2000" concept and the so-called South West Development Authority have not included all members of Parliament, irrespective of what party they belong to, and that they have not included Labor members outside the confines of Bunbury. Everybody outside Bunbury will say, "It is not for us because it is only for Bunbury".

I know and greatly admire Dr Manca. He is the greatest battler for Bunbury; he is known for that, and has been for 20 years. But boy, try to sell him in Collie, Manjimup, or Donnybrook and people will say, "Look, Ernie's great for Bunbury. He does a superb job for Bunbury". That is what is happening now. The South West Development Authority Bill is not in this House. Where is all the action? It is all a complete and utter myth—a public relations exercise created by a massive Press coverage, but it will not provide any jobs. The Government thought it could move, in bulk, public servants to Bunbury, but when asked about it it backed off. As Mr Ferry said, it backed off very quickly. The Government's hit-and-run attitude is amazing. It wants to barge in and leave everybody floundering in its wake.

I just wonder how long the public will stand this sort of attitude. I wonder how long it will be before the public wake up. Perhaps they are beginning to wake up now because cracks are beginning to appear. We have seen the great disc jockey, Brian Burke, involved in ratings wars, instead of running the country. He has had to sort

out the reason that he is not on one station or the other.

He thought he would have the whole thing down his own alley by taking a session on Bob Maumill's show. No-one in the public thinks this is right, but I guess if one is in the Labor Party one does not talk to the general public. One does not talk to the people who matter, the people who made one. One lives on a higher plane now and is wafting over those people. One has forgotten them.

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Kelly is an expert not only on transport, but also on ratings. I wonder whether he knows any more about that than he did about transport. I doubt it. I am sure the Premier will be asking for his help to sort out the row between Howard Sattler and Bob Maumill. I am sure the Premier will need that keen, incisive mind to work out how to sort out the problem.

Hon. P. G. Pental: They are creating jobs.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will not argue whether they are creating jobs; I do not mind who gets jobs, as long as people get them. With this Government in office they are not getting jobs.

From the very moment this Government took office it showed a total lack of interest in giving people jobs and getting them involved in looking for jobs. If certain Bills are passed in this House the people will be constrained even more.

It was interesting to read in the newspapers of the Government's plans for electoral reform; that is, plans by this Government of consensus, this Government which said it would take into account the views of the Opposition. This Government tried to con the Press by saying that it had taken account of the views of the Opposition. Of course members will remember that this Government did not want me to speak in a debate in this House, so it pulled a vote while I was away, even though it had promised me I would be able to speak. That was this Government, this consensus Government. Now, to whom has the Government spoken about this new Bill it has announced?

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: All those who debated the other.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: There has been no real discussion. The Government listened to the debate of one man.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You are not the Opposition—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. P. H. Lockyer): Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I guess I have been in Opposition more times than the honourable gentleman. I have been in Opposition against different Governments more times than the honourable gent will ever be, because he is bound to vote the way his party tells him.

Hon. Garry Kelly: You are saying the objections raised last year were not serious?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Again, we have our instant expert on electoral reform, transport, railways, and disc jockeys now speaking about electoral reform—the Hon. Garry Kelly!

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You would like him on your side; you are just jealous.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If he were on my side I would become an Independent.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: He will do me any day.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr McKenzie has to have him, he has no choice.

We have heard a very good speech from Mrs Hallahan tonight. One of the things she said was that "Government policies need to be based on hard data". Members will be hearing that expression from me in my speech because electoral reform is not based on "hard data".

Hon. Garry Kelly: Are you saying the present system is perfect, and there is no need for change?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Deputy President, you will realise, from the inane interjections, that it will be difficult to obtain a reasonable and fair stance on this matter. I am not saying I know all about electoral reform, but I do claim that I should have had a chance to speak on it. The Government in this House promised I would have a chance, but was controlled from another place and told that the Bill had to be through this House at a certain time. I have no hard feelings against the people who promised me that; I just do not trust them any more.

The Government claims that this is a consensus Bill. The Government was scared because it was beaten last time, according to the polls. This Government is very keen on the polls; but the polls show the public could not care less about the Government's electoral reform.

This is shown very clearly and it is very interesting to see that the lunatic fringe of the Labor Party has forced up this legislation again. I am sure the Attorney General really believes that there are more things this Government should do.

Hon. Garry Kelly: It is not a lunatic fringe. It is representative of electoral parliamentary reform.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The member is living evidence of what I was talking about. I was saying that there are many things that this Government could be doing; for example, informing employees of their future, such as those people at Westrail. It could be telling the people in the south-west what it will do for them and it could be telling their members what it is going to do in the south-west. These things should be done, before all this electoral reform nonsense. I believe in some reform. I believe it has to be discussed and worked out. However, this Government has the hide to say it is a consensus decision and it has taken the Opposition's view into consideration.

This Government should be doing something for the people instead of being seen by the people as trying to do something for itself. I am not saying that the Government is doing something of a gerrymander because there is no Bill before the House. However, it appears to the public—and it does not matter which side brings forward an electoral Bill—that talk of redistribution will be related to a gerrymander. Members of the public are a little cynical and will consider that the Government is trying to get itself re-elected. It is a basic political fact that the public have ever thought like that and will continue to do so. We know that all redistributions are honest.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Like the Hon. V. J. Ferry, I am horrified at the reflection cast upon the Chief Justice—

Hon. Garry Kelly: That is erroneous and you know it. There is no reflection on the Chief Justice.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. P. H. Lockyer): Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: When I read comments like, "grubby little fingers drawing their own boundaries", I can only—

Hon. Garry Kelly: You are deliberately misinterpreting it. You know what was meant.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am reading what is in the newspaper.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Look at the line around the metropolitan area. Who drew that?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I refer the Hon. Garry Kelly to Standing Order No. 91.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If we are going to have consensus, and I believe this has been discussed on both sides, we are all quite willing to get into it, have a yarn and make some decisions. However, it

seems quite strange to have a Government that insists on having this consensus with only its own views.

If the Government is quite dinkum about bringing forward this matter and it will tell the public it has been discussed with the Opposition or that the Opposition's views have been taken into consideration, then those views should be taken into consideration in other places, rather than in this House. It would be interesting to see the results of such discussions.

I will now begin my speech by discussing some matters related to my electorate and some which are not, but which are of public interest.

At this time of the year, every year, it seems that the dental subsidy scheme runs into severe financial problems. It does not matter which Government is in power, the fund runs out. By the look on the Attorney General's face, I know that he understands what I am talking about. The scheme has run out of money so regularly that perhaps the guidelines should be changed or more money should be provided at the start. This is the fourth or fifth consecutive year in which this has happened, but it has run out of money earlier this year than in the past.

The waiting period for dental service has become longer and longer. However, I am sure that the compassion of the Attorney General will ensure that the problem is corrected. I know a submission has gone to the Minister and I have a feeling that the Attorney has only to speak to the Budget manager of the Burke Government and the money will become available for dentists to continue filling teeth. I do not like having my teeth filled any more than you, Mr President, but it seems that city people get an advantage from this scheme; that is, if they have trouble with their teeth.

I am reliably informed that 30 per cent of the business of country dentists is made up of subsidy work. A city person can go to a dental clinic and receive treatment. However, under the scheme an old person in a country town must apply for a dental subsidy and wait for treatment. I think a long bow has been drawn, but I have been told that the waiting period is six months. However, I understand that the average waiting period is four months. I hope that the compassionate Budget manager can reduce that time to a maximum of two weeks.

I also suggest that when someone applies for dental treatment under the subsidy scheme, an acknowledgment letter or slip should be sent to him from the department to indicate his application is being studied. Dentists are being blamed for the

long delays and it has been suggested they are not forwarding the applications or in some way are interfering with the processing. It would be good business management practice to let the applicants know what the situation is.

The other evening the Hon. Phillip Pendal talked about South Africa. It seemed to me that what he said was good commonsense. It is not the first time I have said in this House that I am horrified at the Federal Government's attitude towards South Africa, not only the Hawke Government but also the previous Federal Government. It seems to me that in Canberra completely closed minds are at work with regard to South Africa. I have visited South Africa four times over a period of 15 or 16 years and the South African Republic should be mightily pleased with what it has done to advance all the people of South Africa. I refer specifically to educational and health standards and generally in every other area imaginable.

The development of South Africa has been outstanding. I am a very proud Australian, but we have a great deal to learn from South Africa in many of the methods it uses in agriculture, marketing, shale oil and coal oil production, and many other aspects. Strategically, one day South Africa will be a vital link in our salvation. It is a disgrace for the Government to refuse three members of Parliament visas to come into this country. Did we stop Russian envoys coming here when Afganistan was attacked? No! Have we stopped any politicians coming into this country like this before? Will we be held up to ridicule? I am sure members will agree we will be held up to ridicule in the eyes of the world because the Labor Government cannot make a decision.

What about the 74 per cent popularity boy? What does he do? Cop this, Mr President; it is really unbelievable: he says to the Leader of the Opposition, "If you will guarantee these guys, be it on your own plate". Why does he not get out and go into the popularity stakes—go into the Mr Australia contest, show his muscles somewhere else, and let somebody else's brain run the country? He has to ask the Leader of the Opposition to take the responsibility of issuing visas for three politicians from a friendly nation. One would think South Africa was attacking us; but it is a friendly nation—a brother in arms in two wars. Here we have a Prime Minister who does not have the guts to say "Yea" or "Nay". He is too busy watching the camel races in Camooweal; he goes to every other goddamn sporting event. Really, Mr President, it is a disgrace.

If Bob Hawke wanted to go to Washington, how would it be if Mr Reagan said to Mondale,



"Now, Fritz, it's on your head if you want Bob Hawke here"? Is that the way leaders work? Is that the way the country should be led? Of course it is not. The Labor Party stands condemned, and its leadership stands condemned because of the way it treats South Africa.

As I said earlier—members have heard me talking about the previous Government and its attitude to South Africa, which was a disgrace—we did not expect much from the Australian Labor Party in Government. However, we perhaps expected some commonsense on that issue, but we have not seen any. We have not seen any commonsense, or anything else.

The editorial in *The Australian* of Monday, 9 April, put the matter aptly as follows—

THE Federal Government has won no credit for itself in its handling of the proposed visit to this country by two South African politicians. Its initial denial of visas was arbitrary, and contrary to Labor's professed regard for free speech.

Where are all these human rights people who believe that everybody should have a say? Where are all the people who believe in multicultural societies, the aged, the youth, and the minority groups? They are certainly not in the Labor Party. Certainly they do not want any free speech; they want absolute control. They do not want anybody coming here, rocking the boat, do they? They would hate it.

The editorial continued—

Its subsequent reversal has been hedged with unusually oppressive restrictions and the Prime Minister could not forebear to announce his change of course without gratuitously insulting those members of the Federal Opposition who had tried to reverse the decision.

Does it not run in a pattern? The Labor Party should not forget that it was elected by the people to run the Government for all the people of the State and the Commonwealth. It forgets all about that; then when it makes a mistake—we have heard it time and time again—it says, "It is the previous Government's fault". I wonder if Mr Hawke will blame this on the previous Government. I guess his popularity counts for a lot, because he linked himself with Mr Wran in New South Wales. He must be awfully worried now about his foretold election. The Hon. Kay Hallahan does not seem to think the Prime Minister is worried, but I think he probably is.

I am sure all members of the Labor Party will know that in the poll before the last election the Premier of Western Australia had a popularity

rating, not of 50 per cent, not 60 per cent, but nearer 70 per cent. What happened?

Hon. D. K. Dans: He only ended up with a majority of 17.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: What happened to the Liberal Party, with all this popularity? Let us not be quite as cocky. Let us start making some decisions.

Now that the Leader of the House is back, maybe some of his people will help Mr McKenzie look after the House. The leader always livens up the House with a few interjections, although you cannot hear them, Sir. The rest of the Government members are not allowed to interject unless the Leader of the House is in his seat.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: It is against the Standing Orders.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I realise it is. I wish the Attorney would teach his members the Standing Orders. The Deputy President (the Hon. Phil Lockyer) reminded one member about the Standing Orders, and he left. He was so scared of the Deputy President that he walked out of the Chamber. Maybe that is the sort of control that we need in this place.

Hon. D. K. Dans: "Please bring him back", says Mr Lewis.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: For the benefit of the Leader of the House, having dealt with the previous—

Hon. D. K. Dans: I will forfeit. You need not do anything for my benefit.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Leader of the House ought to learn—

Hon. G. E. Masters: Whether he likes it or not.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is right.

The Hon. Kay Hallahan made a very good speech, and part of that speech dealt with policies. She said, "Government policies need to be based on hard data". I am sure the Leader of the House agrees with that.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Having just commenced my speech, I should like to say that we in Western Australia have a lot to learn from the Coroner's report on bushfires. I know a Select Committee is inquiring into bushfires in another place, but unfortunately the Government has taken the advice of some people who really do not know what the bush is all about.

The Government has taken advice from well-meaning, but ill-advised people on two matters: Burning and the Shannon. It should be compulsory for all members to read the Coroner's report.

At times I am not complimentary about lawyers. In Government and in Opposition I have been very rude to lawyers because of their narrow views.

Hon. I. G. Medcalf: You can say that again.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Leader of the Opposition knows, and Mr Dowding knows that I have been rude about lawyers.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You have never been rude to me.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is impossible for one of limited intelligence to pick up the fact that someone is being rude to him. I have been rude, but I have been fairly direct.

The Coroner's report on the Ash Wednesday fires contains important material for all those people in the ALP who have been conned by well-meaning people about the Shannon basin, forestry, national parks, and wildlife reserves, and burning in those areas. The Coroner says that the undergrowth has to be burnt.

I could prolong my speech by quoting from that report. It has some 344 pages and to obtain the full impact of the report members should hear about those 344 pages. I will precis the report in five minutes and tell members of the Government that they, individually and collectively, will be contributing to another Dwellingup or Ash Wednesday if they continue with their party's policy on protective burning of parks.

I have a lot of very good friends in the Labor Party and in the Warren district, which covers the Shannon area. It is time members of the Labor Party stood up to be counted on this matter of protective burning. A number of people in the Liberal Party, the Country Party and the National Party are worried about burning.

I am not against conservation. I do not use the expression "greenie" because I believe that most of those people believe our children and grandchildren should have the advantages we have, but there is no way we can protect the forests in the lower south-west unless we prescribe burning.

If I were to give credit on this matter, then I would give 90 per cent of it to the former Conservator of Forests (Mr Bruce Beggs) for his attitude on the burning of forests. He had a realistic idea of what could be achieved within the forests. He had and still has a vision, despite the fact that this Government has removed him from a job which I believe is the most important in this State, if we are to keep national parks and forests for the future.

The fire at Dwellingup was a bad one, as was the fire at Mt. Macedon on Ash Wednesday.

There has to be protective burning and communication. This is evident from my reading of the Coroner's report. The lack of communication in Victoria was absolutely shocking.

Having been through an odd cyclone or two in the south-west, I know what they are like. The Hon. Phil Lockyer and the Hon. Norman Moore and others talk about cyclones, but cyclones in the south-west are totally different—they usually hit us when certain burning is in hand.

We should look at protective measures for forestry and agricultural land all the time. I recommend to members that they look at the Coroner's report and make their decisions on what they think is best for the State. A no-burning policy will end in disaster.

I know members of the Labor Party hate making decisions. We have witnessed that over the last 12 months. The Labor Party has bumbled from post to post, never making a decision and having to be reminded about ordinary matters. I make a plea to the Government: For God's sake keep preventive burning going in forestry areas.

I wish to deal with the economy, because I guess when speaking to a Supply Bill one should look at the economy. One can be very critical of the Government for its handling of the railways and pretty well everything it has done, but one can be forgiving I guess, because Government members are inexperienced and brash. Its members think that radio programmes and the Press are more important than the people. Let us consider the rural communities of Western Australia today.

It is easy to become an instant expert. While speaking about beef I think I should mention that last night's cartoon in the *Daily News* was magnificent. We have a Prime Minister who thinks he can travel around the world making himself a nice bloke. However one of the realities of life has come home to him: The Japanese are lowering the percentage of beef they will import from us. Bob said that could not happen. Bob said his rating is 74 per cent. This great leader has let Australia fall into a hole with one of its major export markets, because he was too interested in promoting himself, and he forgot about the Australian beef industry.

If the truth were known he was not interested in the Australian beef industry because he has never been interested in primary production, neither has the Labor Party. The Labor Party has never had a member who could stand up and be accepted in the community as someone who could talk about primary production or the mining industry. The Labor Party's members have thought

that it is an open-ended agreement and the money just rolls in.

The Tuesday, 20 March 1984 edition of *The Australian* ran an article under the heading, "Something to beef about on the farm" which stated—

LET us start with some interesting pieces of information. Australia's rural and mining industries, according to the National Farmers Federation, account for 76 per cent of our exports while only about 10 per cent of the workforce is employed in these pursuits.

Unquestionably, it is this 10 per cent then that does most to maintain the high standard of living enjoyed in this country.

Members should note this and remember that magnificent speech made by the Hon. Kay Hallahan, before the afternoon tea suspension, when she said "Government policies need to be based on hard data". I hope Government members will listen to this. To continue—

The NFF's submissions to the national wage hearing also says that the multiplier effect of every dollar earned by a farmer is between \$1.86 to \$2.50 for the rest of the community.

Ironically, however, as Australia has taken shape demographically, these people have become the group least considered by governments, individual politicians and bureaucrats.

We can look at Labor members representing country areas and see them falling prey to the theory that the exporters have plenty of money. They do this perhaps because they cannot read, perhaps because they can only read dogma from the Labor Party or maybe they do not care for their electors. I think it is probably the latter. They could not care less how much it cost the electors in Esperance or Merredin to produce wool. They do not care about the costs; they have signed a pledge card that says, "We will go along with all our city cousins and it does not matter whether our rural or mining industries are competitive". They do not give a damn, to put it plainly.

We have seen demoted Ministers and others who could not care less about what happens to our national resources. They are not interested; they just sit there drawing their pay, allegedly representing people and allegedly trying to give them jobs. When have they ever created a job? The Labor Party has not created a job in the last 12 months; it cannot name one job it has created. The Minister allegedly for employment sits there; he is a Minister for unemployment because all the Labor Party policy leads to is unemployment for

more and more people, and it will continue to do so because that Minister is much more interested in making his own name than in creating jobs for other people.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: For your information he has created 24 000 jobs in 12 months.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is interesting. Can the Government Whip tell me how many of those jobs were provided by CEP funds and how many were on projects initiated by the previous Government? Of course he cannot.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: None of them.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The previous Government did everything and this Government has done nothing by way of job creation. This Government has not created a job. We have a Minister for Planning, and Employment and Training who could not even give Collie miners a pension without being pushed to the absolute limit by Opposition members. Is he interested in people, jobs, or pensions? Of course not!

Hon. Fred McKenzie interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Can you not hear me Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: The member should quieten down a little.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Government Whip cannot protect the Minister in any way; he has been demoted by the Premier. He failed in his last job and he is failing in his present job. We want jobs for Australians and Western Australians. Do you remember, Mr President, a couple of years ago when the then Government was talking about creating jobs and the then member for North Province said it was not good enough and would do nothing to relieve unemployment? I drew out quotes made by the member for North Province on many topics such as the inefficiency of the then Government in many fields. When one looks at *Hansard* and marks that member's speeches for three or four years with a little piece of paper—everytime he spoke or criticised or asked questions—it looks like Christmas has come early. He spoke so often and with such scorn about the previous Government that I began to think he may have had a point.

I read all the quotes and as he is a friend of mine I thought, "Now, Sandy, you cannot quote them because not only would he be demoted, he would also be sacked if anyone looked at his performance". It is easy to be smart in Opposition. That demoted Minister is now finding it is not so easy to be a Minister in Government. One has to

make decisions. The Hon. Bill Stretch and I pushed him at the end of last year to give the Colliery miners their pension rights. We had to push him day by day and there was always an excuse as to why it could not be done. Finally we got the result we wanted and that was great.

The majority of the people in the community do not understand how serious our position is in terms of the world economy. I will quote a few figures in a moment from the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics in relation to wheat, sheep, and dairy produce, and the rate of returns producers of those commodities are getting on their money. I do not think many city members who can invest in units, flats, businesses, the Teachers' Credit Union, railway credit unions, and all those things realise what is the net return to the producers who are trying to keep Australia competitive in world markets. They are being stopped by a centralised wage fixing system. Wages and costs are continually passed on so that the wheat, meat, dairy produce, soya beans and anything else we produce are not competitive on world markets. We have seen what has happened to our iron ore industry due to industrial unrest and the actions of unthinking people. For five per cent or 10 per cent less a year they could have spent the rest of their lives not on six-inch clover, but on four-inch clover instead of eating clover burr.

It is all right for the Minister to grin; he thinks it is funny and that worries me. It worries the living hell out of me, because I represent people who produce and who give Australia something to live on. The Minister did until he started his antics and now we are battling like hell to get an iron ore market because he thinks it grows on trees.

It is a great shame that so-called responsible Ministers do not think about our position in the world. The Minister for Planning can smile and put on a grin, but history will name him as the Minister who has presided over the highest unemployment and the greatest downturn in Australia's history. He can go on grinning if the electorate allows him to do so. I do not think it is any fun and certainly none of my electors thinks so. If he wants to go on grinning, he can do so and we will bury him with it. Obviously he has never read the true figures.

I will quote the 1982-83 figures which are the latest I have been able to get. I will refer only to sheep, beef, wheat, dairy produce, and horticulture, and then we will talk about all the industries combined and the rate of return, including capital appreciation, to each of those areas. Let us first look at sheep. The rate of return including capital appreciation to a sheep-only producer—bearing in

mind that land values are escalating and inflation must be considered—is minus 15.03 per cent.

Take the beef people. This is before Bob Hawke visited Japan and lost us the rest of the markets. The figure is 1.72 per cent including capital appreciation. I ask members of the Opposition: Would they invest \$100 and give the people they invested with another 15 per cent?

Hon. Peter Dowding: What would they tell you? You have forgotten which side you are on.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is interesting that the member thinks it is so funny that the sheep people are losing 15 per cent. He does not think it is of any consequence to Western Australia. The Minister nods in agreement. How shameful in years to come will our grandchildren think it is that a Minister for Employment and Training nods in agreement when it is said that the sheep farmer is losing 15 per cent!

Hon. Peter Dowding: Even at this time of night you would know that was not true. It has not been such a heavy evening for you, has it?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: You see, Mr President, why the man was demoted.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: He never said a word.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Let the Hon. Fred McKenzie read the *Hansard* tomorrow morning. He did say some words, and they were silly words, as usual. I do not think the member should protect him, he should obey his leader's command and not interject.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You said he agreed.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Until he spoke I did not say he said anything. I said he agreed because he nodded his silly head.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the honourable member to direct his comments to the Chair and not to the other members of the House.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Certainly, Mr President. So we have dealt with the sheep farmers and we have dealt with the wheat farmers.

The Hon. Jim Brown and the Hon. Mark Nevill could not care less about the wheat farmers. I ask you, Mr President, would you invest your money at 1.15 per cent? Of course you would not, yet here is this Government condoning this position. With sheep and beef the figure is minus 2.58 per cent.

Hon. C. J. Bell: Not for long.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Not for long. In 1982-83 dairymen were making 15.68 per cent. I might be dumb, but how much dairy produce do we export? Absolutely damn-all in the total sphere. Even you, Sir, who were city born and bred, apart

from Kalgoorlie, must understand that the rural producer, the cattle producer of Australia, is going down the gurgler so fast that it does not matter.

I think these figures are wrong. They show just the trend. But with this Government they will go further and further down the drain. The Government has no interest in how the dollar which pays the worker is raised because members opposite cannot see beyond their grubby little electorates in the city.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I have 94 000 to 96 000.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: A grubby little electorate.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: What rubbish.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Why is the member complaining? His Minister, Mr Tonkin, says they are grubby little electorates.

A Government member: He did not.

Hon. W. G. Atkinson: Grubby little fingers.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Government members get uptight when it is quoted back at them.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Misquoted.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Really, members want it one way and not the other. They cannot take it when it is spelt out. The Hon. Mark Nevill has never been able to take it. He is prepared to make rude comments but he is not prepared to take them back because members are not interested in the producers in this State and in this country; they are interested only in their little shenanigan within the ALP and their own promotion chances. Not one of them has had the guts ever to cross the floor. They have never been convinced by another argument. You cannot tell me, Sir, that these people all agree without exception on every subject. One only has to read the daily paper, because they leak like a sieve.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: We are a very happy family.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have seen that; Mr Hetherington has seen that. I happen to think the Hon. Robert Hetherington is a pretty good bloke and there is a fair chance I will support him. But what do Government members do with him? They cut the ground from under his feet all the time. They say they will do something. For the first time the Caucus has stood up for itself.

Hon. Robert Hetherington: That is not true.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Come, Mr Hetherington, a little chip here or there, but the main thrust is that members must obey or be kicked out.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: We are loyal.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Members are loyal and dumb.

A Government member: Consensus.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Consensus! Where have they ever had consensus in the Labor Party? I wish their leader would take them in hand. The Leader of the House is a highly intelligent sort of bloke.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He brings in some very dumb Bills because they are forced on him.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Nonsense.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Hon. Garry Kelly has become an expert not only on transport and on all the other issues, but also on his leader, and that worries me.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is about the only thing that he does know when he hears it; the rest of the time he is speaking so fast that he does not hear anything. It is a great pity because he is a nice lad and we have welcomed him into this House. It is very nice to have him, but he is noted for his interjections and he will go down in history for making them.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It may be that I aim my speeches at the people who are listening. If the Hon. Graham Edwards wants to play ball, if he can understand what I am talking about, then I am glad for him because he has a kindly disposition. He has not really read into the speech what should be read into it.

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I cannot even hear what the member is saying.

Let me come back to this Government, this Government of consensus, this Government which tells the truth, this Government which tells one what is going on. You will remember, Sir, that I asked a question about the degradation of forests and the importance thereof. Do you remember that I received an answer? Let us deal with the answers I received in sequence. I asked if the working plans for the regeneration of degraded hardwood forests were available at the State Information Office in the Superannuation Building, as stated in the letter to me. This question was directed to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests. We all know who the Minister for Forests is, do we not? It is the Premier. He should be trusted beyond all people in the Cabinet and in the State. He has the number one job. He should be number one accurate, factual, and truthful. The answer I received was, "Yes".

That was on 3 April. So I followed that on 5 April and asked, "When were the working plans mentioned in part (4) of question 834 of Tuesday, 3 April 1984, sent to the State Information Office?"

The answer was, "The plans were delivered to the State Information Office to coincide with the Press release of 31 January 1984 and are available for public inspection on request". That is a lie; an untruth. It is interesting to see that nobody is challenging me.

I went to the State Information Office on 7 February. I asked for the said plans. I was told the office did not have them. I had a personal letter from the Premier saying they would be there, but some adviser had fouled up. It was not left to the department; the department could not be trusted—a public servant could not be trusted to carry out this Government's instructions.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: How do you know that?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I know it. I do not want to name people, but if the member forces me I will do so, because the Leader of this House was committed to an answer which is an untruth. He is not an untruthful man, as members know. If it is in his own portfolio, he may work round and try to put the Opposition off, but this is not his portfolio, it is the Premier's and what we are told in this House is untrue.

What worries me is that not one, but two leading Government employees and advisers—people who are well ahead of the rest of the mob—knew about this on 7 February. They knew the plans were not there and yet, on 5 April, this House was fed that garbage. Do we intend to continue to be fed this garbage by the Government? Do we intend to accept these lies and untruths? I am not blaming the Ministers in this House; I am blaming the Premier—the Leader of the Government in this State—for allowing an answer that was untrue—that was a lie—to be brought into this House.

I want to know what has happened. I want an answer from the Government. Do we believe other answers which are given or is the Government's smear campaign to continue?

I am happy to see that the Attorney is here. On one occasion he accused me—as did his colleague, the Minister for Employment and Training on another occasion—of besmirching the names of public servants. Both those Ministers promised individually that, if on reading their "greens"—their transcripts—they found they were wrong, they would apologise in the House. Neither of those Ministers has apologised, but both were wrong. The other night the Attorney attacked the

Hon. Graham MacKinnon in exactly the same way, trying to besmirch a member's name and to accuse him of things he did not do.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You know that is not true.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: When did the Attorney apologise to me?

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You are making the assumption that I agreed with the interpretation you placed on what happened and I did not necessarily do that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If the Attorney reads his "green" against my "green", he will apologise. If he does not do that I would expect him to get a member of his staff to do it. If the Attorney intends to take up the issue, I expect an apology from him tomorrow. We cannot believe these Ministers because they do not tell the truth.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I am telling you that I did read it, and the reason I did not apologise was that I did not agree with your interpretation of what was said.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is not what the Attorney agreed to do.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I said that I would apologise if I was wrong.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Attorney said that I had named members of the Public Service.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Do you remember the date, the reference, or the debate?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Attorney said he was going to do it.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I did do it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is like all the rest of the Attorney's assurances—his word is not worth a spit!

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I take exception to that. I ask that it be withdrawn. I did read it, as I undertook to do. The reason I did not apologise was that I believed that my interpretation was correct.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must withdraw his comment and I suggest he get off that topic completely as far as people's truthfulness is concerned. I ask the member to withdraw.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: In deference to you, Sir, I will withdraw.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not intend to be bullied by the Attorney or by any other Minister. These Ministers seem to think they have the privilege of saying anything about me that they wish to say. Tonight we have seen an example of somebody who is prepared to hand it out, but is not prepared to take it. That is all I will say about the subject. The other Minister concerned is not in his seat and I am horrified about that, because it is the Government's job to be in the House.

When I was in the other place the other day I heard an outrageous outburst by the Premier about the Leader of the Opposition. These people want to hand it out, but they are not prepared to take it. They are prepared to make all sorts of statements, but they are not prepared to apologise or accept any sort of chastisement.

We are being run by a Government which wants all the Press it can get. We have seen Federal and State Governments trying to take all the Press. We have seen Bob Hawke on the ABC; he is nearly as bad as Ian Sinclair on the ABC.

It is the duty of a member of Parliament to stand up and be counted. If he is prepared to make these sorts of comments, he should be prepared to accept the reply. We have reached the stage in this place and in other places where Government members are prepared to say anything they like and, when somebody happens to point out that they are wrong—somebody like me who is not very bright; I do not put myself into the category with all these superior people, but I happen to tell the truth and to home in on a few of the Government's weaknesses—they squeal like stuck pigs. Government members are not prepared to take anything like that which they are prepared to hand out.

This hit-and-run Burke Government will not take anything, but it is prepared to hand out plenty. The Attorney and the Minister for Employment and Training come in here and want to wipe off backbenchers, because they think we are not worth consideration. Those Ministers want to wipe us off. However, I happen to be a member of the House of Review. I happen to have a record as a member of the House of Review, and I am one of the people who is prepared to cross the floor, even though Labor Party members cannot do that, because they are not allowed to. They sign their little forms and they are not worried about the people they represent. They could not give a damn about them. They are worried about their own personal promotion and looking after themselves—to hell with the people!

It is about time Labor Party members in this place started looking after people and examining where their own faults lie. The backbench members ought to ascertain their own and their Ministers' faults, otherwise they will go the same way as the Liberal Party went in this place.

It was interesting to hear the Attorney's outburst. I will be quite prepared to accept his apology in writing tomorrow. The Attorney can laugh—

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Don't hold your breath!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If anybody reads the Attorney's "green" he will know that I am telling the truth; he will know how I handled the debate. The same applies in respect of the Attorney's colleague, the Minister for Employment and Training. They are prepared to make all these statements, but when somebody belts them back, they go for cover.

You and I, Sir, have worked in the labour field and we know what labour is all about. Lawyers, pharmacists, and all these other professions are now far more important to the Labor Party than swinging a pick or a 44-gallon drum on the wharf. The Labor Party has lost its credibility in this State.

I shall support the Bill, because I believe Supply Bills ought to be supported in the upper House. Because of the disrespect shown in this House, the failure to answer questions, and the Government's abuse of members, we are getting very close to refusing supply in this place. This Government does not deserve supply, because of its extravagance and its disc jockey Premier who should be running the State instead of talking on radio. Because of the abuse by Ministers of backbenchers, this Government does not really deserve supply.

I am approximately one-tenth of the way through what I intended to say tonight.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It has been a command performance!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We know it is a command performance. We know Labor members have not been able to interject—apart from one outburst by the Attorney—because of their discipline. We had an odd, small interjection from the Government Whip earlier tonight, but we have not had anything as bad as the interjections by the Attorney.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: We have not had anything as bad after your obnoxious comments!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have not had anything as serious in the long term as the Attorney's outburst.

I am approximately one-tenth of the way through my speech. If the Government wants me to continue with it, I shall do so, but I made a commitment to the Leader of the House that I would conclude my remarks before 8.30 p.m. I think my own leader would probably prefer me to continue, if the excitement is not too much!

The Government must accept that some backbench members are individuals and do not intend to be abused or pushed around. They will not be trodden into the ground, nor will they tolerate bullies.

This Government is composed of bullies. It uses bullying tactics, but we give it fair warning that we on the Opposition benches are not prepared to be bullied. The Government can do what it likes; some of us have the integrity to stand up and be counted on numerous issues. We are not guided by Caucus. We stand up for what we believe in and we are not going to be pushed around. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

**HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan) [8.29 p.m.]: In supporting the Bill I thank the member of the Opposition who spoke earlier today for his interest in the boxing committee established recently by the Minister for Sport and Recreation (the Hon. Keith Wilson). I could not think of a more appropriate member to raise the question of fighting in this House than the Hon. Mr Lockyer.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Touché!

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I am aware of the newspaper report to which he refers. I was rather displeased to read the article on the front page of the newspaper, not because I claim to be misrepresented; more accurately, I claim to be underquoted. The story originally contained about 12 paragraphs and in the newspaper it was cut down to about four paragraphs. Part of that which was omitted contained quotes along the lines of—

The committee would retain an open mind on hotel fights and would not be making any recommendations until after submissions had been received, two-way discussions in the community and full and fair consideration given to the issues raised with the committee.

I understand that journalist's law is that he or she is subject to editorial prerogative to suit the publication or the newspaper for which he or she works. I can assure Mr Lockyer that that is certainly the case in this instance.

The question of professional boxing is much wider than whether boxing should be allowed to continue in hotels. It is true to say, however, that this is probably the most contentious issue the

committee will be confronting in its business. Apart from that, I am very pleased to say that the boxing fraternity generally has been very helpful in trying to come to terms with the committee and with the problems that exist in the boxing game. I hope the information we collect will be used to further some good recommendations to the Minister, from which I hope some good legislation will be forthcoming.

The major intent of the committee is aimed at providing protection to the person most involved and most vulnerable within the boxing field—the boxer himself. I suggest that if the Hon. Phil Lockyer has received complaints from someone within the AHA, I would be only too happy to speak to that person. I have spoken to many people from within the boxing fraternity. If those people who have complained are interested in putting a submission before the committee I would receive that submission on the committee's behalf, and I ask the Hon. Phil Lockyer to assure those people that that submission will be given a full and fair hearing.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: I have the greatest confidence in you. I will pass that information on.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr Lockyer; I am quite sure that your confidence is justified.

In conclusion—I do not wish to speak for long on this Bill—I reply to Mr Lockyer to ease his concern; whatever the result of the inquiry, as I said earlier, I hope it will be directed towards the betterment of boxers in this State and will perhaps provide some protection to them such as that which already exists in the Eastern States. It can only be a step forward and to the betterment of amateur boxing and certain professional boxing in this State.

I support the Bill.

**HON. N. F. MOORE** (Lower North) [8.34 p.m.]: I want to use this debate to comment on the rather poor quality of answers we receive to the very excellent questions we ask in this place. I was interested to read in the *press gallery report* as follows—

The Minister for Housing, (Mr Keith Wilson) for example, has shown in the House that he has a pretty short fuse. When he is attacked with questions, he tends to get angry. And it is when a Minister is angry that he is likely to make a mistake.

Clearly, that comment in the *press gallery report* relates to the attitude of Mr Wilson during questions without notice, but I have noticed in the last few days that he gets very angry with questions on notice, and the sorts of answers that



come back show a total disrespect for the person asking the question and a total disregard for the needs of the House and the rights of individuals to ask questions in this place.

I refer more particularly to an answer I received today to a very genuine question which asked for specific and detailed information; it was totally ignored. I asked a question of the Minister for Planning representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs as follows—

Will the Minister provide a detailed, itemised account of all moneys so far expended by the Government in the conduct of the Seaman inquiry and the associated Aboriginal Liaison Committee?

To me, that question is quite straightforward; it should not have been very hard for someone to understand exactly what I asked. We wanted a detailed and itemised account of all Government expenditure on the Seaman inquiry. Had the Minister replied and said, "It will take a week or so to put together all this information", I would have been quite happy to accept that for the time being, but the answer I received was as follows—

The member is referred to an answer given previously to question 5229—

The actual question number was 2559. The answer continued—

—asked by his colleague, Mr Peter Jones. The copy of the material relevant to the member's question is herewith.

I might add that it was not "herewith". The question asked by Mr Peter Jones was as follows—

What was the total amount expended by the Government on the Seaman inquiry?

A total figure was provided in answer to that question. I asked for a detailed, itemised account of all expenditure, for very good reasons; I wanted to know, as did members of the Opposition—taxpayers are entitled to know—where the money was going. We want to know what various groups in the community are doing with the grants they receive. I have asked questions on this matter in respect of grants being made by the Aboriginal Liaison Committee to assist various Aboriginal groups to make submissions to Mr Seaman. The amount of money so far expended by those groups is over \$240 000; that is money that has been made available by the Government to a wide variety of organisations, mainly Aboriginal groups, to assist them to make submissions to the Seaman inquiry. I want to know what each of those organisations has done with the money it

has received, because large amounts of money are involved.

I will give some examples. The Kimberley Land Council has received \$60 000. I want to know where that \$60 000 has gone. A very strong rumour is going around that the lawyer who wrote the Kimberley Land Council submission had requested \$25 000 for his services and that he was not given that amount but something like \$16 000. I want to know whether that is accurate.

I want to know whether Philip Vincent, lawyer and Labor Party candidate in the last State election, was paid \$16 000 to prepare the submission on behalf of the Kimberley Land Council. We all know that that submission asked for the whole Kimberley area to be given back to the Aboriginal people. The taxpayers' money is being used to get lawyers to write submissions like that.

I want to know—and the taxpayers are entitled to know—whether that is where their money is going, and that is why I asked for detailed, itemised accounts of where the money is going. That is just one example.

Another example is the Ngaanatjarra Council Incorporated of Warburton. An initial amount of \$17 500 was given, followed by an additional amount of \$10 000, making a total of \$27 500. Philip Toyne, a lawyer, wrote their submission. If one looks at the submission one will see that council claimed the eastern third of Western Australia. Its submission contained a draft Act of Parliament. I want to know where the \$27 500 went. I want to know if Philip Toyne received the \$27 500 for the preparation of the submission. The Minister gave an answer, "I refer you to a previous question asked by Mr Peter Jones", which gives the total amount expended so far, but gives no details whatsoever.

It is not good enough. All sorts of questions are raised when we consider the particular organisations which have received funds. I will give some examples. I do not know what the Bombers Softball Club is, but it received four grants of \$1 800 and I want to know what it did with that money. Mr Neil A. Phillips—I do not know what his occupation is, but I know he is employed by some Government agency—was paid \$3 000 to make a submission to the inquiry. Mr R. F. A. Isaacs who is employed by the State Government received \$2 500. NAC Area WAB received \$21 385. That organisation is funded by the Federal Government, which also increased the amount of money available to the Aboriginal Development Commission in the last Federal budget by 100 per cent. It receives over \$7 million a year to spend, yet the State Government has given it

\$21 000 to make a submission to the Seaman inquiry.

The Minister will not give me the details. He gives me only the total amount so far expended. His answer then goes on to show his total disrespect for this House by saying—

The Opposition seems to be concerned about the question of expenditure incurred in both the Seaman inquiry and the Aboriginal Liaison Committee.

Of course we are concerned. That is why I asked the question. The taxpayers of Western Australia are entitled to know where the money has gone. The answer continues—

The State Government must incur reasonable expenditure in the running of any inquiry.

We do not object to that. It then says—

The alternative would be for the Government not to expend any money and to allow the Commonwealth to legislate in this area.

I really cannot see the significance of that remark. Where is the suggestion that if the State Government does not spend any money on the Seaman inquiry the Federal Government will automatically legislate? Is the Seaman inquiry preventing the Federal Government from legislating? To the best of my knowledge—and I am not privy to the secret meetings that go on in Canberra between the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the State Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs, and Mr Seaman—I understand the Federal Government has told the Ministers they had better get a move on because it is in the process of preparing legislation on a national basis.

Hon. P. G. Penda: Surely the meeting should never have taken place.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Seaman should not have been involved anyway, but Mr Parker was brought in as well, perhaps to look after the fiery anger of the short-fused Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs from this State. Let us look at what has been said about the state of Australia—

Hon. Mark Nevill: Would you prefer the Federal Government to legislate?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: A statement was put out which describes an accord reached between the State and Federal Governments on this matter and I want to quote it because it is very important that the House knows about this.

Hon. P. G. Penda: They are pretty keen on it, as you well know.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: A joint statement on Aboriginal land rights in WA issued on 14 December 1983, states, in item six—

Having regard to the above, the Federal Minister reaffirmed the Commonwealth's commitment to full consultation with the Western Australian Government prior to the finalisation of national umbrella Aboriginal land rights legislation.

It promised consultation with the State prior to the finalisation of national umbrella Aboriginal land rights legislation. That was a joint statement put out by the Commonwealth and State Ministers for Aboriginal Affairs of December last year when the heat was put on the State Government by Mr Holding. I further fail to see why the Minister feels that the Commonwealth would legislate in that area if the State does not conduct the Seaman inquiry, because the Federal Labor Party and the State Labor Party have identical platform policies on land rights.

They have identical policies. They believe in land rights legislation based on the Northern Territory laws. That is quite specific and categorical in both their policies. What the Seaman inquiry has to do with the Commonwealth is quite beyond me. The Minister then goes on in his answer to talk about the State's interests and how we should be concerned for the State's interest and support the State Government's initiative in setting up the Seaman inquiry. He says—

Members opposite of course, not participating in the inquiry would no doubt be prepared to simply allow the Commonwealth to legislate in this area regardless of the State's wishes. The Burke Government is not prepared to follow that course.

Once again we have this absolute nonsense being churned out by the Minister, that the Opposition has no right to make a comment about land rights because it did not make a submission to the Seaman inquiry. We did not make a submission to the Seaman inquiry—I say this for the 450th time because it takes that long to sink in—because the terms of reference did not allow us to make a submission. The terms of reference simply say that there will be land rights, and they ask for comments as to how they should be implemented. The terms of reference do not say, "Mr Seaman, you go into the community and find out whether there should be land rights". That was not one of the terms of reference of the Seaman inquiry.

If there is any doubt in the mind of the Minister or the minds of any of his colleagues, I will tell them what Mr Seaman said. On page 6 of his discussion paper he said the following—

A few submissions amount to little more than opposition to the holding of this Inquiry or the implementation of a scheme of land-related measures for the benefit of Aboriginal people, and the persons and organisations who made those submissions will appreciate that there is no point in our spending time together to enable them to repeat that material.

What he has said is that any of the submissions that are outside the terms of reference of the inquiry will not be accepted and that he will not talk to anyone who goes back to him about it.

Further to that Mr Seaman sent out letters and tapes to the various Aboriginal groups in Western Australia. In those letters and tapes he talks about what the inquiry is about. I will quote what he said because it is couched in the sort of English that Aboriginal people can understand—it does not say much for the Minister if he cannot understand it. On page 95 of the discussion paper Mr Seaman refers to the tape he sent to Aboriginal people on 23 June 1983 as follows—

The Government wants me to write a Report telling it what it should do to give land rights to Aboriginal people.

Further on he said—

It will then be up to the Government to decide what it is going to do and whether it will give Aboriginal people land rights in the way that I say, or in some other way.

It continues—

My job is to tell Brian Burke's Government what I think is the best way to give land rights, and how it should be done . . .

Further on it says—

The Government has said that Aboriginal people will get land rights and it has given me some questions to answer about how this should be done. Now, these questions are called Terms of Reference.

He then listed the terms of reference, as follows—

The first question is this: The Government has said that first of all, it will give land rights to all Aboriginal Reserve land in Western Australia.

The second question states—

The second question I have to answer is: What other sorts of Aboriginal land rights would be fair thing and how will Aboriginal people own that land?

Everything that is said in that document and a reasonable interpretation of the terms of reference state clearly to me and to the Opposition that the

Seaman inquiry is about what sort of land rights there will be and not whether there should or should not be land rights.

I am sick to death of the Minister peddling the statement that the Opposition has no right to make any comment on this subject because it did not make a submission to the inquiry. Our submission would have received short shrift from Mr Seaman.

I wish the Government would read its own terms of reference and read what Mr Seaman said to the Aboriginal people, and then keep its mouth shut about the Opposition not being able to say anything.

The Minister is also trying to get across the idea that somehow or other the Seaman inquiry will stop the Federal Government from legislating in Western Australia. Mr Holding, the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, has five basic principles for land rights legislation on which he will not budge. He set up an inquiry into the Northern Territory legislation which was conducted by Mr Justice Toohey. He said that that investigation must take into account the following principles which the Federal Government sees as fundamental in relation to land rights—

- (1) Aboriginal land to be held under inalienable freehold title;
- (2) protection of Aboriginal sites;
- (3) Aboriginal control in relation to mining on Aboriginal land;

I would love to hear Mr Nevill's comments on that. It continues—

- (4) access to mining royalty equivalents;

Once again, I would like to hear Mr Nevill's comments. It continues—

- (5) compensation for lost land to be negotiated.

They are the five basic principles which Mr Holding has said are fundamental to any national land rights legislation. I have already quoted in this House what Mr Holding said about national land rights legislation. He said something to the effect that he did not want to twist anybody's arm, but there may be occasions when he would have to break a few. They were Mr Holding's comments in respect to the States when he said that if they did not enact land rights legislation which he regards as adequate, he would have to break their arms.

I wonder what was said to Mr Burke, Mr Wilson, Mr Parker, and Mr Seaman when they were summoned to Canberra to talk about land rights legislation. Did Mr Holding say, "That is what I am going to do; hurry up and do it

yourselves, or you will get it from the Federal Government”?

Mr Burke is now trying to act like a “states righter” even though he knows that the Federal Government can do it, anyway.

I hope that having said that we will not have the State Minister trotting out the idea that the State Opposition has no right to make a comment on this subject.

I have now explained the terms of reference and the fact that the Federal Government has the power to bring in land rights. The Opposition has an obligation to let the people of Western Australia know what is likely to happen to them and their land in respect of the State and Federal Governments introducing Aboriginal land rights into this State.

We must tell the people of Western Australia the facts and the more people we tell, the more upset they get. They are worried about what will happen in this country because of the Labor Government's land rights policies which may be implemented in this State.

I will keep asking the Minister, every day if necessary, to give me an itemised and detailed account of every cent that is spent on the Seaman inquiry.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Are you going to ask any supportive question?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will ask about every cent that is spent.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Will you go to the defence of the Aboriginal people?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will attack the Government for using taxpayers' money to gain political advantage. I will attack the Government and not the Aboriginal people because they are not using the money. I want to know whether Mr Vincent got the money, not whether the Aboriginal people got the money.

The Opposition is entitled to know where the \$250 000 has gone for the presentation of submissions to the Seaman inquiry. One would expect, bearing in mind that the inquiry is to decide how land rights will be implemented, that the people putting forward submissions would not need high-priced lawyers or high-priced activists to present their views. Mr Seaman, being a man of great compassion, should be quite happy to sit down with the Aboriginal people in the Kimberley and ask them what they want. He could take note of the fact that they are not well-educated or that they are not QCs, and he could listen to their arguments. That is what the inquiry is about. An amount of \$60 000 has been given to the

Kimberley Land Council to put forward a submission.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You have not read the report. Read chapter 6.

Several members interjected.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You have not read it, yet you talk about it as though you have.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not care what is in the submission to Mr Seaman. What I am concerned about is the taxpayers' money that is being used to prepare those submissions. I want to know who is receiving the money. There are rumours flying around everywhere that not only did Mr Vincent get \$16 000 for a day's work, but that also new Land Cruisers have appeared and money is being spent on things that one would not associate with a land inquiry. That is why I want to know where the money has gone. The Seaman inquiry has already cost \$500 000.

I would have thought that a Government or political party which already has a policy on land rights would not need to spend that much taxpayers' money to tell it what to do. It knows what it wants to do and together with the Federal Government it will do it anyway. However, the money has been spent and the Government refuses to tell us where it has gone. I think it has something to hide.

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I spent the first half of my speech giving the answer as to why we did not put in a submission. I suggest to the honourable member that he reads Mr Seaman's discussion paper. Mr Kelly, I have already explained why we did not put in a submission. I do not want to go over that again. I did say that I had answered that question 450 times, but for Mr Kelly 500 times would not be adequate.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You could have argued for the status quo.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Seaman inquiry was set up to look into Aboriginal land rights. The reason the present Government did not make submissions to a multitude of inquiries which were undertaken during our term in office and the reason we have not made submissions to all the inquiries being undertaken by the present Government should not debar either party from making a comment on those inquiries.

I wish the Minister would settle down and get a new speech writer or answer writer. He does his block during questions on notice. The Minister for Planning enjoys reading the answers out and he gets quite a smile on his face. I suppose the answers have been written by Mr McDonald who

is a consultant on any matter which the Government—

Hon. Tom Stephens: You make Bjelke-Petersen look like a left-winger. He will be bringing down land rights legislation soon. You will be embarrassed when you see that.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Another question I asked yesterday, which was answered today, related to a group of people who were transported from Carnarvon to Geraldton at a cost of \$1 600. I was advised that this was the cost of hiring a bus and the provision of accommodation for those people who went to Geraldton. The purpose of the trip was to discuss the Seaman inquiry discussion paper.

I asked why the amount of \$1 600 was spent when it would have cost \$281.60 to fly Mr Seaman to Carnarvon, thus saving the taxpayers \$1 300. The reply I received said that I did not know anything about the Aboriginal consultation process, that Mr Seaman had nothing to do with it, and that a central point was required.

This allows for an exchange of views with people on a regional basis. It would have been a lot cheaper for Mr Seaman to go to Carnarvon and explain the discussion paper.

I cannot see why I am attacked because I think it would have been cheaper to send Mr Seaman to Carnarvon rather than hire a bus, take Aboriginal people to Geraldton at Government expense, accommodate them overnight, and take them back again. They would have got a better deal if Mr Seaman had gone to Carnarvon and it would have saved some money.

It is a deplorable situation if I am not entitled to ask questions which will save the Government, that is the taxpayer, money without being subjected to drivel of this nature. The answer continued as follows—

Members will naturally appreciate that because the Opposition have no views on the issues and are unwilling or unable to address the issues, other members and organisations within society have accepted the inquiry as establishing a firm basis for proposed Government legislation.

That is the reply to my question about wasting \$1 300. The same answer applies as was given in the last half an hour of debate.

Our views on land rights are well known and agreed to by about 80 per cent of the population.

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Our views are quite straightforward and well known; we are opposed to granting land rights based on the Northern

Territory model because we believe it is racist. It provides laws for people based on their race and we are opposed to that in principle. We are also opposed to the practical application of it. We have made our position quite clear to the community and from surveys carried out we know that the vast majority of the population agree with us. They do not agree with people like the Hon. Tom Stephens or with the Minister—his comments indicate that he is a man with his head stuck in the sand or his answer writer is living in a false world. I hope that in the future the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs will give me a fair go by answering my questions in a fair way and providing the information I require. If the information requested is confidential or secretive he should tell me so.

Hon. Tom Stephens: How many questions did your Government answer on the cost of the Noonkanbah convoy when your party was in Government?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not propose to go into that.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It answered no questions whatsoever.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I accept the right of members opposite to do this; when Mr Dowding sat on this side on many occasions he gave the Government a serve because of answers which he believed were not satisfactory. He was entitled to do so just as I am entitled to say that the present situation is not satisfactory. The Minister is using question time to give political speeches and he is not answering questions. That is not acceptable. I do not mind the political speeches but I would like an answer contained in them somewhere.

I make one final point relating to the sale of Bow River Pastoral Station. I have a sneaking suspicion that we have land rights in the Kimberley by default. The Government is buying pastoral leases and I understand another two have just been sold in the Halls Creek area. I have asked a question but have not received a reply.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Wait for the answer before you comment.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am looking forward to receiving that. When one looks at the number of pastoral leases held by Aboriginal communities, one could be excused for thinking that land rights in Western Australia could be introduced by purchasing pastoral leases, giving them to Aboriginal communities, and not requiring the communities to abide by the Land Act. Therefore, the pastoral

lease is not run as a viable enterprise but, to use a word of Mr McDonald's, it becomes a "homeland".

A Government member: That is a good reason for making a submission.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not believe that is what should happen to pastoral land in Western Australia. It should be used to its maximum economic potential.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Where will you put the Aborigines—in the Roebourne gaol?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Bow River station was purchased by the Government for \$450 000.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It was not. It was purchased by the community.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Using funds provided by the Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It was not. The community borrowed money in advance and bought the station.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The funds were provided on the basis of \$200 000 from the Aboriginal Development Commission and \$250 000 loaned by the State Government. The Government purchased it with funds provided by the taxpayers.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is not correct. You are a pompous fraud.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Minister has interjected and he is right off the track. The next part of my comment relates to repayment of the loan. I asked the Minister to provide details of the terms and conditions of the loan of \$250 000 to the Warmun Community. I cannot remember how long ago this sale was announced, but in reply to a question in the House I was advised today that no formalised details of the loan have yet been set.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister for Planning knows that the reading of newspapers is out of order.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I presume the Minister's interjection saying that the community has borrowed the money means it will pay back the loan.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is right.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: We presume that the community will pay back the \$250 000, but the information provided in reply to my question is that no details have been finalised. Can the Min-

ister by interjection tell me over how many years it will be paid back, how often the repayments will be made, the interest rate to be applied to the loan, and other details of the loan?

Hon. Peter Dowding: Can you not read the newspaper? It was an advance on funds to which they were entitled.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The information in newspapers and replies to answers can be two different things. I asked a question about the details of the loan. If the newspaper stated one thing it would not necessarily be true, but we know that all answers to questions in this House are absolutely true. The Government never tells lies in the House or provides false information in answer to questions! If the answer is that no formalised details of the loan have yet been set, that must be the correct situation.

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I ask the Minister to give me further details in the adjournment debate. I am not sure that the money will be paid back, but if it is a loan I want to know what are the conditions.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Would you like it to be a grant?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Not necessarily. I am not sure.

Several members interjected.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Your inability to be sure about this issue is well known.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am asking the Government to account for its actions; I am not accounting for mine. I am not buying pastoral stations for Aborigines. The Government is providing loans to the Aborigines and together with money provided by the ADC they are buying pastoral stations.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You would prefer it to buy a gaol perhaps?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. Tom Stephens: Your Government produced the highest imprisonment rate in the world.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: We all know that the comments made by the Hon. Tom Stephens are inane. We accept that there is a problem with regard to imprisonment of Aborigines. We accept that Aborigines have grave poverty problems. Nobody ever denies those problems. In fact, I have asked this House to set up a Select Committee to inquire into these matters.

Hon. Tom Stephens: What did you do during the nine years your party was in Government?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I was too busy doing other things. I now have more time.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: This Government has had one year in office and it is time that substantial improvements were made in the conditions of Aborigines. I accept that things were not done in the past and Aboriginal people live in poverty in many instances and too many of them are in gaol.

Hon. Tom Stephens: We will not accept that situation and we will do something about it.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Regrettably the member has misunderstood my use of the word "accept". I meant that I am aware of the situation, not that I find it satisfactory. I know there are too many Aborigines in gaol and too many of them live in poverty. That is why the Opposition seeks to do something about it.

A Government member interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The sum total of the Labor Party's efforts for Aborigines since it has been in power has been one inquiry held at a cost of \$500 000 or thereabouts, and I would imagine much more is to be spent on the inquiry. The Government seems to think that if it gives land rights to Aborigines all the problems will go away; that is nonsense. We have suggested that this House set up a committee which will have a good look at and find out what this Government has not done. The committee will find out how serious the Government is.

I have taken the opportunity of this debate to refer to the many misconceptions being floated around by the Minister who is always hot under the collar and who will not give answers to questions to which this House is entitled. He can be assured that questions will be asked day after day until he gets as sick of them as I do and until this House and the people of Western Australia know where the money has been spent in connection with the Seaman inquiry.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You are a terrible fraud.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is a pity that the Minister seeks to interject at this stage because he has missed the first nine-tenths of my speech.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I heard it on the speaker in my office and it was a pitiful attempt.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It would have saved the Minister from interjecting if he had heard my speech previously. With those few uncontentious remarks, I support the legislation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. John Williams.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [9.13 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### *Electoral Boundaries: Comments by Minister*

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [9.14 p.m.]: I do not want to leave the House without commenting on one of the articles in this morning's paper. I do not want to talk about the article so much as one of the expressions used which has already been referred to this evening by a previous speaker. The expression was used by Mr A. R. Tonkin, a Minister of the Crown, who is alleged to have said, "No politician will be able to get his grubby little fingers on the map and draw a line to save his own seat". I know to what he refers, and what inference he is drawing. I can speak from the heart, because at one time I lost my Assembly seat as a non-Government member through a re-distribution which took it four ways.

We have a sorry standard of political force in this State when we allow ourselves to reach the situation of a Minister degrading himself, his colleagues, and his Parliament. After all, we should be responsible for the institution to which we belong. Not only has the Minister degraded himself, his colleagues, and his Parliament, but also he has cast disrepute on the Electoral Commission which comprises Sir Francis Burt (Chief Justice), John Morgan (Surveyor General), and Douglas Coates (Chief Electoral Officer). The statement made is one of the saddest statements I have read in the Press for many a long day. I take strong exception to it, as others most probably do. In some way or another, this Parliament should get a message of apology to the Electoral Commissioners for and on behalf of a member of Parliament who has spoken out of line.

If the Minister had any gumption, he would have risen in his seat in another place and apologised to his colleagues and to the commission. I have been waiting all day for that to happen in a ministerial statement, but it has not happened. I cannot leave without registering my deep concern that we have reached the stage of reducing ourselves to getting into the gutter.

Comments like that are made for one or two purposes. They are made either to gain the atten-

tion of the Press, which is cheap in itself, or purposely to smear the Parliament so as to do away with the necessity for the Parliament in the eyes of the public. It could be done with no other purpose.

The Minister has my contempt. There are other ways of being a statesman and putting a point to the public, no matter what the legislation is.

We should have some simple method in our Standing Orders—I have checked the Standing Orders of both Houses—whereby we can chastise a Minister, call him to order, or call him before the House. I know a method is provided but it is so complicated that one would not go through it. A previous exercise in the House proved that point.

No member, whether on the Government or the Opposition side of this House, would care to associate himself with the words printed. No-one could agree with the inferences that were made and then go home tonight and say, "I have done a good job in Parliament today".

**HON. GARRY KELLY** (South Metropolitan) [9.19 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to dissociate myself from the remarks that have just been made.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Surprise!

Hon. GARRY KELLY: As the speaker said, this matter was raised earlier this evening, and in the course of interjections members tried to make the point that there had been a deliberate misconstruction of the remarks reported in the Press. It has been alleged that the remarks were disrespectful of the Electoral Commissioners; but nothing could be further from the truth. Our party on this side of the House recognises the job that the commissioners do in drawing the boundaries for the election of members to both Houses of this Parliament. That is not the point.

The point is that the rules under which the commissioners work are rigged, they are crooked, and they are drawn by politicians with their own interests in mind. To make the point absolutely clear one only has to look—

Several members interjected.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: —at the electoral map to see the crooked line which has been drawn around the alleged metropolitan area. That line was not put there by the commissioners. It was put there by this Parliament, which is controlled by politicians; it is controlled by politicians not from this side of the House. The effect of that line is to weight the electorates in favour of members on one side of the line as opposed to members on the other side of the line. That line on the map is

the means by which this Parliament is brought into disrepute.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer mentioned the fact—  
Several members interjected.

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): The House will come to order. I ask the Minister and others to stop interjecting.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: The previous speaker said that the comments of the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform brought the institution of the Parliament into disrepute.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: Was he correctly quoted?

Hon. GARRY KELLY: The comment in the Press is the only comment I have seen. The comment was said to bring the Parliament into disrepute; but nothing could be further from the truth. What brings the Parliament into disrepute is the fact that the electoral laws of this State mean that members of Parliament are not elected on a fair and democratic basis. The Parliament does not represent the views of the electorate.

Several members interjected.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: I said the comment as reported in the Press, and commented on by the previous speaker, brought the institution into disrepute. What brings the Parliament into disrespect and disrepute is the rigged, gerrymandered electoral boundaries upon which the Parliament is elected.

The only way to raise the esteem of this Parliament in the eyes of the people of Western Australia is to reform the electoral laws and the Constitution Acts so that members of Parliament are elected on the principle of one-vote-one-value. Then and only then will this Parliament have the respect that it should have in the eyes of the people of Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

The **PRESIDENT**: I ask the Hon. I. G. Pratt to desist from interjecting.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: So much nonsense has been spoken tonight about protecting the integrity of the Electoral Commissioners. As I said, it is not the Electoral Commissioners who are at fault; it is the rules under which they work which are corrupt. They were designed to protect certain party-political interests. What should be attacked is the basis on which the commissioners worked. Members of the Opposition should not try to hide behind the fact that the Minister is allegedly attacking the commissioners. That is not the point at all. He is attacking the rules under which the commissioners worked. When the rules are cleaned up, the Parliament will have the respect it



deserves, and it will be able to function as a democratic institution.

**HON. JOHN WILLIAMS** (Metropolitan) [9.24 p.m.]: The last speaker used the words "rigged", "corrupt", and "crooked" in regard to the electoral laws.

**Hon. Peter Dowding**: He is dead right.

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: He then went on to say that nothing is wrong with the Electoral Commissioners.

**Hon. Garry Kelly**: That is right, too.

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: I say there is everything wrong with Electoral Commissioners who will dabble in corrupt, rigged, and crooked laws.

**Hon. Peter Dowding**: They are given a direction from this House, you silly Billy.

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: I happen to know the three commissioners. Sir Francis Burt is the Chief Justice and Lieutenant-Governor of this State—

**Hon. Peter Dowding**: He would have no alternative but to deal with it on the basis of directions from this House. You have read the report.

**Hon. Garry Kelly** interjected.

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: I have told Mr Kelly before that when I am on my feet making my speech, I will make it. I will appeal to the Chair if necessary to have you thrown out if you continue interjecting.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! The speaker will address the Chair and not the member.

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: I am just about fed up with Mr Kelly being so thick that he cannot understand what it is all about.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**Hon. GARRY KELLY**: I would like him to withdraw the last remark.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: What was the remark?

**Hon. GARRY KELLY**: I know the debate is getting rather heated, but there is no need to start slinging off at people.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: What remark do you want withdrawn?

**Hon. GARRY KELLY**: The member threatened me.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: If you cannot give me the remark you wish to have withdrawn, I will have to sit you down.

**Hon. GARRY KELLY**: The member referred to me as being thick, and he threatened to have me thrown out on direction from the Chair.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT**: That is not a point of order. I have already corrected the speaker on his feet and asked him to desist from referring to the member as he did. I have corrected that matter.

I ask the Hon. John Williams to continue.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed.*

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: I will not say Mr Kelly is thick, I will say he is thin!

The remark made by the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform is disreputable by imputation. The imputation is that corrupt laws are being administered by three eminent people in the State, one being the Chief Justice, one being the Surveyor General, and the other being the Chief Electoral Officer. I know full well that one could not get those people to administer crooked laws.

Is it not amazing that those same crooked laws were not in vogue when the electorates of Sandy Lewis and Mick Gayfer disappeared altogether under the Tonkin Government through the drawing of lines? Is not that a bit strange?

**Hon. Peter Dowding**: What did Bill Withers say in this House?

Several members interjected.

**The PRESIDENT**: Order! When I call "Order" I ask members to come to order. I ask the Minister not to continue with his constant barrage of interjections. I ask the member addressing the Chair to do that, and ignore the interjections.

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: I apologise. It is just that the constant rip, rip of the interjections does not allow one any reasoned argument.

The imputations contained in the article may not have been intended by the Minister. If members had allowed me to make that point, perhaps they would not have become so heated. My point is that it was reported in the Press and therefore, by imputation, the names of those three gentlemen have been besmirched. It is all right for us to say that the commissioners must administer the rules, the law, and what have you. We understand that; but the man in the street does not understand it to the same degree as we do.

The journalist's quoting or misquoting of the Minister in this way leads me to suggest seriously that it would be a good thing if the Minister were to issue a statement to the effect that in no way did he intend to impugn the integrity of any mem-

ber of the Electoral Commission, past or present, in order to clear up the matter. That is my appeal. The man in the street could be very worried by the exaggerated words the Minister used, words such as "rigged", "corrupt" and "crooked". I hope the Minister will clarify his comments to remove any slur he may have inadvertently cast on members of the Electoral Commission.

**HON. V. J. FERRY** (South-West) [9.31 p.m.]: I agree with the comments made in recent minutes about remarks reported in the Press and attributed to the Hon. Arthur Tonkin, the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform. Earlier today I referred to his comments reported in the Press and also to remarks he made on a radio talkback programme today when he implied that 17 members of this Chamber had drawn the lines of their own provinces. Members need not rely on me but can obtain a transcript of that radio talkback programme to ascertain what the Minister said.

What the Minister implied was that the Electoral Commissioners could be persuaded, pressured, or coerced to draw boundaries as we would wish them to do. He implied that they were cor-

rupt commissioners prepared to accept the directions of 17 members of this Chamber in order to alter the boundaries of their provinces. That is completely unworthy of the Minister and it is completely unacceptable that the Parliament should have to put up with that sort of nonsense.

**Hon. G. E. Masters:** He should resign.

**Hon. V. J. FERRY:** Yes, he should resign.

**Hon. Peter Dowding:** Come on—shake the sand out of your hair.

**Hon. V. J. FERRY:** The Minister implied that the Electoral Commissioners are capable of being subjected to this sort of thing from anyone in this Parliament.

Several members interjected.

**Hon. V. J. FERRY:** Government members show their contempt for Parliament and all Electoral Commissioners, including the Chief Justice, by their inane interjections.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.33 p.m.*

# QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

890. *This question was postponed.*

## SUPERANNUATION

### *State Scheme: Review*

894. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

- (1) Is the Government currently reviewing the operation and rules of the State superannuation scheme?
- (2) If "Yes", when does the Minister expect the review to be completed?
- (3) Will the Government table in Parliament any such review to ensure public scrutiny of any of its recommendations?
- (4) Has the Government received an initial or interim report on the review of the superannuation fund?
- (5) If "Yes", will the Government table in Parliament a copy of the report?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) A committee set up by the O'Connor Government comprising senior Government representatives is currently reviewing the State superannuation scheme.
- (2) The review of the scheme is a complex arrangement and has required a great deal of research by the committee. The Government is hoping that the review will be completed by early 1985.
- (3) The Government will decide whether to table the review when it is in receipt of the document.
- (4) It is assumed that the reference to a review of the superannuation fund actually refers to the review of the Superannuation Board. The latter conducted by management consultants, Price Waterhouse and Associates, is a review of the management structure and investment policy of the Superannuation Board, including an evaluation of current proposals before the board and some existing investments.

The Government has received an initial draft report from the management consultants on the review of the Superannuation Board.

If the member is referring to the triennial report of the superannuation

fund, the answer is that the Government is not in receipt of a report.

- (5) The Government has only recently received the consultant's draft report and is in the process of analysing its contents. The Government is not prepared at this stage to table the report.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: OIL

### *Exploration: Offshore Boundary*

902. Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Attorney General:

In view of the arrangements made between former Commonwealth and State Governments to ensure that Western Australia was represented at the negotiations between the Commonwealth and Indonesian Governments in respect of the seabed boundary between Australia and Indonesia for the purpose of defining oil exploration and other maritime rights, would the Attorney General advise whether or not Western Australia was represented at the last meeting which took place in Canberra in March last?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

There was no meeting in March last. However, a round of negotiations was held in Canberra from 2 to 4 February 1984 between Australian and Indonesian officials on the delimitation of the maritime boundaries between Australia and Indonesia. The Western Australian Government was represented at those negotiations.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

### *Bunbury Power Station: Service Corridor*

903. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that before Muja was chosen by the Government as the site of a new power station discussions were held between the State Energy Commission and a number of Bunbury people on the understanding that Bunbury was the then favoured site for the new station?
- (2) During those discussions it was understood that a service corridor would be created from the Bunbury power station site to the hinterland, and I ask whether

it is still intended to relocate existing power lines into such a corridor, thereby advantaging local land holders and enhancing the aesthetic appearance of the local environment?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This matter is being considered in conjunction with the development of the Bunbury regional plan which is being co-ordinated by the Town Planning Department.

904 and 905. *These questions were postponed.*

### PASTORAL INDUSTRY

*Lease: Bow River*

906. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Why was the Bow River pastoral station purchased by the Government for an Aboriginal community when—
  - (a) there is some doubt that the community wants the station; and
  - (b) there is a station manager who currently leases the Goose Hill grazing lease, who wished to purchase Bow River?
- (2) Why has the lease over Goose Hill been terminated?
- (3) Will the Government compensate the lessee of Goose Hill grazing lease for any improvements made on the lease?
- (4) Will the Government reconsider its decision to terminate Mr Lilley's lease over Goose Hill?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) (a) It would be appropriate for the member to redirect this portion of his question to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs;
  - (a) presumably the member is referring to Mr K. J. Lilly, in which case the Department of Lands and Surveys has no record of any recent application by Mr Lilly for the Bow River Station pastoral lease.
- (2) The special "grazing" lease over the area known as Goose Hill Station was terminated because of extensive overgrazing and degradation of vegetation, and extensive and unabated free

ranging practices in the locality resulting in major damage to waterholes and wetland vegetation on conservation reserves.

- (3) A special lease was granted for the express purpose of "grazing", and the lease document contained the following clause—

Compensation shall not be payable to the lessee in respect of any improvements effected by him on the demised land and remaining thereon at the expiration or earlier determination of the lease.

- (4) No.

907. *This question was postponed.*

### STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

*Bunbury*

908. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What progress is being made to provide adequate regional headquarters in Bunbury for the State Emergency Service?
- (2) Will additional staff and equipment be made available to assist the Regional Co-ordinator at Bunbury?
- (3) If so, what arrangements have been made, and when will the new moves take effect?
- (4) Is the Government intending to introduce legislation to support the State Emergency Service?
- (5) If so, when will the Bill be introduced into Parliament?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) The matter of premises and staff for the regional headquarters of the State Emergency Service in Bunbury will be considered during the normal process when formulating the 1984-85 Estimates.
- (4) and (5) The member will be aware that the Government has set up a committee to review emergency services in this State. The question of legislation is within its terms of reference, and will be considered following receipt of the committee's report and recommendations, expected later this year.

# TRAFFIC

## *Cyclists: Offences*

909. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

As it is an offence for a juvenile to ride a bicycle on a footpath not designated as a cycleway, is it a matter for action to be taken against the offender by—

- (a) the police; or
- (b) local council?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The police.

910 and 911. *These questions were postponed.*

# APPRENTICES

## *Government Departments and Instrumentalities*

912. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

As at—

- (a) 31 July 1983; and
- (b) 31 March 1984;

how many apprentices were employed in the south-west region of WA by—

- (i) the Main Roads Department;
- (ii) the Forests Department;
- (iii) Westrail;
- (iv) the Public Works Department;
- (v) the Department of Agriculture;
- (vi) the State Energy Commission; and
- (vii) the State Housing Commission?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (a) and (b) The information requested will take some time to collate and will be forwarded to the member by letter in due course.

# PARLIAMENT

## *House: Front Steps*

913. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works:

Concerning the steps at the front of Parliament House—

- (1) How many slabs were replaced?

- (2) How many persons were involved in supervising and carrying out the repairs?
- (3) How many man hours were involved by all parties concerned?
- (4) What has been the total cost of the project to date?
- (5) When is it envisaged the job will be completed and the projected cost at that completion date?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) 120 slabs.
- (2) Excluding the contractor's staff, two Public Works Department officers were involved.
- (3) The contractor's times are not known; however, 55 hours were involved regarding Public Works Department officers.
- (4) \$18 409.
- (5) Estimated completion date is 30 April 1984.

Estimated final cost is \$21 230.

# LAND: ABORIGINES

## *Rights: Inquiry*

914. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

Will the Minister provide a detailed, itemised account of all moneys so far expended by the Government in the conduct of the Seaman inquiry and the associated Aboriginal liaison committee?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The member is referred to an answer given previously to question 5229 asked by his colleague, Mr Peter Jones. The copy of the material relevant to the member's question is herewith.

The Opposition seems to be concerned about the question of expenditure incurred in both the Seaman inquiry and the Aboriginal liaison committee.

Members will no doubt appreciate that the State Government must incur reasonable expenditure in the running of any inquiry. Members will also appreciate the necessity of the inquiry from the point of view of the protection of the State's interests in areas of concern, e.g., the relationship between the grants of Aboriginal land and mining and pastoral industries.

The alternative would be for the Government not to expend any money and to allow the Commonwealth to legislate in this area. Members will appreciate that we are most concerned to protect the State's interests. If for no other reason, the Opposition should support the State Government's initiative in setting up the Seaman inquiry.

Members opposite of course, not participating in the inquiry, would no doubt be prepared to simply allow the Commonwealth to legislate in this area regardless of the State's wishes. The Burke Government is not prepared to follow that course.

Hon. N. F. Moore: I just want to know how much it will cost.

#### TOURISM: COMMISSION

##### *Advertising: Radio Station 6PR*

915. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is it correct, as reported in the *Sunday Times* of 8 April 1984 that the WA Tourism Commission has allocated the whole of its annual radio budget of \$200 000 to Radio 6PR?
- (2) If so, on what basis is the total budget for any agency permitted to be channelled into one section of the media?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

##### *Power Lines: Bunbury*

916. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that land described as being Lots 4, 5, 6, 13 and 14 adjacent to Jubilee Road, Glen Iris, Bunbury, owned by D. E. Wass is substantially disadvantaged by high tension transmission power lines of the State Energy Commission traversing this property?
- (2) Is he also aware that this property is likely to be further disadvantaged by the excision of land for a proposed—
  - (a) railway spur line; and
  - (b) main road?

- (3) If he is aware of the existing and proposed public services affecting Mr Wass' property, what action is being taken to compensate him for loss of productivity, property devaluation and personal trauma arising from these difficulties?
- (4) If he is not familiar with the circumstances affecting this property, will he please investigate the matter with a view to resolving the difficulties?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) I am aware that 132kV transmission lines traverse those properties.
- (2) (a) and (b) The precise location of these facilities is not yet known.
- (3) and (4) The question of compensation can be addressed once the plans are finalised.

#### TOURISM

##### *Bungle Bungle: Tours*

917. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to my previous questions relating to Bungle Bungle in the Kimberley, and ask—

- (1) In view of the Minister's statement that tourist promotion of Bungle Bungle will be delayed until a control and management plan for the area has been completed, why is it that, as late as last week, the WA Tourism Commission has been part of nationwide advertising generating tourist interest in Bungle Bungle?
- (2) Why is it that Airlines of WA was allowed to promote Bungle Bungle as a tourist destination with the overt backing of the Tourism Commission when another arm of Government is apparently yet to complete a control and management plan for the area?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) I believe that the member is referring to the listing within the publication, *Australian-made Holidays*. The copy deadline for this publication was late November 1983, at which time it was anticipated that the Airlines of Western

Australia tour programme for 1984 would proceed.

Subsequent deliberations have identified the need for the completion of a control and management plan prior to the Tourism Commission endorsing further promotion of the region.

- (2) Airlines of Western Australia promoted its 1984 Bungle Bungle tour programme on the basis that such tours would operate "subject to Government approval", and this fact was clearly stated within the promotional brochure. The inclusion of the tour within the brochure was a commercial decision by the airline.

#### LAND: RESERVE

##### *No. 16044: Cancellation*

918. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) What stage have negotiations reached between the State and the Commonwealth Governments for the cancellation of a lease over Reserve No. 16044 for land ceded by the Bunbury Council in 1915 to the Commonwealth for the purpose of a rifle range?
- (2) As the land contained in Reserve No. 16044 originally formed part of Reserve No. 670 (Bunbury endowment lands) will this land be returned to and included in Bunbury endowment lands?
- (3) If the land contained in Reserve No. 16044 is not returned to Bunbury endowment lands, what is the reason for denying the people of Bunbury the benefit of a long established and acknowledged benefit?
- (4) If the land contained in Reserve No. 16044 is retained by the Government, what compensation will be paid to the Bunbury City Council for some 37 hectares formerly comprising portion of Reserve No. 670 but now comprising Reserves No. 31044 (technical school site) and No. 32805 (advanced education centre site)?
- (5) Does the Government intend to compensate the Bunbury City Council for any other parcels of land already excised from Reserve No. 670?
- (6) Is the Minister aware that undue delay in satisfying the needs of the Bunbury

City Council in their handling of endowment lands could seriously jeopardise orderly planning for the most desirable land use to cater for the growth of the city?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Reserve No. 16044 is currently leased to the Commonwealth on a yearly basis, and the Small Bore Rifle Club operates within that area. The Department of Lands and Surveys has recently been involved in discussions with the City of Bunbury, Commonwealth Department of Administrative Services, and the Army concerning the relocation of the rifle club, and a particular site is presently being examined by various authorities for its suitability.
- (2) and (3) Over a number of years the Town of Bunbury has maintained that the rifle range reserve should be included in the adjoining endowment land. However the town has been advised by successive Premiers that this land, as a matter of firm Government policy, would be retained for Government purposes.
- (4) and (5) No compensation will be paid.
- (6) No.

#### LAND

##### *Crown: Vacant*

919. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

What is the total area of vacant Crown land in the South-West Land Division?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The calculation of the information sought by the member would be a costly and time consuming exercise, particularly if townsite Crown land were included.

However, if the member would be satisfied in terms of broad acres exclusive of townsite land, an effort will be made to provide the information direct. This could take a little time in view of the considerable number of public plans involved.

## TOURISM

*Bungle Bungle: Tours*

920. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to the WA Tourism Commission's advertisement in *Australian-made Holidays* regarding Bungle Bungle, and ask—

- (1) How many readers have responded to the advertisement by mailing the coupon to the WA Travel Centre?
- (2) Upon receipt of the coupons by potential tourists expressing interest in the Bungle Bungle tours, how has the Travel Centre been advised to respond to the inquiries now that tourist promotion of Bungle Bungle has been delayed?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) 34.
- (2) The Holiday WA Centres are advising inquirers that tour programmes into the Bungle Bungle area are currently not being endorsed by the Tourism Commission. Further product information relating to the area will be provided when prepared and available in accordance with confirmed control and management objectives.

## MINING: DIAMONDS

*Lake Argyle: Aboriginal Community*

921. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

Further to my question 826 of Tuesday, 3 April 1984, will the Minister—

- (a) provide details of the terms and conditions of the loan of \$250 000 to the Warmun Community; and
- (b) provide the names of the Aboriginal communities that are being consulted on the future allocation of funds?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (a) No formalised details of the loan have yet been set;
- (b) 1. Mandalgala  
2. Guda Guda  
3. Balangarri  
4. Warringarri

5. Woolah
6. Warmun (Turkey Creek)
7. Bungle Bungle
8. Jarlalu (Frog Hollow)
9. Baluwah (Violet Valley)
10. Rugan (Crocodile Hole)
11. Yardungal (Dingo Springs)
12. Emu Creek
13. Mirima
14. Dambaral (Bubble Bubble Springs)
15. Kumbarumba
16. Marralum
17. Ningbingi
18. Moongoong Darwung
19. Mulliakar
20. Molly Springs
21. Kununurra Aboriginal Medical Service.

## TOURISM

*Bungle Bungle: Tours*

922. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to his answer to me on Wednesday, 4 April 1984, in which he specifically states that "the Tourism Commission is not prepared to endorse tourist promotion of Bungle Bungle until the control and management plan for the area has been worked out" and ask—

- (1) Upon what grounds can he state that the Tourism Commission is not prepared to endorse tourist promotion of Bungle Bungle when the Tourism Commission's own advertising to stimulate interest in Bungle Bungle appears on page 85 of the booklet *Australian-made Holidays* distributed with the April edition of the *Australian Women's Weekly* throughout the nation last week?
- (2) Why was Airlines of WA led to the belief that it could sell tours into the area when, by the Government's own admission, the Bungle Bungle area was denied access to the airline because of the need to complete



the so-called control and management plan?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) and (2) Refer to answer to question 917.

## ABORIGINES

### *Aboriginal Lands Trust: Leonora*

923. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Further to my question 835 of Tuesday, 3 April 1984—

(1) Will the Minister advise whether the agreement of the Leonora Aboriginal Movement Body to the transfer of Reserve No. 24481 to the Aboriginal Lands Trust was obtained in writing?

(2) If so, will the Minister provide the names of any persons who signed such an agreement on behalf of the Leonora Aboriginal Movement Body?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) and (2) My information is that the matter was discussed at a meeting of the Leonora Aboriginal Movement Body and it was unanimously agreed at that meeting that the reserve should be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

## RECREATION

### *Model Aircraft: Control*

924. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Local Government:

Will the Minister initiate discussions with local authorities on the safety aspects and control of the flying of model planes, bearing in mind the fortuitous escape of a South Perth boy from injury after the crash of a model plane at the weekend?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I am informed that local authorities regulate the activity of flying model planes on public reserves through by-laws made under the provisions of the Local Government Act. However, the safety aspects of flying model planes are controlled under Commonwealth air navigation regulations which are administered through the Department of Aviation. The Minister for Local Government believes it would be more

appropriate for the matter to be raised with that department to determine whether action is possible in cases similar to the instance referred to.

925. *This question was postponed.*

## ROAD

### *Nanutarra-Wittenoom Road*

926. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Transport:

Will the Minister advise whether the future alignment of the Nanutarra-Wittenoom Road will pass through Paraburdoo to link up with the sealed Tom Price-Paraburdoo Road?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The future alignment of the Nanutarra-Wittenoom Road from the Paraburdoo turnoff to Wittenoom is currently being investigated, but no decision has yet been made on its final location.

## MR GRAHAM McDONALD

### *Employment by Government*

927. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

(1) Is Mr Graham McDonald employed by the State Government in any capacity?

(2) If so, will the Minister provide—

(a) the details of Mr McDonald's employment; and

(b) the qualifications and experience that Mr McDonald has which qualify him for this position?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

(1) No. Mr McDonald is employed as a consultant.

(2) (a) To consult as required;

(b) Mr McDonald has a law degree and has practised as a barrister and solicitor for 12 years.

## BUSINESSES

### *Registration: Fee*

928. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

(1) Has the fee for the registration of a business name been increased?

- (2) If so, what is the new charge, and what has been the percentage increase over the previous charge?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.  
(2) \$50, an increase of 150 per cent on the previous charge of \$20.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Is that all?

## COMMUNITY WELFARE

### *Department: Bus Charter*

929. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

Further to my question 877 of Wednesday, 4 April 1984, will the Minister provide an explanation for the decision to transport a group of Aborigines from Carnarvon to Geraldton at a cost to the Government of \$1 600, when the cost of an air fare from Perth to Carnarvon and return for Mr Seaman would have been \$281.60?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The member misunderstands answer (2) to question 877. Nowhere is it said that Mr Seaman attended the meeting.

If the member knows anything of the Aboriginal consultative process, he may be aware that the State is divided into seven regions. Aboriginal representation from each area within the region is chosen by meetings of Aboriginal groups. Those delegates then attend at a central point. This allows for the exchange of views from people on a regional basis.

It was a system used by the Liberal Party when in Government.

As the member will appreciate, it is important for Aboriginal people to be fully informed of the complex issues arising from the Seaman discussion paper so that Aboriginal individuals and communities may address their concerns to Mr Seaman.

Members will naturally appreciate that because the Opposition has no views on the issues and is unwilling or unable to address the issues, other members and organisations within society have accepted the inquiry as establishing a firm basis for proposed Government legislation.

Hon. N. F. Moore: What garbage; what absolute garbage!

Hon. A. A. Lewis: No wonder you were—

Hon. N. F. Moore: Once again he misunderstands the question. Why don't you answer a question occasionally?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: You ought to button your lip.

930. *This question was postponed.*

## MINING

### *Act: Exemptions*

931. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

Further to my question 880 of Wednesday, 4 April 1984, will the Minister advise—

- (a) the duration of the exemption;
- (b) the names of the Government departments, if any, which need to make decisions affecting the Leonora area; and
- (c) the matters about which decisions need to be made?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (a) The exemption is of a temporary nature only and although the precise period is not known, it is not expected to be long;
- (b) and (c) there are a range of matters and departments which are involved, and ultimately it is expected that Cabinet will make the decision; the exemption results from requests by industry.

## FISHING

### *Jewfish: Bag Limit*

932. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Acting Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Does the Government propose to reduce the daily bag limit on jewfish for amateur fishermen?
- (2) If so, what is the reason for this reduction?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife is currently carrying out a review of all existing bag limits.

No proposals have yet been put to the Government for consideration.

# COURTS

## *Legal Information Retrieval System*

933. Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Attorney General:

- (1) With reference to the answers to question 882 of Tuesday, 10 April 1984 is the Attorney General aware that the contract referred to involved an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government for access to Commonwealth laws and judgments?
- (2) Did the State Government object to this arrangement which effectively gave priority of availability of the system to users in NSW and Victoria?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The concept of the New South Wales system includes the possibility of incorporating legal material from the Commonwealth and the Australian Capital Territory. The agreement only refers to the fact that the New South Wales Government will use its best endeavours to procure from the Commonwealth Government the grant to the operator of an authority to include such material in the system. It is my understanding that at this stage no such arrangement has been made.
- (2) No. As indicated in my reply to question 882, residents in Western Australia will be able to use the Eastern States schemes by arrangement with the operators.

# QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

## ACTS AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS) BILL

### *Copies*

222. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House:

In view of the shortage of copies of the Acts Amendment and Repeal (Industrial Relations) Bill, will he—

- (1) Make sure members get sufficient copies of the Bill?
- (2) Delay progress of the Bill until copies can be circulated to interested people for comment?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) This matter was raised with me earlier by Mr Lewis. I am not prepared to delay progress of the Bill. I am prepared to see that all members of this Chamber have at least one copy and as many other copies as they require. Most of the interested parties have been supplied from my office with as many copies as they have asked for. I only wish this matter had been brought to my notice before today. I am rather amazed at a statement made to me privately that members are being asked to pay \$2 for a copy of the Bill. If that is the case, I will see it does not occur again.