

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 18 November 1982

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

The Late Sir Arthur Griffith

Condolence: Motion

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [2.17 p.m.]: I move—

That this House records its sincere regret at the death of the Honourable Sir Arthur Frederick Griffith, former President of the Legislative Council, former Minister of the Crown and Member of the Legislative Council and Assembly and tenders its deepest sympathy to his widow and members of his family in their bereavement.

I was dismayed and surprised when I heard this morning of the untimely death of Sir Arthur. He was a man who served this Parliament well for many years. He was a member for the seat of Canning at a time when there had been seven or eight members for that district over about the same number of terms of Parliament. He was a member of the Legislative Assembly for a three-year period, and then became a member of the Legislative Council. I came to Parliament in 1959, and during my first term Sir Arthur was Minister for Mines at a time when tremendous development was taking place in the State, and there was a great deal of strain and much for us to learn in that particular field.

Sir Arthur carried out his duties assiduously at all times, and with a great deal of integrity. He later became President of the upper House and served in that capacity for something like three years. Sir Arthur was very well respected by members on both sides of the House. He could be relied on totally in every way and he carried out his duties with a great deal of honesty and integrity.

I knew Arthur personally because he was a member for a province which also encompassed my electorate of Mt. Lawley. We worked as running mates in the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly on various occasions. He was extremely hard-working and when he left Parliament he carried on some duties on behalf of the State. He was involved with the Zoological Gardens Board, and recently had been at the fore in endeavouring to obtain a new lions' cage area at the South Perth Zoo.

I had the pleasure of being with Sir Arthur about two weeks ago when he appeared to be in extremely good health and he reminisced about the number of years he had been a member of Parliament.

On behalf of members on this side of the House, and members of the Legislative Council, I express our sincere regret at the loss of a very good Western Australian and a man who served this State very well. I pass on to his wife, and to his daughter Ronelle, our sincere regrets.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [2.20 p.m.]: On behalf of the Opposition, I second the motion moved by the Premier.

Little did I think about 30 years ago when I was responsible for Sir Arthur no longer being a member of this House that I would be seconding a condolence motion to him. The Premier has mentioned his characteristics; I think most of us knew him as a plain sort of person in that he was not one for a great amount of grandstanding or anything like that. He did his job as he saw it and satisfied everybody to the best of his ability.

I am sure his recent efforts have not gone unnoticed and perhaps the Zoological Gardens Board, when it gets enough money to build the new enclosure, might name it the Sir Arthur Griffith lion enclosure. It would be appropriate inasmuch as in life he was subject to the lions' pit in this House and in another place.

I have known his wife and daughter during the time I have been a member, particularly his wife, whom I met at a number of functions, and who is a most pleasant person. We regret that she has to bear this grief, and we all grieve with her. It comes to all of us, and it is most regrettable that it has occurred to her.

It is fortunate perhaps that we are able to express our condolences on what may be the last day of this Parliament, whereas if we had not been sitting, Sir Arthur's passing may have gone less noticed and been merely recorded in some future Governor's Speech.

To Sir Arthur's widow and daughter and other members of his family I extend on behalf of the Opposition the sympathy that is associated with this occasion. We hope their grief will soon be overcome by the knowledge that his activities in his lifetime will be respected by those who were associated with him, and that he accomplished much during his stay on this planet.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Primary Industry) [2.20 p.m.]: While the Premier has offered condolences on behalf of the Government, on this occasion I would like to say a few words on behalf of my colleagues, because I knew

Arthur Griffith for many years. At the time I met him—long before he came into this Parliament—Sir Arthur Griffith, then Arthur Griffith, was an administrative officer in the Air Force. Of course, the member for Welshpool will recall the occasion about which I am speaking.

Arthur has been known very well to me since our first meeting; while we did not always agree, certainly in the Air Force, I have always had a great respect for him and his ability.

On behalf of my colleagues, I add our condolences to Lady Griffith, and my personal sorrow at the passing of a man who was respected in this State.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [2.21 p.m.]: The National Party joins other members in supporting this condolence motion in relation to the late Sir Arthur Griffith. We convey also our sympathy to his family.

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I invite members to rise in their places and observe a period of silence as a mark of respect for the late Sir Arthur Griffith.

Question passed, members standing.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: SUBIACO CITY COUNCIL

Health Department: Petition

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [2.23 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

TO:

The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned ratepayers & business people of the City of Subiaco, petition an urgent inquiry into the actions of the Health Department of the Subiaco Council. Your petitioners in duty bound will ever pray.

This petition bears 134 signatures. I confirm and certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 43.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: SUBIACO CITY COUNCIL

Health Department: Petition

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [2.24 p.m.]: I have a petition in similar terms, bearing 23

signatures. I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 44.)

LIQUOR: TAVERN

Wanneroo Shire: Petition

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [2.25 p.m.]: I have three petitions. The first contains 476 signatures and reads as follows—

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

We the undersigned citizens of Western Australia protest very strongly at the decision of the Minister for Local Government to allow a tavern to be built next to the Heathridge Primary School, contrary to the wishes of local people. We ask that the decision be immediately reversed.

We your petitioners, as in duty bound, will every pray.

I certify that the petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 45.)

EDUCATION: ABORIGINES

Curriculum: Petition

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [2.26 p.m.]: The second petition contains 176 signatures, and reads as follows—

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

We, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia voice our concern that teaching in Western Australian Schools does not include a comprehensive coverage of Aboriginal Culture, History and Society.

We call on the Government to ensure that a proper and effective curriculum for Aboriginal Culture, History and Society is produced and included in the Educational Programme of all Western Australian students.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest con-

sideration and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

I certify that this petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 46.)

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Smoking: Petition

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [2.27 p.m.]: The third petition contains 39 signatures and reads as follows—

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

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

I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 47.)

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Smoking: Petition

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [2.28 p.m.]: I have a petition in terms exactly the same as the last petition presented by the member for Gosnells. It bears 329 signatures, and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 48.)

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Smoking: Petition

MR COURT (Nedlands) [2.29 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

TO:

The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the Undersigned supporters of Winfield Claremont Speedway, wish to protest at the Bill, currently before State Parliament, which aims to ban certain forms of promotion and advertising by Tobacco companies.

Sponsorship by the Winfield Company has been the major factor in the rise of this Speedway to its position as Australia's No. 1 venue for the sport. Without the help from the Winfield Company, the sport must decline in this State, with a consequent decline in employment generated by the Speedway Industry.

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

The petition bears 865 signatures. I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 49.)

STAMP AMENDMENT BILL (No. 6)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 26 October.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [2.31 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this Bill, but indicates it is a pity it comes up for debate at a time so late in the life of this Parliament. At the outset I say that this State has lost and is losing millions of dollars from the Treasury as a result of evasion and avoidance schemes involving stamp duty. While this Bill goes to the closure of just three areas in which avoidance has proved to be expensive for the people of this State—areas that have been exploited by people who want to avoid their obligations—for the benefit of members I intend to identify five other areas which are still providing the scope for avoidance and evasion and which will not be addressed by this Bill.

We have a situation in this State in which millions of dollars have been stolen from the State Treasury by very dubious and artificial schemes involving the avoidance or evasion of stamp duty. I do not think anyone can say about this Government that it has been anything but tardy in the pursuit of the closing of these loopholes, because they have been well known for many years now. In general discussion, knowledge has been passed from person to person about the different loopholes that can be exploited so easily.

Mr Speaker, I know you will be surprised to learn the details of one of the companies which has been involved in this sort of avoidance, because it is a company which has been the recipient of Government assistance to a considerable extent and it is a company I am sure which members believe has not performed to the level expected of it when it was smiled upon by this Government some years ago.

The company I refer to is Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd., which on 9 July 1979 lodged with the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs a document which showed that Bunbury Foods Pty. Ltd. had transferred its register of shares to Peet Marwick Mitchell and Co. in Darwin and on 3 August the same year had the register returned to Perth. That is a company which has benefited to a considerable degree from the application of taxpayers' money, yet that company, which was benefiting from Government guarantees from taxpayers' money, at the same time was using an artificial scheme to avoid paying its obligations to the public of this State.

Mr O'Connor: Does this Bill close that loophole?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It closes part of the loophole. The point I am making is that even if it closes it all—and the Treasurer can smile if he likes, but I will venture to say he will not even follow the details—why has it taken since 1979, when this case was current, until 1982 for any action to be implemented? I will explain to the Treasurer the doubts which exist about whether one of the amendments made in this legislation does close that loophole entirely.

It is true that this company, which benefited from Government guarantees from taxpayers' moneys and which will now it seems in its liquidation cost the taxpayers of this State a further considerable amount of money, was cheating on its stamp duty obligations. I say "cheating" because it is an artificial scheme which transfers a register to Darwin for one month and then brings it back.

Let me be as brief as I can in outlining firstly how this legislation addresses itself to those areas of avoidance involving the use of discretionary and unit trusts as a means of conveying property.

Mr Evans: How much was the company worth?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There seems to be a considerable amount of doubt, but there is no doubt about the millions it will cost the State.

Mr O'Connor: I might just mention that the company refuted what was said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I saw the publicity, and I do not believe the company did that. But I have here the official Corporate Affairs Office documents which show the transfer on that date—

Mr O'Connor: I do not refute that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —and the return to Perth on a date a month later.

This legislation addresses itself also to the execution of documents outside the State to avoid the payment of duty, and this is one of the areas I have touched upon already. It addresses itself also to the increasing of interest rates of lending transactions after a loan has been made. I do not want to go through all the detail I have because at this time obviously it would not meet with the approval of all members, but for the Treasurer's edification I indicate that the one area in which it may not be that the execution of documents outside the State will be covered by this legislation is that area of avoidance which reduces the value of property on which duty is to be calculated. It involves the granting of an option to purchase and the acquisition of the option by the buyer, with that acquisition occurring outside the State.

Mr O'Connor: Reducing the value of what?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It involves reducing the value of the property and the acquiring of an option by someone outside the State. Our advice is that there seems to be some doubt about whether that part of the Bill which addresses itself to the execution of documents outside the State will cover that example. I will touch briefly on those areas which we believe are not addressed by this legislation.

The first tax avoidance loophole which on our advice is operating today and which is not addressed by this legislation could be most appropriately termed the "verbal" avoidance. If no document can be construed to be an instrument, no stamp duty is imposed. For example, if an offer is made in writing, but is made prior to the transaction taking place, and the acceptance of that offer is verbal, no instrument is available that attracts duty—duty is avoided. That is one clear area which should be the subject of legislation to ensure that those people who exploit this area are forced to pay the tax. It really boils down to the proposition or the truth that verbal contracts do not attract duty.

The second area of avoidance that is not addressed by this legislation might be termed the new allotment of share schemes. The new allotment of shares or the allotment of new shares does not attract duty. The value of existing shares may be diluted by the issuance of new shares, and when a vendor wishes to dispose of an interest in a

company, new shares can be allotted to the buyers and the old shares will thus be transferred at a much diminished value; that is, one is disposing of an interest by watering down the value of existing shares with the issuing of new shares which do not attract duty. That is a loophole that is being used; it is not difficult to comprehend, and it should be attended to by Government.

Another area of avoidance of stamp duty works on the basis that, if a contract for the sale of property is excluded and the buyer does not wish to go ahead with the deal, but another buyer comes in and takes his place, the second buyer acquires the same rights under the contract originally held by the first buyer and does not pay duty. So the second contract avoidance scheme is another way in which duty is being avoided and it is something to which Government should at least pay some attention in order to make sure that the rights of the public in this State are protected.

The fourth of the five ways that I indicated the Opposition was aware that are being pursued by people wanting to avoid taxes might be called the annuity bond method. An annuity bond is any contract to secure moneys. Duty is assessed on the value specified in the bond, but if no certain sum of money is specified as being payable either as a maximum or a minimum, there is nothing on which duty can be assessed. That seems to us to be a very vulgar and crude, yet effective, way, we are advised, of avoiding stamp duty; that is, simply by deleting any reference to a maximum or minimum amount of money when referring to an annuity bond.

The fifth way of avoiding stamp duty is by way of the joint venture avoidance scheme. Contributions to joint ventures are dutiable, but what happens is that a small amount is contributed to a joint venture, that attracts duty and later further payments can be made which do not attract duty but which can multiply the first initial small payment by tens, thousands, and sometimes, I suppose, millions of dollars when we are talking about major joint ventures.

What I have tried to demonstrate very briefly today is that this State has lost millions of dollars in past months and years as a result of artificial avoidance schemes which have cheated Western Australian taxpayers of moneys that were rightly theirs in the general sense and rightly theirs in the sense that the moneys should have been paid as stamp duty. That occurs with a whole range of companies—and I have referred to only one because of its specific or particular nature and involvement.

There have been instances where registers have been transferred out of State for periods of three or four weeks so that duty can be avoided and then the registers have been brought back to this State. In the case that I referred to as the unkindest cut of all, we have a situation in which a company which has been pampered by the taxpayers and which by virtue of its defective performance has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars, also has been in the business of cheating on its stamp duty, and this cheating occurred as long ago as 1979. While I have attempted to explain, and am supporting, the proposition that this Bill addresses itself to the closure of some loopholes permitting stamp duty avoidance, I have indicated to the Premier that perhaps the three areas addressed are not addressed as securely as he thinks they are—but it is a question on which there is some conflicting advice, I suggest. Leaving those three areas aside, there are five other areas of which I have today given details which are presently being exploited by people who want to avoid the payment of stamp duty.

I do not need to belabour the point to the Premier about the need for Governments to be assiduous in the collection of revenues in difficult times such as these, and although we did not fly at the Premier's throat and ask him where he is going to get the \$1.6 million or the \$2 million to do this or that, obviously he would realise that the closure of these five extra loopholes will probably bring in sufficient revenue without promoting the funding of schemes such as those that have been announced recently—the five areas that I have spoken about.

I will recap on those schemes briefly. The joint venture scheme implies the payment of a little at first, the payment of duty on that little bit, then the payment of a lot more later, but not the payment of any duty. The no-instrument scheme or the verbal-offer scheme is where an instrument cannot be found which for the purposes of this legislation will attract duty. The new share allotment scheme is where new shares are issued to dilute the value of existing shares and where new shares do not attract duty. The dual contract scheme is where the first contract attracts duty, the second contractor receives all the benefits inuring to that first contract, but pays no duty on the second contract, and thus duty is avoided. The annuity bond scheme is where no maximum or minimum amount is listed and where the failure to list that maximum or minimum amount means no stamp duty is paid.

The Opposition supports the legislation. We say, frankly, that it does what we would do if we were in Government.

Mr Bertram: Is it retrospective?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is another point. When he foreshadowed the Bill, the Premier said it would be retrospective and subsequently he announced it would not be retrospective.

Mr O'Connor: Retrospective to the date I announced it. That is what I said at the time.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is right.

Mr O'Connor: There were some complications that the Taxation Department found where it would be almost impossible to do that, and that is why we had to give another date.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: A Press release that the Premier issued stated 1 July 1982.

Mr O'Connor: Correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Premier announced—

Mr O'Connor: It would apply from that date.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —it would apply from 1 July and subsequently announced that would not be the case. I do not want to get into that argument. Everyone knows the arguments about retrospectivity, and the Premier can row his own boat there, but as far as this Bill is concerned, there are areas which are now providing a service for people who want to escape their responsibilities; this legislation does not address those areas and this legislation is really a form of tardy reflection on what was necessary to combat exploitation of loopholes that everybody knew were the order of the day some years ago.

We support the Bill.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [2.49 p.m.]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support of the Bill. My reply will be fairly brief. Officers of the Taxation Department and I want to ensure that taxes which should be paid are paid. The Leader of the Opposition can rest assured that the points he brought up in this House will be taken back to the Taxation Department for further investigation.

The Leader of the Opposition brought up the point regarding Bunbury Foods. I have seen the Press comments which indicate there was no avoidance in that area. These are the points that should and will be investigated.

Further points raised by the Leader of the Opposition are covered in this Bill. I refer to some of the comments I made in my second reading speech as follows—

In brief, the various proposals will affect schemes which involve—

(a) the use of discretionary and unit trusts as a means of conveying property;

(b) the execution and retention of documents outside the State to avoid the payment of duty; and

This sort of thing has been suggested in relation to Bunbury Foods, but it is covered by this legislation. My comments continued—

(c) the increasing of interest rates on lending transaction after the loan has been made.

That was another point that was made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Every area where there is the possibility of tax avoidance or tax evasion should be investigated properly. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the Commissioner of State Taxation is not tardy in relation to these matters and he spoke to me recently about them.

I will investigate the other areas mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and advise him accordingly.

I thank the Opposition for its support of this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 November.

MR PARKER (Fremantle) [2.54 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this Bill, although I have some concern about it, and I know the member for Welshpool is also concerned about it and will express his views shortly.

The purpose of the Bill is to allow those persons with religious convictions to follow those convictions and not be compelled to vote. This Bill is the result of a recent case where the Chief Electoral Officer challenged a person who failed to vote in the Kalgoorlie by-election because of his religious convictions. That person was prosecuted for failure to vote. The court held that under the existing

Act that person who was a Jehovah's Witness did not have sufficient grounds to be exempted from voting.

I understand that under this legislation a person with religious convictions of that kind will not be required to vote. The reason such people do not desire to vote, as I understand it, is that they do not recognise the power of Governments, but rather that of the Kingdom of God. They do not consider it is their responsibility to vote. They do acknowledge, however, that they recognise the laws made by those people who are voted into Government by the people who vote. If a person feels he does not wish to participate in the choice of candidates of our earthly political parties and simply wants to make peace with his maker, he will have that right. However, such people will be obliged to register with the Electoral Department because they concede they live in this society and they should abide by the conditions of this society.

When voting, no-one is forced to fill out a ballot paper and put it in the ballot box. It is not a requirement that the ballot paper should be filled out in a formal way. It could be placed in the box without its being completed, or it may not be placed in the box at all.

I have some reservations about the Bill, but it conforms with legislation in other States and for that reason the Opposition supports the Bill.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [2.57 p.m.]: I cannot see the necessity for this legislation. I am aware of the recent court case, but I note that there is a provision in the Act to cover a person who because of a religious conviction is precluded from attending a polling place on the day of voting. The section to which I am referring is section 90(1)(e) which reads as follows—

- (e) is, by reason of his membership of a religious order or his religious beliefs—
 - (i) precluded from attending at a polling place; or
 - (ii) precluded from voting throughout the hours of polling on polling day or throughout the greater part of those hours;

In other words, he is able to make an application for a postal ballot paper.

The point that worries me, even though the Opposition supports the Bill, is that this legislation lends itself to manipulation. I hope the Minister has taken this matter into consideration. I have discussed the question of people with religious convictions with many people from overseas to ascertain what occurs in other countries, where the political parties may not be as honest as those in this country. They are not all lily white here,

and neither are their supporters. From what I can ascertain, they obtain lists of names of people belonging to various religious sects and who claim exemption from voting. They then make sure that a person votes in that person's name for his particular party. The person whose vote was used is not aware that he is registered on the electoral rolls as having voted.

It would be more honest if a person with religious convictions were compelled to attend the polling place, even if he placed a blank ballot paper in the ballot box. At least this would prevent someone else from voting in his name. This sort of thing is more likely to happen with organised computer systems. Lists of names of those people who belong to various religious sects could be compiled, and used by dishonest groups to cast votes in other people's names.

This seems to be a strange provision. These people should not be excused from their requirement to attend the polling booth. Such a provision leaves the Act open to manipulation. Some time ago, the Government brought to Western Australia that brilliant judge who studied the electoral situation and reported he saw no evidence of double or false enrolments. Nevertheless, he recommended closing a possible loophole in the system by limiting the category of people who could witness electoral enrolment cards.

However, in this area where steps could be taken by dishonest people to cast votes illegally, the Government takes action to make the offence easier to commit. It seems to be weakening the legislation. The Minister, of course, will say that penalties are provided for people who break the law and who vote in other people's names. These things happen. If we allow this loophole to remain, we can be certain that overenthusiastic or dishonest people will take advantage of it. It should not be allowed to happen. The Government has stuck out its neck with this amendment, because in fact it may be encouraging people to break the law. If breaches occur, the blame must fall on the Government for not more clearly providing that people who claim to be associated with the various religious sects must be able to prove that association. Section 156(16) of the Electoral Act states—

Every elector who—

- (a) fails to vote at an election without a valid and sufficient reason for such failure . . .

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty—Twenty dollars.

The phrase "valid and sufficient reason" is to be defined as an honest belief on the part of the elec-

tor that abstention from voting is part of his religious duty. However, from what I can see, he is not required to fill out forms or statutory declarations to that effect.

I have some doubts as to whether it is desirable to include this provision in the Act. Obviously, the Government feels it should be included because the legislation in other States contains such a provision. However, I would like to see some sort of saving clause which would ensure the clear identification of those people who claim their association with a religious organisation prohibits them from meeting the requirements the Act imposes on the general community. After all, even if a person is not liable to pay tax, if he has worked, he must submit a taxation return. If a person's name is taken from the electoral roll and he is required to present himself for jury service, he must attend on the day stipulated. At that point, of course, he can plead to the bench that justifiable reason exists for his being exempted, and he may be so exempted. However, this provision will not work in the same way.

I believe this will result in more people taking to religion, simply because they do not want to pay a \$20 fine. People will be prepared to say voting is against their religious convictions and, having established the precedent, they can continue to claim that exemption year after year. Of course, the State Electoral Department will not examine its records thoroughly enough to establish whether, in fact, that has been the pattern of that person's behaviour at each and every election. So, those people who are lazy, or who do not want to live up to their responsibilities in the community, will be able to get away with not voting by claiming involvement with a particular sect which prevents them from voting. These people still should be obliged to present themselves at the polling place and have their names ticked off the roll and thus be part of the community, which includes responsibility for electing the Government.

For what it is worth, I indicate the Bill has our limited support. However, it contains pitfalls which will manifest themselves clearly over the years as this provision comes into effect.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Deputy Premier) [3.07 p.m.]: I thank the members for Fremantle and Welshpool for their limited support of the legislation. The matter has been discussed thoroughly in another place, and the intention of the Government is well known. I acknowledge the concern and doubts expressed by both members. This legislation needs to be kept under surveillance to see how the provision works. However, it represents a genuine effort on the part of the Government to accommodate conscientious objec-

tion on religious grounds. We should give the legislation a go and if it is abused in any way, we will have another look at it.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

LOAN BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 26 October.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [3.10 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this legislation.

I will not go to great lengths to talk about the Bill, or to mount all sorts of arguments touching on the three main proposals contained in it. However, I have a couple of points to make about debates that have been occasioned on pieces of legislation similar to this one. I am pleased that the Treasurer has returned to the Chamber.

It seems that every time I am not here, the Treasurer has a field day, embarking upon quite vitriolic criticism of me.

Mr Bryce: Uncharacteristic for the Treasurer!

MR BRIAN BURKE: It was uncharacteristic, but that is not now the case. It seems that it is now characteristic.

I have taken the trouble to read through the Treasurer's speech in respect of the General Loan Fund, and I was interested to read some of what he said. His remarks do not perturb me greatly, because the people hearing or reading those things can judge for themselves. However, I do take exception to the Treasurer's saying all those things when I was not here, although it may be more convenient in some ways.

It is true that I am here most of the time. If anyone bothered to add up the periods of time that the Treasurer was absent and those during which I was absent, they would be roughly the same periods of time in terms of hours of absence. In fact, I venture to guess that perhaps the Treasurer, with his official duties, is absent even a little longer than I am, from time to time.

Two or three members, or 55, can play the same game, and wait until people are absent before criticising them in their absence and in their inability to reply at the same time to that criticism.

I will not go step by step through all the things the Treasurer said about me. I assure him that I am probably as competent as he is to deliver rebuttals to each of them, and address myself to new matters that he raised in his speech and, as competently as he could, criticise some of those things. I do not intend to do that; but I do say that I resent the implication about dishonesty or insincerity. That is not a remark that sits easily with the Treasurer.

I will not backtrack to engage in a disparaging debate; but I suggest, if the Treasurer is willing, that we debate publicly, in any forum of his choosing or of anybody else's choosing, step by step, every one of those criticisms he raised. He could deal with each of those that he thinks I have raised. I do not seek any special consideration about time, venue, audience, or forum. I am perfectly prepared to engage the Treasurer in debate in any forum that he thinks is appropriate; and I am perfectly prepared, in public, in a debate of his choosing, to list all of those things that he believes are matters of contention, where he thinks I have made misstatements or errors. I will deal with those in the way that he thinks fit.

I ask only that I be present, and that I have the chance to answer the points that he raises. I suspect that in the months leading up to the next election, the time will come when a public forum presents itself, in which the Treasurer will be able to state his case and I can state mine.

However, I would ask the Treasurer to desist from conducting this "war" *in absentia*, because although it does not perturb me greatly, it is not an appropriate way of dealing with the contentious matters when one side of the argument is in Albany or somewhere else.

As the Treasurer knows, I am perfectly prepared to co-operate in any way possible to have legislation debated when he wants it debated. He has always indicated that he would return the same co-operative spirit in discussing matters that I wanted debated at a certain time, when I wanted them debated.

It is probably an unwise practice to debate contentious matters if one or other of us is absent. I am perfectly prepared to stand in public, in any forum that the Treasurer chooses, and debate those matters with him. I ask no special advantage or consideration except that I be present, and that the Treasurer state his case, outline his argu-

ments, and give me the opportunity to do the same, so the people can judge for themselves.

The Opposition supports the Bill.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Treasurer) [3.16 p.m.]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support of the Bill. I will reply briefly to the points he made.

When the Leader of the Opposition was replying to the Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget, he made some scathing remarks about me. At the time I said I would come back in due course.

Mr Brian Burke: But you were here then.

MR O'CONNOR: Sure; I expected the Leader of the Opposition would be back on Friday.

Mr Brian Burke: No-one made any inquiries.

MR O'CONNOR: The General Loan Fund Bill went on for a day or two, and at that time I pointed out a number of what I considered to be inaccuracies which I felt ought to be raised in the House. I did it on the basis of disclosing to the House what I believed were grievous errors, and ones that should have involved *Hansard* advice accordingly.

I had no intention of debating the issue in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition. I would have done it had he been here.

I believe that we spend too much time in this House debating some things when we could spend that time on more fruitful areas.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support for the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

PAY-ROLL TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Requested Amendment

Amendment requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Tubby) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

The amendment requested by the Council is as follows—

Clause 4, page 3, line 36—Delete “worker.” and substitute the following—

worker, but this subsection does not apply to the current term of any arrangement entered into by an employment agent before 12 October 1982 which extends after 1 January 1983 if the Commissioner is satisfied that no provision was made in the arrangement for the payment of pay-roll tax in respect of that term.

Mr O'CONNOR: This amendment is now before the Committee, as a result of recent representations made to me.

As the Bill is a taxing measure, it cannot be amended in the other place and consequently the request for this Chamber to consider the proposed amendment.

By paragraph (d) of clause 4 of the Bill, a new subsection (2a) is to be included in the law which will make liable for payroll tax certain arrangements entered into by employment agents who “on hire” the services of a person.

The proposed amendment is to apply from 1 January 1983.

However, it has been drawn to my attention that although most of these arrangements are of short duration, some existing arrangements would extend beyond 1 January 1983 and, therefore, become liable for tax.

As these arrangements were entered into prior to the Bill's being introduced into the Chamber, it is unfair to make them liable to tax until such time as the term has expired.

Consequently, I propose to move an amendment which will exclude from the payment of tax the current term of any arrangement entered into before 12 October 1982—the date of the second reading—and which go beyond 1 January 1983 if the arrangement did not already make provision for the payment of the tax. This gives the commission some discretion.

I therefore move—

That the amendment requested by the Council be made.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition supports the amendment. As the Treasurer has outlined, it goes to the relief of the burden imposed on people

in respect of contracts entered into and binding at rates or at levels of obligation which subsequently have been changed by the Budget legislation. We cannot see any objection that should be raised to, wherever appropriate, allowing the obligations to persist unchanged, particularly when those people on whom the burden of payment falls have no ability, because of their contractual arrangements, to adjust their own returns.

This Bill points to a much wider problem which is one to which I have referred previously; that is, the burden of payroll tax on the community. Surely it brings home to the Treasurer that, if we are having to make amendments specifically in this regard, the burden is a substantial one that is a disincentive to employment and that has to be looked at realistically if we are to set about sensibly to solve or help to solve the present unemployment problem.

It is true also that, despite the concessions made in respect of payroll tax in the Treasurer's Budget, the concessions amount to about one-fifteenth of the increase that the State will obtain in revenue as a result of payroll tax and its natural escalation in revenue terms in the coming year. Therefore, the increases or the concessions are not really concessions about which we should write home.

The Opposition supports the amendment.

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for support of the amendment. Like him, I am concerned about the burden of payroll tax on the community. However, by way of letter and discussions with the Prime Minister, we are endeavouring to replace this tax with something else. So far, however, we have been unsuccessful.

Mr Tonkin: Keep working at it.

Mr O'CONNOR: We will do so, along with the other State Premiers.

Mr Brian Burke: I think you will need a new Prime Minister. You will not get much out of this one.

Mr O'CONNOR: The present Prime Minister is a pretty tough character—I do not deny that. All the States are concerned about payroll tax, because we do not like it. The level of payroll tax in this State is below that in other States; for instance, the rate in Victoria and New South Wales is six per cent compared with five per cent here. We will continue to look at this matter in the interests of those who are burdened with it.

I thank the Opposition for its support of the amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's requested amendment made.

Report

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

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

In Committee

Resumed from 17 November. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Tubby) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Progress was reported after Division 55 had been agreed to.

Division 56: Local Government, \$1 190 000—

Mr WILSON: I take part in this debate on the local government section of the Estimates to draw attention to some problems confronting young people attempting to pay off a block of land under the different rating systems pertaining to local authorities in Western Australia. In particular, I refer to the case of a young man—at 17 years of age—who, on the advice of his parents, decided to begin purchasing a block of land for a future home.

The block of land concerned happens to be in the Shire of Wanneroo which operates under a rating system based on unimproved capital value. The block is valued currently at \$12 800 and the rates levied amount to \$233 for the current financial year.

The person concerned did not think twice about this matter until he learnt by chance that the owner of an equivalent block of land only one kilometre away on the other side of Alexander Drive, in the Shire of Swan, where the rating system is based on gross rental value, was paying an annual rate for the current year of \$75, as opposed to the rate of \$233 which he was paying. He has been paying for his block for four years at the rate of \$177 per month. He also pays annual water rates of almost \$200 and land tax of \$85. In these times of high interest rates and associated problems for home buyers it is disappointing to witness the way in which this system militates against young people with the foresight and the will to make provision for a future home. Surely at these times, in particular, Governments at all levels should go out of their ways to provide incentives to such people. It is time local authorities, particularly those which operate under an unimproved capital value rating system, gave consideration to providing some concession to prospective young home buyers in the cases to which I have referred.

It is a rude shock to many of them to find that having made the wise effort to provide for their future home needs, they must pay out large sums of money on an annual basis for vacant blocks of land, on which they hope to locate their future homes. Of course, it is hard to determine how the Minister for Local Government can do anything about this matter, but I think it is wise and good that this problem be brought to the attention of the community and local authorities. In such time when difficulties fall on young home buyers, consideration should be given to easing their difficulties in regard to vacant land.

The second matter I raise refers to the proposed rezoning of a large section of land in Dianella adjacent to existing television stations TVW7 and STW9 held currently by the State Housing Commission. For the purpose of extending the land holdings of these media establishments, those holdings will be rezoned so that the new zoning will be considerably broadened; but the new zoning to the minds of many people will be specified vaguely. As I understand the proposal, enlarged areas will be zoned for the purpose of "media establishments".

Considerable concern has arisen about the proposals by TVW Enterprises Ltd. to establish the publishing and distribution premises of *The Western Mail* in the vicinity of those premises set aside for television and film studios. It had been understood for some time that a large area in this vicinity had been zoned and would be used for the purposes of television and film studios. However, the decision by the Housing Commission, largely at the request, I think, of at least one of the television stations, and in conjunction with the development of Dianella Drive and the arrangements that need to be made about the subdivision of the land in the vicinity owned by the commission, has resulted in a changed understanding of the use of these extended land holdings.

While people who have lived in the residential area in this vicinity for up to 30 years have grown to accept the idea of the use of the land for television and film studios, considerable concern has developed about the extended use of the land to be rezoned to include the rather vague term "media establishments", which certainly in the instance of one of the interested parties will include the establishment of a distribution and production base for a newspaper. Currently the newspaper is a weekly, but it has plans to become a daily in the not-too-distant future.

The real point of concern at this stage is that while the City of Stirling, as I understand, has made a decision to approve the rezoning proposal, the Cabinet, which must give the final approval

for the sale of the land concerned, has continued to withhold permission for the making public of a traffic study commissioned by the State Housing Commission of the effects of this development on surrounding residential areas.

It seems to me only fair that with this decision by the City of Stirling to approve the rezoning, and the subsequent 35-day period during which submissions in respect of the rezoning proposals may be accepted, the study which contains considerable information about measures that should be adopted to mitigate any undue invasion of established areas by increased growth of traffic movements, should be available to people wishing to make public comments on the rezoning proposals. I thought it would be fair at this stage that the decision for the rezoning proposal be advertised for public submission and response, and public approval or rejection, and that the details and recommendations of the traffic study should be made public now so that those making their submissions can do so with the full knowledge of that study. Therefore I urge either the Minister for Local Government, or the Minister with this responsibility, or the Cabinet as a whole, to give consideration to that plea in the light of the most recent developments of the situation.

Mr NANOVIK: I wish to make a few brief remarks about this division. I take the point that the member for Dianella raised regarding the difficulty experienced by young people to meet rate commitments. No doubt we all seem to show some resentment at having to pay rates when a substantial increase has occurred for the coming year. Of course, local authorities must survive by levying rates, and the problem for ratepayers is that they are required to pay this money in advance. A certain period is given in which to pay those rates, but on many occasions ratepayers resent having to pay the money.

Having been in local government, one finds a certain percentage of ratepayers will pay promptly, others show some resistance and will hold back the payment as a means of protest, and others do not pay for a number of months. Local authorities are then put in a position where they have to write threatening letters to recoup the money, but in general they may act fairly.

If a person can prove that he is finding it difficult to meet his rate payments, all that is required is a letter to express those problems and generally the council will try to help people who are experiencing difficulty.

Some councils adopt a strong attitude because they have their programmes for the next 12 months which they must finance. In some areas

local authorities are not helping people who are experiencing difficulties but they should show some compassion towards those people.

Some ratepayers, through ignorance, are not aware of the action they can take if they cannot meet their payments. In general terms, local authorities are helpful so I encourage people to contact their local authority if they are in a difficult financial position.

Mr Wilson: Don't you think there is a case for young people paying off blocks of land to have some concession on rates when they are not receiving any benefits at that time?

Mr NANOVIK: These difficulties are experienced in local authorities especially where people have decided to go to isolated parts of the shire and they do not have public transport facilities, electricity, etc. However, they make this choice and although they may find it difficult when the council strikes its rates during the year, it is a uniform rate, it is the means by which the councils levy their rates. If a council is genuine, and if people find it difficult to pay, the council generally will accept a certain amount paid to it on a one, two, or three-monthly basis.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I wish to draw to the attention of the Minister a local government matter which concerns the Boulder Brick and Tile Company. This firm has set up in a decentralised location and has shown great tenacity. I am very proud to offer any assistance to that firm because of its determination to succeed in the goldfields.

The firm is facing a problem for which really the Government is responsible and I feel the Minister could resolve this problem if she desired to do so.

In 1981, the State Housing Commission, in association with the Anglican Church agreed to build 12 aged persons' units in Kalgoorlie. The Boulder Brick and Tile Company tendered for the bricks that were to be used for the construction of those units and suggested they could be built at a cheaper rate if a hollow concrete block construction were provided in the goldfields. At the time, the company found the uniform by-laws prevented its using a hollow concrete block construction. The by-laws make some provision for the use of these bricks in the north-west areas of the State. The by-law states—

(3) In the districts of the Shires of Carnarvon, Exmouth, Port Hedland, Roebourne, Shark Bay, Upper Gascoyne and West Pilbara, a wall constructed of hollow concrete blocks shall be deemed to be a cavity wall for the purposes of sub-by-law (1) of

this bylaw and paragraph (b) of sub-bylaw (2) of by-law 36.1 if—

- (a) the wall is not less than 190 mm in standard thickness;
- (b) the hollow concrete blocks comply with by-law 28.2;
- (c) the design and construction of the wall complies with by-law 36.4; and
- (d) the wall is coated externally with—

The by-law continues on to say that the exemption is on the basis that the wall is coated externally with certain products that are waterproof.

The Boulder Brick and Tile Company wrote to the Minister about this matter on 5 May 1982 and in its letter gave a number of reasons that it should be possible for the by-laws to be amended to allow for this construction. The letter said in part as follows—

We wish to bring to your attention a problem we have discovered with the Kalgoorlie/Boulder area. According to the Uniform Building Bylaws—bylaw 36.7, it leads us to believe that if we wanted to build a habitable building in 16"x8"x8" blocks we may not do so because it is not a cavity wall as such, because it does not have a continuous cavity.

The letter continued on to say that a number of locations had constructions of this type in this State and the company gave the figures for a house of 300 square metres. The company said that \$1 728 could be saved in the actual labour content and in addition there would be a saving of \$3 132 in the brick content. The total saving amounted to \$4 860, a considerable sum for a normal-sized home and of course an even greater saving to the State Housing Commission and the Anglican Church for these 12 aged persons' units.

On 31 May I wrote to the Minister asking that this matter be hurried along as the closing date for tenders was 14 June 1982. However, as things turned out it was not possible for Boulder Brick and Tile to resolve this matter before tenders closed. On 24 June the Minister wrote to me saying that the building advisory committee at its meeting on 4 June had resolved to recommend that it was not desirable that the areas where single leaf hollow block construction is permitted should be extended. The Minister's letter stated—

This decision was based on the fact that in areas where such building is allowed rain is infrequent and temperature ranges are high. Consequently there is little scope for the penetration of moisture.

On 27 July, Boulder Brick and Tile replied to the Minister and was able to prove with the help of a large amount of research on the part of the Bureau of Meteorology, and by the company itself, that Kalgoorlie and Boulder had the second lowest annual rainfall, and little difference existed between the towns in the north-west and Kalgoorlie and Boulder on a temperature basis. On 17 August, Boulder Brick and Tile again wrote to the Minister pointing out the significant cost savings, and also suggesting once again the Minister should reassess the position. I followed the matter through in Parliament with a number of questions to the Minister, many of which no doubt she would recall.

One was question 1400 on 21 September in which I asked—

- (1) Further to question 1334 of 1982, is it fact that the so-called sound basis for the decision of the building advisory committee not to allow the use of single hollow concrete block construction in the districts of the Shire of Boulder and the Town of Kalgoorlie, was that such construction is only allowed in areas where rain is infrequent and temperature ranges high?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) could not the climate in the Eastern Goldfields be described in exactly those terms and, if not, why not;
 - (b) on what climatic data was the decision based?

The Minister replied as follows—

- (1) The building advisory committee's opposition to a relaxation of the requirement for habitable rooms to have cavity walls where masonry construction is used, is not based purely on meteorological statistics. Although I had originally understood that climatic conditions were the determining factor and had advised Boulder Brick and Tile to that effect on 23 June 1982, that advice was corrected in my further letter of 10 September 1982.
- (2) Answered by (1).

As a result of that reply, I asked question 1543 on 12 October in which I sought to find out what other factors were taken into account by the committee apart from rain and the temperature. The Minister replied as follows—

The building advisory committee's stand is based on cavity walling being a time tested

and proven method of permanently waterproofing external masonry walls.

If there were no requirement for cavities in external masonry wall construction, the external application of a suitable waterproofing substance would be necessary. Repetitive maintenance would also be essential in order to ensure permanency.

The committee has noted that there is no practical way of enforcing this regular maintenance.

In the committee's opinion, the appeal system offers the most appropriate means for any non-conforming building proposal to be considered on its merits.

Mrs Craig: I have often wondered whether this was the first time Boulder Brick and Tile had tendered to be able to build with these blocks.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is the first time to my knowledge.

Mrs Craig: I think it must have been a new innovation because if they had tried before, the same situation would have pertained.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I will come to that aspect in a minute.

In another question 1724 I asked whether the Minister could provide further details of the appeal system and the grounds for appeal. The Minister in her reply referred to the appeal system under the Local Government Act, and the fact that it was possible if the council's decision was not to allow the construction that an appeal could be made in writing to the Minister on the prescribed form. It seems to me that was not the solution of the problem before the Minister on this particular occasion. Under the building by-laws at present, the shires in the north-west are allowed to use hollow concrete block construction. That allowance is based on the proviso that some waterproofing method is adopted, and that method is outlined in the uniform by-laws. Provision exists for waterproofing, and there is no basis at present to suggest any check is made on whether repetitive maintenance is being undertaken. In addition, the appeal system is such that if Boulder Brick and Tile were to tender for another construction project of this nature—and another is about to take place on the eastern goldfields; namely, a joint venture between the Grand Lodge of Western Australia and the State Housing Commission, to build aged persons' homes—to be built of hollow concrete block construction, the company would be placed in the situation where the SHC would be able to say that construction was outside the law in terms of the current Uniform Building

By-laws. Therefore, it probably would reject the tender on that basis.

Mrs Craig: I think the council would reject it.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: That would put Boulder Brick and Tile in an invidious position in tendering for a project in any field while it cannot go ahead.

Mrs Craig: They are manufacturing a product they know cannot be utilised.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: The company is manufacturing the bricks for uses other than habitable homes. They are used underground in the Golden Mile to build up areas to prevent rock falls. The company wants to be able to use them in habitable homes. It suggests it would be good from the company's point of view in terms of profits and that it also would be quite cheap from the Government's point of view, and from that of any private person who wanted to build a house, to use hollow concrete blocks. I hope the Minister will ask the Uniform Building By-laws committee to have another look at this matter because it needs to be reviewed. I would prefer the committee to look at it rather than that it should go through the appeal system which could be cumbersome and which would make it difficult for the company in the meantime to obtain any tenders.

Mr BERTRAM: I want to put the record straight on a matter. On 23 September, as appears in *Hansard* on page 3174, I spoke for a few moments on the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Amendment Bill. At that time I reminded members how a Government of the same persuasion as the present Government, in about 1969, brought in a Bill for the purposes of denying a spouse, or particularly in its application, a wife, the right to sue her husband to recover damages for an injury received while travelling in a motor vehicle driven negligently by her husband. Subsequently the Minister when replying in the debate on 28 September at page 3232 of *Hansard* acknowledged the comments I had made and explained that her research had revealed that the facts as I related them were inaccurate.

I had told the Parliament that, as a result of the intervention of the Labor Opposition of the day, ultimately the Bill was withdrawn by the Government. I just wanted to provide the reference for those statements. Anyone who is interested and would like to check this matter out will find the debate recorded in volume 2 of the 1968-69 volume of *Hansard* at page 1362 and thereafter. The debate explains the nature of the Bill more precisely. Then on page 2944 of *Hansard* of 1968-69 the following appears—

**MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY
INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Order Discharged

MR BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [9.6 p.m.]: I move—

That Order of the Day No. 14 be discharged from the notice paper.

Question put and passed.

Order discharged.

So I place on record that my comment was perfectly accurate. The Bill was introduced, and ultimately it was discharged because it was such an unworthy measure.

Mrs CRAIG: I will reply briefly to those people who have made some comment to the general debate. The member for Morley last night sounded, I am sad to say, rather like a cracked record. Every time he gets up to speak about local government he says exactly the same thing.

Mr Tonkin: That is right.

Mrs CRAIG: He says that local government wants more autonomy. During the whole period he has been the spokesperson for the Opposition on local government matters he has never been able to indicate positive steps the Opposition would take. It is very difficult for one to know exactly what proposals he has in mind. I would have thought that over the period of a few years he could think of something better to put in front of people; some actions which he believed would be of benefit to local government. I would have welcomed such suggestions.

The Opposition still is carrying on in the extraordinary way which was commenced by the member for Victoria Park some years ago when he was Leader of the Opposition. He spoke at a Country Shire Councils Association conference, I think supported by the member for Geraldton, and he announced very firmly that 250 sections in the Local Government Act referred to the need for ministerial approval. That is not so; I think the correct number is 138 and the Government has been taking action to remove some of these provisions as we have been able to do so. We have reviewed whole sections of the Act, and, as it is possible to have the legislation drafted, we have moved towards taking away those matters with which local authorities very often do not agree.

Although the Opposition has had much to say on this subject, I have yet to receive any submissions from local government specifically requesting the removal of any of these provisions relating to ministerial approval. However, the Government believes it is necessary to change

some of these amendments, and we have been moving steadily towards that end.

Mr Parker: Haven't they asked for a wholesale review of the Act along SA lines?

Mrs CRAIG: The Local Government Association has not sought particularly a wholesale review of the Act. Every time Opposition members have spoken to local authorities in any capacity or at any conference, they have said it is the intention of the Opposition to review the Act. We on this side have been able to review the Act quite steadily over the last nine years, and in that period of time there has been no approach for any particular sections of the Act to be re-enacted.

Mr Parker: I am not talking about particular sections.

Mrs CRAIG: We have reviewed whole sections of the Act relating to such matters as electoral procedures and road closures. As the member knows, the Government is examining the sections relating to rating. We are moving all the time, in conjunction with local authorities, to ensure that the Act meets changing requirements. If the Act were reviewed, as happened in New Zealand—

Mr Parker: South Australia.

Mrs CRAIG: —we may find that it takes some 4½ years and that we end up with an Act far more voluminous than the present one.

Mr Parker: South Australia had a new Act.

Mrs CRAIG: I think the member will find that in SA there is no longer just one Act; there is a series of Acts. Some areas are being removed entirely from the jurisdiction of local government and inserted into other legislation. It probably would be the member's view against mine as to whether or not the result is better local government. Certainly I have not received any indication from local authorities that they would like WA to follow the South Australian model.

Local authorities suggested at first that they liked the NZ model, but when they discovered what had happened with the review and how much more voluminous the legislation was, the attraction palled somewhat. I agree that local government is a dynamic area of government and the Act needs to be reviewed constantly. However, a review in toto would take a great many people and a period of about five or six years, and then by the time the legislation was enacted, it would need amending again anyway. We must keep moving in this area to keep abreast of the changes.

The member for Morley talked about appeals. I remind him that in any appeals situation a decision will please only half the people. We use our

best endeavours to ensure that we are as fair as possible to all concerned. Approximately 800 local government and planning appeals are considered each year, and approximately half a dozen cases cause some controversy. I would like to say to the member for Morley, despite the fact that he said I was held in such ill-repute and that many people had insisted that all the decisions made were unfair, I could refer him to two letters which I have received recently from local authorities. The contents of these letters would surprise him greatly because they indicate the attitude that the appeal system has worked fairly and consistently.

Mr Tonkin: Two out of 139!

Mrs CRAIG: The councils wrote to me of their own volition, and one of the councils deals with many appeals each year. It is rather gratifying to know that the local authorities are pleased with the decisions.

The member for Dianella raised some interesting points, and indeed, his comments about rates and the anomalies in the various rating schemes and the decisions that local authorities take on behalf of their ratepayers were quite correct. He referred to the case of a young man who owns a vacant lot in the Shire of Wanneroo. The rates for this lot are \$233 a year, and he felt this was far too high, especially when nearby lots in the Shire of Swan, rated on a different basis, attracted considerably less.

The member for Dianella said he knew I could do nothing about the situation, and that is quite so. The Shire of Wanneroo adopted the rating system that is utilised least by the shires in the metropolitan area. We refer to it as the golden rule of rating that urban areas should be rated on gross rental values, and rural areas should be on unimproved capital value. Wanneroo has decided not to change to that method, and in doing so it made a judgment that it would prefer the rate burden to fall on residential rather than on industrial and commercial sections. Councils are quite free to make such decisions.

I do not know how we could achieve a system which would allow some sort of subsidy for young people in the situation to which the member referred. It is fair to say that local governments in the main, and even those anxious to see a new system of rating, are all of the opinion that a different rate should apply to vacant blocks of land. Suggestions have been put forward about a differential rating system, or maybe the two-tier rating structure mentioned by Mr McCusker. This suggestion was put forward by the Shire of Northam in the first place and a slightly different structure was suggested, I am told, by the Shire of

Wanneroo. Local authorities say that if the rates on vacant land are too low, the other ratepayers are penalised because the costs of administration are just as high in relation to vacant land as to improved land. This is one of the reasons that local authorities have asked for a rise in the maximum permitted minimum to \$150.

While I can well understand the suggestions put forward by the member to endeavour to assist this young person, it is an area where councils feel they are not able to offer much assistance without penalising other ratepayers, unless, of course, they are prepared to raise less money.

Turning now to the rezoning of land in Dianella; firstly, the Cabinet has not refused to release the traffic study report. It was necessary to reprint the report because of an error, and it will be available very soon. I agree entirely that this is necessary to enable local people to make submissions on a sound basis. They must understand the effect of the study on their area. I hope it will be available for the local people so that they may be made aware of as much evidence as possible. I have been told today by the honourable member that the Stirling City Council has approved the rezoning. That is not entirely in accord with my information, but the member's information may be more recent than mine. I can inform the member that the mayor told the Secretary of TVW Enterprises Ltd. that it would be proceeding, as I believe council considered that the particular media establishment is acceptable.

I understand that while the council was in accord with the proposals, it had not yet determined whether to amend the present scheme or to introduce the zoning in a new scheme. The matter may well have been resolved within the last few days. I am sure the people will hear about it at local level, and in the fullness of time we will know the exact decision of the council.

The member for Whitford referred to the situation that exists from time to time when people find they have great difficulty in paying their council rates in one moiety. We have great sympathy with people in this situation, and I inform members that in the replies I have received to my letters to local authorities about this problem, almost without exception I have been told that if such a person informs the shire of the situation immediately on receipt of the rate notice, arrangements can be made for the account to be paid on a monthly, quarterly, or some other basis. That is a good public relations exercise that local authorities can indulge in, and indeed, they often do.

The member for Kalgoorlie raised the vexed question of the Boulder Brick and Tile Company. He may well be interested to know that ever since I have held this portfolio I have been having what could best be described as a running argument with my building advisory committee about walls which do not have cavities. In fact I have looked very closely at various types of construction where people wanted to be innovative and use different sorts of materials. Such applications have been sent back time and time again.

In fact, one of the applications mentioned by the member was reviewed on many occasions because I was not happy about the position. He also, quite rightly, was not happy when he received the first letter, because if we looked at the mean average rainfall of the two areas, we saw that was a rather silly reason to advance. I stand guilty, because I signed the letter and I guess I read the other information on the file, but I let the letter go to the member with only that comment on it.

This is a difficult matter, because we are talking about people's health. In particular, when we refer to these aged persons' home units, the matter has even greater sensitivity. When I am advised by the people on the building advisory committee—people with expertise who are drawn from a variety of areas; indeed, I believe it was the member for Kalgoorlie who asked how the committee was constituted—and they come back to me not once, twice, but thrice with a clear recommendation that it ought not to proceed, I would be taking on myself a most awful responsibility were I to override all that expert advice and say, "Blow you, Joe; I think those old people can go into a home built that way." That is the difficulty I face and it is the difficulty which will remain in so far as the amendment of the Uniform Building By-laws is concerned.

Bearing in mind the advice I have had when I have examined ways to allow these people to achieve what they want to do, I believe that perhaps we ought to start from the beginning and ascertain whether the composition of their product can be changed slightly. As the member understands, the porosity and aspects of that nature have a bearing on whether the material will be suitable. However, any local endeavour which has an opportunity to contribute to the growth of the area should be assisted, not hindered.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn simply put me straight on the research I had organised previously. I remember his comments very well. I was advised the legislation sought not to deny spouses the right to sue their husbands, but to do exactly the opposite. The member has now indi-

cated that is not correct and in fact the order was discharged from the notice paper.

That completes my remarks and I believe I have responded to all the items raised by members.

Division 56 put and passed.

Division 57: Keep Australia Beautiful Council, \$173 000—

Mr BRYCE: I congratulate the Keep Australia Beautiful Council for the work it has done. It is appalling that our society in recent years has become the "throw away society." The mess on country roads and highways has become a fact of life and it disturbs a great number of Western Australians. The work of the Keep Australia Beautiful Council in generally cleaning up the State has been remarkable and very effective. It has been a noticeable step in the right direction.

I appreciate in the context of these sorts of budgetary times the amount that can be spent on these areas is limited. However, I ask the Minister how the allocation for 1982-83 of \$173 000 measures up in respect of the work that must be done.

I have travelled a rather significant number of kilometres on country roads in the last 12 months and I have gained the distinct impression that the job is being done well, but I also have the impression we have a fair way to go. When the Minister responds I should like her to indicate exactly how far this sort of allocation will go towards coping with this Statewide problem, bearing in mind this "throw away society" of ours seems to have made a mess of Western Australia to a large extent.

I appreciate this matter is not the Minister's responsibility, but I shall comment on the scourge of the pressure pack spray paint cans that are available and the way in which they have been used to vandalise community and public facilities including not only bus shelters and other roadside facilities, but also a whole host of community structures.

I see vandalism and, in particular, the extent to which those spray cans have been used, as one of the greatest scourges with which we have had to contend in recent years. When one visits different countries and communities, one notices the spread and effect of vandalism. The lack of respect for community property has become a rather serious problem in our community and while the Keep Australia Beautiful Council is doing a sterling job in respect of the clean up of the community, I take this opportunity to say, as one Western Australian who is rather concerned about the appearance of our community, that it disturbs me

greatly that we cannot perhaps ban those convenience spray packs in order to get rid of a great deal of vandalism which occurs in the community presently.

Mr NANOVICH: I support the remarks made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who paid tribute to the Keep Australia Beautiful Council. When the council was established as a statutory body, it was said it would not have any teeth and, therefore, no progress would be made in its aim to beautify our State. However, it can be seen those who criticised the council at that time have been proved to be wrong.

Since the establishment of the council I have spoken to a large number of people about it, all of whom have paid tribute to the way in which it has carried out its activities and tidied up the State, particularly country areas.

Recently I spoke to a person who had just taken up residence in Western Australia. He travelled from Melbourne across the Nullarbor and criticised the fact that the road verges were covered with litter. Since then this man has made a return trip across the Nullarbor and he complimented the council on the work it had done in the interim.

I endorse fully the remarks made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and hopefully the council will continue with its good work in our State, making it the cleanest State in Australia.

Mrs CRAIG: I thank the members for Ascot and Whitford for their comments about the Keep Australia Beautiful Council. It is made up of a group of people who are very concerned with the environment in Western Australia and they have done a very good job. The member for Ascot asked how the \$173 000 allocated in the Budget this year would measure up to the work that needs to be done. The clear agreement between the Government and the KABC at the time the Statute establishing it as a statutory body was enacted, was that the Government would be responsible for the administrative costs, but the balance of the moneys required by the council would be supplied by industry in the form of a levy on items which entered the litter stream.

I am sure the member for Ascot is pleased to see that revenue of this nature is greater this year than last year, as a result of the efforts of industry to support the council and to do everything possible to ensure people in Western Australia are educated better in this area. Education is really what it is all about. The council's education programme is innovative and has great merit.

Much of the council's funds are spent in schools and in providing short, in-house courses for

teachers in order that they might be better able to educate children on this matter.

I am glad the work of the council has been recognised. It has certainly achieved a great deal in the time it has been in existence, although we still have a long way to go. It is good that we are making progress and to know that the council's efforts are proving successful.

Mr Nanovich: Hear, hear!

Division 57 put and passed.

Division 58: Town Planning, \$4 116 000—

Mr DAVIES: I might say many things about town planning, but bearing in mind the state of the Parliament, I shall limit my comments to one or two matters which are of real concern to me and, in particular, one of them is of concern to the community at large.

I was rather surprised, when looking at the details of the department, to see no provision was made for the new staff appointments. I suppose the Minister may say that they come under the heading of "Other Payments: Allowances—Overtime, Higher Duties, Annual Leave Loading, etc.". However, that is not very satisfactory.

Accurate details of staff positions should be provided so that any changes can be noted. In this instance, changes have occurred at the top management level of the Town Planning Department. The Minister assures me those changes are all to the good and they will make for a tighter department and better administration.

Some time ago I asked questions mainly concerned with the appointment of a Deputy Town Planning Commissioner. That position has been vacant for some time and there are some excellent fellows in the department and the profession generally in this State who could adequately fill it.

I know two or three individuals who could do the job very well and they should have been encouraged to apply for the position. Indeed, I am aware of at least one fellow who should have been appointed to the position, because he has done an excellent job within the department and has also sponsored the profession in the teaching establishments of the community.

I would have thought that, as we have been training graduates in this field for some time now, we would seek to appoint to our top positions people who had graduated in this State.

It always is a cause of a great deal of pride to me when I find medical men who did their training at the University of Western Australia have graduated to senior positions both within and without the department. My policy is to see

that men who have trained in Western Australia and have the capabilities required are given job opportunities.

On 29 September I asked a question without notice of the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning as follows—

Would the Minister advise what progress has been made in the appointment of a Deputy Town Planning Commissioner? The position has been vacant for some considerable time.

I had asked a question quite some time before that and had been told the matter was under consideration.

Mr Rushton: Could you tell me something about the man; what colour in his hair and is it curly or whatever?

Mr DAVIES: I am referring to Lloyd Graham. Of all the men in the department when I was the Minister he was the one most able to explain in a few words what something was all about. He wasted no words and he showed how knowledgeable he was. He has been chosen by the Government on different occasions to undertake special projects for it. Unfortunately he was not appointed to the position.

Mr Rushton: A boy you would be proud to call your son.

Mr DAVIES: He really is. Anything I wanted explained when I was a Minister he would explain, not necessarily immediately, but certainly in the appropriate time. He would provide information with sufficient detail to be understood without using any superfluous words. If I did not understand anything, he would be the man within the department—and there were many good men—whom I would ask to clarify it for me. In reply to my question, the Minister said—

I can tell the member for Victoria Park that the appointment of a Deputy Town Planning Commissioner (Administrative) has been made. I understand the gentleman who has been appointed will be taking up his new role about the middle of October. As far as the Deputy Town Planning Commissioner (Planning) is concerned, it is my understanding that the Public Service Board has readvertised the position. I cannot say accurately whether the advertisements for the position have yet appeared in the Press, but if they have not they will in the near future.

That was the first inclination I had that there were to be two Deputy Town Planning Commissioners. The Minister referred to a Deputy Town Planning Commissioner (Administrative)

and a second Deputy Town Planning Commissioner (Planning). I was very patient and did not follow up the matter with another question until 19 October, when my question 1672 read—

- (1) Referring to question without notice 562 of 29 September 1982 in which she says there are to be two deputy town planning commissioners will she state when and on whose recommendation this decision was taken?
- (2) What salary range will be paid to each deputy (administrative) and (planning) as mentioned?
- (3) How does this compare with the position previously obtaining?

The Minister replied—

- (1) There is only one position of Deputy Town Planning Commissioner as provided for under section 3(3) of the Town Planning and Development Act 1928-1981.

In other words she is saying, "You fool; there is only one, and you know that." I am not the fool, because the Minister told me there were to be two deputies when she replied to my earlier question. The implied insult was there. To continue with her answer—

A position of Assistant Town Planning Commissioner (Finance and Administration) was created by the Public Service Board on 8 July 1982, and shown in the Public Service notices dated 4 August 1982.

Mrs Craig: It was a genuine mistake; I did not know what was in a name.

Mr DAVIES: I am surprised. I would have thought that at the top level the Minister might know.

Mrs Craig: I had been told, but I did not know the actual name.

Mr DAVIES: I accept that, but I must confess I do not read Public Service notices. To continue with her answer—

- (2) (a) Deputy Town Planning Commissioner \$40 561;
(b) Assistant Town Planning Commissioner (Finance and Administration) \$47 382.
- (3) The position of Assistant Town Planning Commissioner (Finance and Administration) replaces the position of administrative officer (salary range \$26 755-\$27 479).

That indicates a remarkable jump. Having been appointed to a top level position, the man is to re-

ceive an extra \$20 000 a year rise over the man who previously held the position.

On 20 October I asked question 1774, which was as follows—

- (1) Referring to question 1672 of 1982 regarding senior administration in the Town Planning Department, what advantage is likely to accrue as a result of creating an assistant town planning commissioner (finance and administration) and abolishing the position of administrative officer?
- (2) What other staff changes have been made as a result of this change?

The Minister's reply was as follows—

- (1) The position of assistant town planning commissioner (finance and administration) has been created at a sufficiently senior level to—

ensure the efficient management and co-ordination of all administrative functions in the department, together with the operational activities of both the Town Planning Board and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority;

ensure that maximum efficiency and economy of operations in the administrative and financial field are implemented through the use of modern technology and systems.

- (2) Abolish item 34 1000 secretary C-II-9 (salary \$26 755—\$27 479) and replace it with item 34 1001, secretary MRPA A-1-1 (salary \$31 752).

Abolish item 34 0440 clerk C-II-3/4 (salary \$18 086—\$19 963) and replace it with item 34 0436—secretary Town Planning Board (salary \$23 290—\$24 659).

Amend the title and classification of item 34 0065 from senior clerk (salary \$20 603—\$21 246) to assistant administrative officer C-II-7 (salary \$23 290—\$24 659).

Amend the title and classification of item 34 1010 from clerk (salary \$19 319—\$19 963) to assistant secretary, MRPA C-II-6 (salary \$21 924—\$22 612).

Those five positions represent an increase of roughly \$35 000 a year in salaries. I wonder why this is considered necessary at this time. I know the department is expanding; I know it needs to expand because of the work it is doing. However,

I am concerned that a man should be brought from outside who has no experience in Government departments, and particularly the Town Planning Department, and given a job with a salary which has increased by \$20 000 above that paid to the man who held the position earlier. I wonder about the justification for this in a time of financial stringency. I would have thought the department could manage with its previous positions.

Another thing which concerns me is that, to the best of my knowledge, we have not yet appointed a Deputy Town Planning Commissioner and that advertisements are being published both here and overseas. I really consider this to be quite disastrous. If we did not have trained officers here, many of whom are teaching other people in the town planning field; if we did not have excellent officers available as we do, this might be the only alternative. On this occasion, as on most occasions, I am seeking the endorsement of the home-grown product.

We have had one experience with a person imported by the Perth City Council to be a town planner. This occurred in the 1960s. While I have great admiration for some of his ideas, we know he is no longer the town planner and has not been for some considerable time; we know that the present incumbent is an Australian resident of many years' standing.

I wonder whether the Minister knows what is going on in her department in view of the answers she has given me and in view of the agreement apparently which has been reached for the appointment of people to fill new positions.

On top of that, over the years we have had a permanent Chairman of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority who has been paid a handsome salary. I might have commented on this if I had been here at the time the item went through. We also have a part-time Chairman of the Town Planning Board. That position previously was occupied by the Town Planning Commissioner, so it did not involve any cost to the department. We now have a chairman who is listed in the Estimates to receive a salary in the region of \$22 900. In view of the information I have just provided about changes in the department and the new salaries to be paid, I wonder why it is necessary to have a part-time chairman of the board being paid this additional figure. We are getting up to over the \$50 000 mark when there could be reasonable savings made by the department. On top of all this, besides the salaries paid to these people, some are entitled to receive \$45 or \$60 for attending meetings, depending on what category they fall in. Here we have the Chairman of the

Town Planning Board brought in from local government, where he built a very distinguished record in two shires during the period I have known him, but a man who, as far as I am aware, has no particular town planning expertise.

What is more, we find the man has some personal interest in development in this State, and I refer members to an article which appeared in *The Western Mail* dated 25 September. It is an article by Jan Mayman in which she drew attention to the fact that the planning chief was involved in a multimillion dollar "time sharing" resort development at Busselton. The man we are talking about is Mr O'Meara, the three-day-a-week Chairman of the Town Planning Board. The article indicates that the scheme in which he is involved is currently before the Town Planning Board. The article indicates that the Minister had some concern; but I am not satisfied with the statement she made that she knew all about it, but was not concerned as long as Mr O'Meara did not vote on anything in which he had a personal interest. She said she saw no danger in it. I quote from the article as follows—

She released a letter she wrote to Mr O'Meara at the time thanking him for bringing the situation to her attention.

The "conflict of interest" issue was an extremely delicate one and she noted and endorsed his intention to declare to the board his interest in any matter in which he was involved.

I have looked at the Act, but have been unable to see any requirement for an interest in any matter to be declared. This might be covered by the regulations, but, as I said yesterday, the Town Planning Act as amended looks like a kindergarten scrap book.

My concern is: What will the position be if Mr O'Meara does not declare an interest in a development? Will he receive the same treatment as Mr Burkett, the Mayor of Stirling, who in fact committed no offence at all, or will the Minister say, "I am sorry you did not declare an interest; but never mind, don't do it again." Apparently he will be allowed to do these things because he has indicated that he cannot make a living with 3½ days' work a week. This year we will be paying him around \$22 900, when the work was previously done by the Commissioner of Town Planning—who would not have done any worse a job than Mr O'Meara—and it did not cost the Government anything at all.

So why do we have these escalating costs? Mr O'Meara knew what it was worth when he took on the job. He was regarded as being a very com-

petent local government officer, having served the Kalamunda Shire and the Swan Shire; if he decides that he no longer wants that job and takes a Government job, he must divorce himself completely from those fields. *The Western Mail* of 25 September states—

On appointment, Mr O'Meara said his aim would be to work for better rapport with local councils.

We could certainly do with better rapport with local councils after what the Minister did with the amendments to the Act yesterday. He will have a 3½ day a week job—a part-time job—because the local authorities will wipe the Minister off, after the way she dealt with their representations. So there is a full-time job for Mr O'Meara; I am not advocating that he be appointed full time; I am saying he should not be there at all. The town planning chairman should not be seen as having to act as a liaison officer with local authorities, for God's sake. He has to overview planning matters. If we want a publicity man to act as a liaison officer, let us appoint one. We already have spent some \$35 000 increasing the "chief" appointments within the department and now we will have a man in charge of the Town Planning Board who, in Mr O'Meara's own words, was reported as being able to work for better rapport with local government councils. That is a pretty expensive way of doing it. It will be more than a full-time job, after what the Minister did with the Act yesterday. I was unhappy about it, but I decided not to do anything about it. I know Mr O'Meara. I have appreciated his counselling in my dealings with him. While he is a very good local government officer, I doubt whether he has any town planning experience. The Minister may be able to enlighten us on that point.

An article in *The Western Mail* of 16 October 1982 states—

Town Planning Board chairman Laurie O'Meara has set up a consultancy organisation for local authorities.

Mr O'Meara may have a flair for that type of work, but he is working as a consultant, and receives \$22 900 a year from the Government for 3½ days' work a week. There is concern that there could be a conflict of interest. The article continues—

A spokesman for Mrs Craig said she saw no potential conflict of interest in Mr O'Meara's dual position because the terms of his appointment specially barred him from given paid advice on town planning matters.

She must be naive. She said that he will not talk to councils about town planning matters because

under the terms of his employment he is not allowed to do so, and yet, according to Mr O'Meara, his work is to be particularly directed towards better liaison with local authorities. On the one hand, according to Mr O'Meara, he will do one thing and, on the other hand, according to the Minister, he will not be able to do that type of thing. Where are we heading? She did not even see any potential for danger. I will read a letter which aptly sums up the situation. I have taken the letterhead off the letter so that I will not thereby upset the Minister—

Mrs Craig: It is not upsetting me.

Mr DAVIES: —or jeopardise any further approaches this firm may make to the Town Planning Board. The letter sums up the general feeling within the community and it says—

Our company is involved to some extent in property development, and it was reported in the September 25 edition of the "Western Mail", followed by a further report in last Saturday's "Western Mail", that the Chairman of the Town Planning Board is himself a developer. Whilst the press mentions a "time-sharing resort at Busselton" other information available to us indicates that he is also involved in Strata Title unit developments at at least two locations in the Como/South Perth area.

Also very relevant is the legislation which we understand is being put forward in State Parliament to allow the Minister for Town Planning and Local Government to initiate rezoning proposals.

Recently the Premier put on record a statement to the effect that after an investigation, it was found that no State civil servant had outside pecuniary interests which could involve a conflict of interests. Whilst the Chairman of the Town Planning Board may not strictly qualify as a civil servant, it does not seem tenable that a man who is himself involved in sub-divisions which include Strata Titles, should sit in final judgement on other people's applications for sub-division, as it is obvious that a serious conflict of interests could result. For example, if this company was planning a time-sharing resort in the Busselton area, approvals for which we understand include approvals for sub-division, then if our own and the Chairman's project look like exceeding market demand, it would be only human nature for some reason to be found to delay our application whilst the other got prior approval. When you couple this obvious potential for a conflict of

interests with the Minister's ability to initiate rezoning, the position becomes potentially even more serious. It is unlikely the Minister would act on rezoning proposals without in some cases requests, and in others advice from his senior advisers, one of whom is no doubt the Chairman of the Town Planning Board.

The financial benefits available to developers from unzoned or lowly zoned land and having that property rezoned to a higher and better use can be huge, and historically when such financial windfalls are available to developers, they have proven to be adept in gaining approvals through close contact with politicians and senior Government advisers. At the moment we believe there are several major developers eager to proceed with land rezoning and subdivision schemes in the Peel Inlet area, and it seems that if the local Authority feels these are not wise at the moment, the rezoning could, under the new system, be initiated by the Minister and the subsequent sub-division approved by the planning board.

The developers, the writers of that letter, are concerned about what could happen.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! I refer to the fact that the member has tended to read quite extensively from documents. The Standing Orders do provide, and indeed there have been many precedents to suggest, that nothing more than a few lines should be read. I ask the member not to make these long readings from various pieces of correspondence.

Mr DAVIES: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman. I read questions in full because it is easier to incorporate them into *Hansard*. *Hansard* reporters struggle under extreme difficulties and if I read the entire question they only have to find the question and photostat it on to the transcript. I could paraphrase them, but I think that would take much longer. That is why I read this letter. Perhaps I should have apologised to you, Mr Deputy Chairman, before I read the letter. The letter illustrates succinctly the views of many people and I thought it preferable to incorporate it in *Hansard* in its entirety rather than to paraphrase it because politicians, as you know, Mr Deputy Chairman, have a tendency to lengthen proceedings when they try to paraphrase documents.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Some more than others.

Mr DAVIES: Yes, some more than others. Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman, for that warn-

ing. I assure you that is the last letter I will be quoting. I repeat that the only reason I read questions and answers out in full is because of my belief that it helps the *Hansard* staff.

The letter which I have just read out expresses the concern of many people and illustrates their view on appointments such as this being made. On top of that, we have from outside the department a private enterprise man who I do not think has any experience in the bureaucracy of town planning—I use that word kindly—who has been appointed to a \$47 000 a year job when we have a full-time MRPA chairman and a 3½ day a week Town Planning Board Chairman. I wonder who is paying for it all. It is as simple as that.

I will leave that matter there because I have made the point that I am sorry indeed—and I do not blame the Minister, but perhaps the Public Service Board—that the local product has not been appointed as Deputy Town Planning Commissioner. I am concerned also that there has been so little consideration given to very important appointments; that the Minister easily lays herself open to the charge that the department can be subject to too many outside influences. She is not in a position to watch that. That is why she should be ultra-careful in relation to these appointments. These additional appointments of “chiefs” having been made within the department, it would have been just as easy to have left the present Town Planning Commissioner as Chairman of the Town Planning Board. I have the greatest faith in that man and in officers of the department. At least we would have saved ourselves a large sum of money which is being paid to the chairman and there certainly would not have existed grounds for criticism in regard to conflict of interest. I suppose we can be thankful that *The Western Mail* brought this to our attention. The letter which I read from a developer adequately outlines the concern felt by developers at large, that some may now be able to effect a greater influence over the work they want to do and the applications they may want to make, despite the fact that the Minister says the chairman of the board certainly will declare his interest. I cannot see anything in the Act, unless it is in the regulations somewhere, where it states that a person must declare his interest. I believe Mr O'Meara would declare his interests because he is that type of person. While he admits to an interest in one development we discovered there could be others of which we know nothing.

Mrs Craig: Are we going to hear about the tavern? You have spent 50 minutes on it so far. I suppose you are advising the Licensing Board?

Mr Bryce: And it could not have a better adviser!

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order!

Mrs Craig: He has been advising him for 50 minutes.

Mr Bryce: He shares himself around.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The member for Gosnells got to his feet to make a speech and he has not been allowed to utter a single word, which is most unusual for him because he is usually fairly quick off the mark. He has had to endure a whole host of interjections. I call on the member for Gosnells.

Mr PEARCE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman, for those very just remarks. Indeed, we are going to hear a word or two about the tavern. I have 30 minutes this time and the education estimates are coming up shortly in which I will have unlimited time and, unlike the last 45 minute occasion when I was shouted down for most of that time, I intend to make my point. If I do not finish in 30 minutes, I will speak on the education estimates in relation to the question of the tavern and on that occasion I will have unlimited time and, if necessary, I will use it all.

Mr Clarko: You couldn't do that.

Mr Tonkin: They are quick off the mark.

Mr PEARCE: This matter could be disposed of in 10 minutes and could be finished. I am prepared to go over the points in logical sequence without interruption, so the question of how long we will discuss this rests entirely with Government members. I am quite happy to accept their judgment about how they wish to conduct this debate.

I tendered in this House earlier today a petition containing 476 signatures from people in the immediate area of the Heathridge Primary School requesting the Government to reverse its decision to allow a tavern to be built next to that school. That is a clear demonstration to the Minister if she has not yet had one, that the people in the area do not want the tavern built next to the school.

I am advised that the participants in the doorknock which was held over the weekend to obtain the 476 signatures, were told by the people in Caridean Street, where the tavern will be located, that they had signed petitions on at least three or four occasions. That cuts across the argument put by the Minister in this place last week that there had been no objections from residents in that street. Some of these people are writing to

the *Wanneroo Times* because they took objection to the story printed in that paper, a story which, I might say, distorted the nature of the debate that took place in this Chamber, that objections had not come from residents in that area.

People do not want a tavern near the school and they reflect the attitudes of all Western Australian communities, and it is enshrined in our legislation.

When the Licensing Court considers the application for a licence for that tavern, one of the areas of objection it can consider is whether the tavern will be placed desirably. The Licensing Court, as the Minister has indicated, will be able to make a decision not to allow the application on the grounds that it is undesirably placed near a school. Why should it be up to the Licensing Court to make that kind of judgment when the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning and the Minister for Education will do nothing to protect the children in that area?

Mr Clarke: What can I do?

Mr PEARCE: The Minister for Education could have prevailed upon his colleague not to allow the rezoning. He told me in this House that he was aware of this matter before the approval was given.

Mr Clarke: I did not say that. If you remember, you tried to imply that I knew nothing about it. I did know about it.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister for Education is walking a fine line if he says he knew about it before I asked, but he did not know about it before the decision was made.

Mr Clarke: You stated that I did not know about it at the time I gave my answer. I said it was not correct because I saw an article in the northern supplement of *The West Australian* which referred to it.

Mr PEARCE: Therefore, the Minister for Education was not consulted. That is the point I am making. It seems that the Minister for Education should be consulted and one of the questions I asked him was whether or not he was consulted. He replied that the question should be directed to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning.

Mr Clarke: You made a number of other points.

Mr PEARCE: I did, but the Minister for Education was not prepared to answer any of the questions. It is an unfortunate principle being enshrined.

The reason I raise this subject again today is that we have received a petition from the local

residents asking that the tavern not be built next to the primary school. Under those circumstances it is incumbent upon the Minister to reconsider the situation. I advise her now that when the application goes before the Licensing Court, the residents in the area will make objections.

Mrs Craig: That is the proper action for them to take.

Mr PEARCE: An application has not yet been made although the Minister may say it is proper for the local people to take this action. I do not think that I have the authority to make an objection because I do not live in the area. Although the local people have the right to do that, and I believe they will be successful, it should not be necessary to prevail upon the Licensing Court not to allow the tavern on these grounds when the decision should have been taken at local authority level. Indeed, the Shire of Wanneroo did take action and refused the application which was subsequently overruled by the Minister.

An effort was made to distort what I said when the Minister believed I was implying that there was some financial arrangement between her and the developers.

Mrs Craig: I did not say that.

Mr PEARCE: I will say what I meant.

Mrs Craig: I did not say that. In fact, I told you I did not know who the developers were.

Mr PEARCE: If the Minister would listen—

Mrs Craig: How could I have said there was a financial arrangement?

Mr PEARCE: The Minister said that I had implied there was some financial arrangement between the developers and herself.

Mr O'Connor: You misconstrue everything that is said in this place.

Mr PEARCE: I raised a question and the Minister said that she did not know who the developers were. It is amazing that the Minister should be upholding an appeal when she does not know who the developers are. It is the Australian Guarantee Corporation Ltd. (General Finances) and its name appears throughout the documents. The most interesting document is a letter dated 6 September which is addressed to the developer and signed by the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning allowing the appeal.

Mrs Craig: That was after I made the decision in the first place.

Mr PEARCE: I did not suggest that the Minister had been unfairly influenced in any way by the developers.

Mrs Craig: You just said that I had some sort of financial arrangement with them.

Mr PEARCE: This will be a long night. What I said last week was that it appeared only two people were in favour of having the tavern constructed next to the Heathridge Primary School and that those people were the developers and the Minister. This was because the developers wanted to construct a tavern on that site and the Minister was allowing the zoning that would permit it. I could not find anyone else in favour of the construction of this tavern and I said that it was the combination of the developer and the Minister who were putting the tavern by the Heathridge Primary School. The Minister appeared to read into those remarks the proposition that I was saying there was some relationship between her and the developer, or that I had suggested she had been improperly influenced by that firm. That does not follow and I did not impute that.

Last week the Minister made an assertion in this Chamber that she did not know who the developers were. She did, because she signed a letter addressed to them which was dated 6 September. It appears that the Minister does not look at her letters to ascertain to whom they are addressed and that she merely signs them.

Mrs Craig: I said, "At the time of appeal".

Mr PEARCE: The Minister said she did not know who the developers were. I told the Minister who the developers were last week in this House and I am now able to tell her that she has written to them. I do not expect Ministers to memorise every letter that crosses their desks, but to be making assertions of the kind the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning has made tends to indicate that that Minister does not know what she is doing, or she would not have made that assertion.

I do not remember every matter with which I deal and I may not remember who the constituent was in a particular case. However, if a matter is later drawn to my attention I am able to recall the relative details. I think the Minister, in raising a whole range of questions, in her interjections and speeches, shows the extent she is in control of her department. She should spend less time in this House and look at more tapes of the television programme "Yes, Minister" to see why Ministers should be in more control of their departments.

It is not too late for the Government to go back on the zoning provisions it has allowed. It should reconsider the matter. If that is not done, I would be looking at the Minister for Education and his department to lodge objections when the application goes before the Licensing Court. As I have

said, the local residents, in consultation with me and some of my colleagues, will be doing that. They should not be the people to establish a principle. Clearly the Education Department is responsible in this regard. I will be watching closely to see whether the department lodges an objection at the appropriate time; if it does not, it should and if it is after next March, of course, it will.

The other point I wish to canvass in regard to this matter is to express my personal thanks and congratulations to the housewives in the Heathridge area who undertook to have the petition circulated. The group was organised by Julie McKay. They worked all last weekend and early this week to establish a proposition that the parents in the area did not want the tavern built.

In the attempts to blame the previous Wanneroo Shire Council for this whole thing, a suggestion was made that the council had virtually committed itself and the developers to establish a tavern on this site. This argument was advanced rigorously by the member for Whitford. The point he should understand is that the special commercial non-retail zoning that area has is not a specific tavern zoning. It does allow a tavern, but it will also allow a facility such as a bank or squash court to be established.

Although the area was zoned for special commercial non-retail purposes, the previous Wanneroo Shire Council took steps towards disallowing an application for rezoning which would permit a tavern on that site; that is to say, not just for special commercial non-retail purposes, but specifically for a tavern.

I was critical of the previous council last week about the way it went about this matter. However, it did allow for a period of objections which is standard practice and the fact a council commits itself to advertising to seek objections does not mean it will approve the application. In 1979, the Wanneroo Shire Council started the process regarding the zoning application and it received more than 51 objections. In fact, it received something in the order of 360 objections and they included objections from people residing in Caridean Street. The council scrapped the proposal in the light of the objections it received. The most democratic thing for the council to do is to consult with those persons concerned in any proposed development. That is why I wish to tie this into the power given to the Minister as a result of the Town Planning and Development Amendment Bill which was before the House yesterday.

Mr Nanovich: When the council approved the development of that shopping centre, it had the

power to approve it, provided it was under 10 000 squares. Is that right?

Mr PEARCE: I will take the member's word for it.

Mr Nanovich: That did not require the approval of the Minister. There was a proposed centre to be built on the corner of Marmion Avenue and Ocean Reef Road. A shop similar to the old-fashioned corner store should have been built on this site to serve the area of Heathridge. That approval given by the council did not require the approval of the department relating to the size of the development, because that power lay with the local authority.

Mr PEARCE: I am being critical only of the Minister in her role in overriding the council's decision not to allow the tavern to be built there. The point I am making is that the only grounds the Minister gave in overturning the decision of the council was that the council had given a commitment to the developer to allow a tavern to be built there, and that the developer now was being disadvantaged.

Mr Nanovich: It should never have amended its zoning to AA use.

Mr PEARCE: The member for Whitford has been present at meetings of the local authority; indeed, he was president of that body for some time. During his term as president, many a zoning change must have been proposed to which objections were made. If we were to say as a matter of principle that as soon as a council initiates a zoning change, it is committed to that zoning change, it makes nonsense of a council's calling for objections. What is the point? That is not the way the town planning and local government systems should work. Such a principle would serve to prevent the voice of the people from being heard on these issues.

The Minister's decision seems to be a remarkable undercutting of the principle of democracy at local government level. In effect, the Minister has said that if a local council has committed itself to a developer to initiate a zoning, it is not fair for the council to consider the objections of local residents. That is a very strange thing for the Minister to say.

All these town planning matters are worthy of our attention. However, the most important principle is that taverns should not be built next to schools. During petition time today, I was able to demonstrate that the local people did not want a tavern situated there, and the Government should do something about their wishes. If necessary, the local people will take action on their own behalf. However, it should not be necessary for them to

have to campaign and organise themselves to overthrow stupid actions of the Government.

Mrs CRAIG: The member for Victoria Park discussed the Town Planning Department, its staffing, and its changing structure. As I pointed out last night, I believe the member for Victoria Park has forgotten many of the things which happened within the department. He reminded me it was 10 years since he was a Minister. During that 10-year period, significant changes have occurred in the weight of work and the administrative tasks coped with by the department.

For instance, today, very few local councils in Western Australia do not have or are not in the process of compiling town planning schemes. The actual work of the department in assessing a scheme and determining whether it needs to be changed, together with the constant consultation which takes place with local authorities, represents a large task. In recent times, the department has been considering schemes—which of necessity are complex—from the Subiaco City Council, the City of Perth, the South Perth City Council, the Melville City Council, the East Fremantle Town Council, and the like. All these proposals require a great deal of discussion between the board and officers of the department and, indeed, between members of the councils and the Minister and some of my advisers. That is only one of the extra burdens presently borne by the department.

Another area where additional work has occurred is that of special projects. As this State grows, as we take on extra responsibilities, and as we seek to ensure the environment the people of Perth have enjoyed for so long is maintained, the necessity arises to examine more and more areas in greater detail. That, of course, means that a certain number of officers must be allocated to the specific area of special projects. One such matter which the member for Victoria Park would well understand relates to the planning presently going on in relation to the central business district of Perth, the Forrest Place project, and all the complications inherent in the compilation of a plan of that sort. This project has necessitated the City of Perth and the Town Planning Department diverting two full-time officers to this task alone, for a period of not less than six months. The department allocated a very senior officer to this task. Many changes have taken place, and I have touched merely the top of some of them.

Mr Davies: But the \$47 000-a-year man is an administrator, not a planner.

Mrs CRAIG: Indeed, and I am sure the member will understand why that was thought to be necessary. We have a Town Planning Commissioner who in fact has a great skill as a planner; I do not think anyone in Western Australia would deny that. He has served this State well; however, essentially, he is a planner. The person who prior to this time held the position of Assistant Town Planning Commissioner—or perhaps he was called the deputy—Mr Doug Collins, who was seconded by us in July to carry out another task, very largely has dealt with the administrative function of the department.

Mr Davies: Mr Collins was coming up for retirement, and you seconded him from the department.

Mrs CRAIG: From about July to November, he was seconded away from the department to fill another role. That was when the vacancy arose to which the member for Victoria Park alluded.

I am sorry that on this occasion, as on so many previous occasions, the member for Victoria Park saw fit to name names and talk about people's capacities, and things of that sort.

Mr Davies: Your predecessor did it; he made it very obvious.

Mrs CRAIG: The person's name was banded around this Chamber.

Mr Davies: We did not bandy it; I spoke of him with reverence.

Mrs CRAIG: I respect that person greatly; I have found him to be a most helpful officer.

The Public Service Board works in a particular way—

Mr Davies: Which only God would understand!

Mrs CRAIG: —and called applications for the position. An interviewing panel was established by the board and after applications were assessed and people interviewed it was the view of the panel that no suitable person was available to take on the role the board was endeavouring to fill. The member for Victoria Park, as a former Minister, would know Ministers need to accept the recommendations of these bodies. After all, it is the Public Service Board which is making the appointment. For that reason, the gentleman concerned presently is working in an acting capacity, and the position has not yet been filled on a permanent basis. The Public Service Board determined it would readvertise to see what other people came forward with a wish to fill that role. That is the position I am in now.

It is true to say certain criticisms have been sheeted to the Town Planning Department that administrative procedures have led to delays. To a

large degree, these delays have been created by a difficulty of administration; we simply have not had a person capable of filling that heavy administrative role. The changes to the department were made in consultation with senior officers of the department and with the Minister in order to establish a structure which would enable the department to function more efficiently, in the best interests of the people of Western Australia.

Then, of course, the Public Service Board examined the department and its workings and the board's clear recommendation was that a necessity existed to upgrade the position to cope with the extra weight of work and the need was seen to employ a person skilled in the administrative area.

Mr Davies: I believe the best thing we can do is to examine the Public Service Board; that would appear to have a high priority.

Mrs CRAIG: If that is the member's view, he can make a separate speech on the matter; if he wishes to denigrate the board, that is his right in this place.

Mr Davies: Certainly, I am starting to doubt the board's capacity.

Mrs CRAIG: The member for Victoria Park also referred to the upgrading of the other positions within the department. It would be well known to everybody in this Chamber that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority plays a vital role in the planning of this State. Earlier this year and, indeed, at the end of last year, concern was expressed in this Chamber about the non-notification of people whose properties were affected or were likely to be affected by amendments gazetted and recommended by the authority. So, we examined the structure of the department—which previously had proved to be suitable—and changed that structure to ensure that many more people were personally contacted when any change to land use was proposed in their area.

Quite clearly, that function requires a much greater administrative role. To begin with, it requires an enormous increase in public relations to ensure that the people who need to know the information in fact are the recipients of it.

Mr Davies: I could not agree with you more; I always have said the department needed a public relations officer.

Mrs CRAIG: That is a problem which has faced the Government for some time. If we are to turn our backs on the need to communicate with people, we will never be successful in indicating to them the changes which are proposed to be made, and the reason for those changes.

It was easy to assess the clear need for that public relations role as one which needed a great deal more time and effort. In order to ensure that happened, we needed a person who was capable of carrying out that role. That in no way casts aspersions on the previous Secretary of the MRPA, who was an officer who worked hard and well, but who did not have quite the experience necessary to fill the role. The present incumbent is a man by the name of Mr Hendry who, previously, was with the State Government Information and Inquiry Centre. Mr Hendry is very skilled in the area of communication and has a capacity of being able to relate to people. We saw that quality as being very important. I would hope the member for Victoria Park does not argue that that in fact is not the case.

In regard to the upgrading of the role of the Secretary of the Town Planning Board, again, letters sent out to people often have been the cause of considerable criticism. On some occasions, this criticism has been justified. People no longer were happy to receive a letter which, in essence, told them very little as to the reasons their applications had been rejected. So, all these things must be put together in an effort to assist those people working within the department so that we can relieve them of the time they are spending on administration and allow them to apply themselves to the task in which they have great expertise—namely, as planners—and leave the administrative tasks to people more capable of carrying them out.

The planning situation in Western Australia has changed in the 10 years since the member for Victoria Park was involved in the Town Planning Department. The people of Western Australia are better informed; they rightly question many decisions made, and they want to know exactly how the system works. All that requires a greater communication skill and a greater administrative effort to ensure that the people are given the notice they deserve. They are some of the reasons for our restructuring the department to ensure that the citizens of Western Australia will benefit from the changes.

Reference was made to the fact that the Chairman of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority now occupies that role on a full-time basis. The weight of work carried by that gentleman is considerable indeed. The member for Victoria Park can probably recall the size of the agendas that went before the MRPA—

Mr Davies: I did not interfere.

Mrs CRAIG: —but it is fairly safe to assume that the size has now doubled.

I am not talking about interfering. There is no way the member could not have seen the agenda, or leafed through it from an interest point of view, to see exactly what the members of the authority had to cope with at any given meeting. The hours of work put in by the members of the authority in an endeavour to ensure that Western Australian people have these matters considered properly are incredible.

Mr Davies: Are you saying we might want a full-time authority eventually?

Mrs CRAIG: We reached the stage where a part-time chairman was unable to cope with the role. That is why the decision was taken.

As a result of the appointment, people have much more ready access to the chairman. They are able to enter into discussions with him about the problems confronting them in relation to their properties—whether they are affected by a reservation; whether there is a need to have a reassessment of the acquisition, with values; and things of that sort. The chairman spends a great deal of time at meetings of local authorities, and assisting them in their planning roles. The City of Perth has now about one million people living in it, so we need to have an overview of planning matters.

The full-time appointment of the Chairman of the MRPA has meant that the people have a better crack of the whip. He has been able to give more assistance to members of the Town Planning Department. If the member for Victoria Park would like to check on my comment, I suggest that he speak to the commissioner and ask him whether in his view the appointment has been of great benefit to the department.

Mr Davies: I do not talk to that fellow. I have no reason to talk to him.

Mrs CRAIG: The appointment of the chairman has made a considerable difference to the work of the authority and to the work of the planning officers.

Mr Davies: I will try to find time to see him one day and ask him.

Mrs CRAIG: We were treated to a number of quotes from newspaper reports by the member for Victoria Park. That is the sort of thing the member has started to do doing in recent days. He sought to cast aspersions on the Chairman of the Town Planning Board. I regret that circumstance, because it was made clear to Mr O'Meara, when he was appointed to the position, exactly what his role would be so far as his involvement in planning matters in Western Australia was concerned.

The member tried to make much of the fact that Mr O'Meara is a participant in a time-sharing development in Busselton. The subdivisional application for that went to the board before Mr O'Meara was involved with the board. The land was zoned for the purpose before Mr O'Meara became the chairman of the board. All these matters would be verified if the member cared to question the Shire of Busselton, because they are matters of fact.

By innuendo, the member tried to assert that someone has been deriving an advantage by achieving, on his behalf, a development that otherwise would not be achieved. In my view, that is a very low way to go about trying to denigrate someone who has been a very good officer, and who has served local government and the Government very well.

It is true that Mr O'Meara is in a part-time position—three days a week. For the rest of the time, he is a local government consultant. He knows and understands—indeed, the conditions of his appointment indicate this clearly—that he cannot be consulted in relation to matters of planning that may come before the board. Local authorities carry out many roles, the great majority of which are not associated with planning in any way. If a local authority chooses to employ Mr O'Meara on a problem that it refers to him from time to time, I cannot see any conflict of interest.

The member for Victoria Park asked me whether any standing orders required an interest to be declared. I recall answering a question, not posed by him, but by another member from his side of the House, as to whether Mr Wilkins, during his time as a member of the Town Planning Board, had declared an interest in any matter. In my reply, I gave the times at which he had done so. I am afraid that I cannot say, with any accuracy, what the requirement is, but a requirement exists, and I would be happy to tell the member for Victoria Park afterwards exactly what is that requirement.

Mr Davies: Mr Wilkins is on the authority; O'Meara is on the board.

Mrs CRAIG: I was careful to say, "When Mr Wilkins was a member of the Town Planning Board."

Mr Davies: Because it applies to a board—

Mrs CRAIG: The member was talking about Mr O'Meara and the board. I was speaking about the question asked from his side of the Chamber about Mr Wilkins, when he was a member of the board and whether, at that time, he had declared an interest in any matter before him. I am talking

about the board, and when Mr Wilkins was on the board. The matter of his being on the authority now is entirely different; and the member has been given the answer to the question that he asked.

Mr Davies: At that time, were you able to give me the authority under the Act for having to declare an interest, from the reading of the regulations?

Mrs CRAIG: I have said before now that I am not sure whether it is laid down in the regulations. That is why I have offered to tell him when I have had an opportunity to research the question. I do not know just where the power lies, and how it is applied.

Mr Davies: I could not find it. It might be in the regulations somewhere.

Mrs CRAIG: Certainly it is not written into the Statute. It may be in the regulations. I will advise the member about that.

Generally speaking, that covers the matters raised by the member for Victoria Park. He said that very little thought had been given to the appointments. I assure him that an enormous amount of thought over a period of two years or more was put into the restructuring of the department in this way. In the future, that should begin to show benefits for the citizens of Western Australia. After all, that is what we are about. We are looking at the efficient functioning of a department.

Mr Davies: Hear, hear, at all times!

Mrs CRAIG: Predictably, the member for Gosnells took up the subject of the tavern at Heathridge, and he made all sorts of assertions. I say simply that if he read the Statute he would find that the decision is final when the Minister has made it. His plea to me to reconsider the matter means that simply he has not read the Statute, because I am not able to reconsider the matter—the decision has been made.

Mr Pearce: How about making an objection to the Licensing Court?

Mrs CRAIG: As I previously told the member, the decision was made after a comprehensive review of the application before me, and after discussions with shire officers and others who indicated to an officer of my appeal committee the information contained in a report placed before me. I have no reason to disbelieve the information, because the report was drawn up by a person of high integrity. He is highly regarded in local government circles, and he always has been. It was a sensitive issue, and I wanted someone who was heavily involved with local government, or who

had been in the past, to assess that particular recommendation—

Mr Tonkin: But you did the right thing?

Mrs CRAIG: That man indicated that the officers had nothing at all to say against the planning development; and it was an appropriate area for it to be sited.

Mr Pearce: The council did not allow that. The conditions had been set by the council.

Mrs CRAIG: I could not agree more. He had conferred with the council and had round-table discussions with it.

Mr Pearce: You obtained the information from the council, and then you prevailed on an individual on the council staff to give an opinion on that.

Mrs CRAIG: Very often members of the appeal panel speak to officers of councils in regard to schemes presently operative, certain clauses that could be introduced, and the council's interpretation of those. The council officers were not named in the report, so I am unable to say who they were.

This is all part of the process. As the member would know, when an appeal comes in from a council, very often the board looks at the decision of the council and also of the planning officers. Very often—and fairly so—a council makes a decision that is not in accord with what the planning officer has recommended. However, that is the council's role, because it sees it as being in the best interests of the people.

I said I had received 51 objections lodged with a petition. With the exception of three people, they were all south of the road mentioned. It was not Caridean Street. The member has presented another petition today. All I would say, in summing up on this matter, is that it shows the disadvantage that accrues to people when they wish to politick in local government. That is exactly what the member for Gosnells has sought to do during this matter.

The member knew very well that the Minister had no opportunity of reconsidering an appeal decision.

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs CRAIG: He had people sign a petition when he knew that, legally, I am unable to take any action. I said not one person who objected was on the other side of Caridean Street immediately opposite the tavern site.

Mr Tonkin: Haven't you got a mind of your own? Take the responsibility for your decision.

Mrs CRAIG: I took the decision.

Mr Tonkin: It is the wrong one. It is a bungle.

Mrs CRAIG: I took the decision on the basis of information before me. I say simply that if a council wishes to go back on the arrangement it made in the first instance, perhaps it will hand back the 2 000 square metres of land and the other things it took in exchange for this approval.

Mr Tonkin: Would you want a tavern next door to your place?

Progress

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr Davies.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

Sitting suspended from 6.17 to 7.30 p.m.

BILLS (4): RETURNED

1. Stamp Amendment Bill (No. 6).
2. Loan Bill.
3. Wheat Marketing Amendment Bill.
4. Bulk Handling Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

In Committee

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Division 58: Town Planning, \$4 116 000—

Progress was reported after Division 58 had been partly considered.

Item 1: Salaries, Wages and Allowances—

Mr DAVIES: I thank the Minister for her comments; she was very defensive. I was not being hypercritical of the department. The only thing she did not tell me was why all the new positions were not listed on the amendments. According to the question she answered earlier in the year, the new appointment of the assistant commissioner (administration) was made from 8 July. I imagine that, if the appointment was made from that date, provision should have been made in the Estimates, but looking at the position here, one finds no provision for a deputy commissioner, and the new assistant commissioner and the other higher positions she mentioned are not shown. I draw attention to that because I believe we should be given as much information as possible when considering

the Estimates. After all, we get very little information—and I am not being critical of the Minister; it is the way the Estimates are written.

There was time and room to show the new positions under the lists of establishments in the Estimates. The department's main need is for a public relations officer. The Minister told us at some length that the real difficulties lay in communications and that most of the upgrading that had taken place was as a result of the need for better communication. The assistant commissioner (planning) seemed to have some special expertise in this regard as did the new Secretary of the MRPA. We agree, but it does not matter whether we give a man \$10 000, \$50 000, or \$60 000 a year; he can work only eight hours a day—or that is all that is expected of him. But if the previous incumbent was working full time as I am sure he was, because the Minister said it was a busy job, I imagine the answer is not to appoint another man with better qualifications on a higher salary. He can sign only so many letters and get material out to affected landowners and ratepayers; he can do only so much. It might have been better to appoint a full-time public relations officer to cover the lot.

Mr Laurance: If you pay peanuts you get monkeys.

Mr DAVIES: I suppose the Minister is right. It is a cliché, but if one gets a top administration man, he can still work only the allotted hours a day, or be expected to work those hours. Will the department be upgraded and a couple more clerks be employed to sign the letters or write the letters for him to sign? The answer is not to get someone superior to a monkey—it is to get the right people for the job and to make certain the people appointed have the capacity to do the work required. They will have to get additional people to help them. That may have happened by this time next year.

The Minister talked about the huge amounts of documentation coming before each meeting of the MRPA and said that is why the need existed for a full-time chairman. He works hard and is very dedicated. But if it is going to take so long to deal with the documentation, the position will be reached shortly where we will need not only a full-time chairman, but also a full-time MRPA. If the chairman is manufacturing all this work and there is so much documentation, he is not the only one who will have to deal with it. He will be generating so much work the MRPA will not be able to handle it in normal meeting time, and we will need a full-time MRPA.

If I cast aspersions on anyone over the appointment of Mr O'Meara and the appointment of Mr Wilkins, it is on the Minister. If she wants to read in any innuendo that some advantage has occurred to some person or another within the pay of the department, she does that wholly and solely in her own right. I do not cast any innuendoes in that regard. I read a letter from a developer who reflected to me the feelings of other developers about what was happening at the Town Planning Board and in the department. If Mr O'Meara was appointed to liaise with local government, and he is an expert in local government, on what matter is he liaising with them? Is he liaising on local government matters, or is he liaising with local government on town planning matters? If he is liaising with them on town planning matters, what we say can happen eventually will happen—he will find a conflict of interest arising on town planning matters.

If we want someone to liaise with local government, we must appoint a full-time public relations officer because it will be impossible for the Chairman of the Town Planning Board to improve relations with local government if he does not discuss town planning matters.

Division 58 put and passed.

Division 59: Lands and Surveys, \$17 022 000—

Mr DAVIES: An area in the old Collier pine plantation was earmarked to be subdivided into land for housing. This was announced about 12 months ago and the idea was that the money made available from the sale would be used by the Forests Department to pay for the new administration headquarters. A great deal of interest has been shown in this, and I have been interested because of all the inquiries made to me arising from the fact that it is right on the boundary of my electorate.

It turns out as a result of questions I have asked, that no-one can say when the subdivision will take place or how much land is likely to be made available because part of the area is to be given to the new technology park. Here again, some confusion or argument must be taking place between Treasury, the Department of Lands and Surveys, and the Forests Department as to who shall pay how much for any particular area of land. I have asked a series of questions and I will paraphrase the answer I received tonight which said that part of the land which is about half of the estate to be made available for the technology park, is to go into the hands of a board to be set up for the purpose of establishing various interested organisations on that area of land. This board apparently will have the right to sell that

land. It will be only vested in the board; it will not be made available to it. Half of the land which was to pay for the new Forests Department administration buildings has been made available to a board which will sell it in the course of time. We do not know what the board will do with the money.

My question to the Minister—and it is handy that all the departments fall within his purview—is: What arrangements have been made to recoup the money they were looking to get in order to pay for the new administration buildings? If the land to be made available for the technology park is to be sold to an independent board yet to be set up, will the board then give the money back to the Government or will it be able to use it? Will the board have the land vested in it free of charge and not have to pay anything for it at any time? A further question is: What progress is likely to be made on the development of half of the Collier pine plantation—the area bounded by Jarrah Road, Hayman Road, and Kent Street—which is to be developed eventually for housing? When is this likely to proceed and when is the land likely to go on the market?

Mr LAURANCE: The matter raised by the member for Victoria Park is quite complex. I could go on at length and explain it, but I will not do so now. I undertake to give him an answer in writing to the questions he has raised.

Division 59 put and passed.

Divisions 60 to 66—Bush Fires Board, \$1 154 000; Kings Park Board, \$1 650 000; Zoological Gardens Board, \$1 458 000; Forests, \$27 082 000; Conservation and Environment, \$2 761 000; National Parks Authority, \$2 702 000; Waterways Commission, \$841 000—put and passed.

Division 67: Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development, \$6 477 000—

Mr BRYCE: I would like to make a few comments about a fairly fundamental difference of approach to this very important portfolio between the Government and the Opposition, and I am referring to the question of technology. I could refer to many aspects of this portfolio, but I intend to confine my remarks to the future of Western Australia and the importance of this high technology issue, and especially the difference between the way the Government thinks we should handle this situation and the correct course as perceived by the Opposition.

It is a great disappointment to us that we have no Minister for technology. There is no longer any doubt in the minds of Opposition members that WA should have had such a portfolio at least

three years ago. Had there been a change in Government in 1980, we would have such a portfolio.

Members will appreciate that the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development, Tourism, and the North West has been given, almost as a throwaway, the responsibility for the future of technology.

The Government has refused steadfastly to appoint a Minister for technology. The Liberal-Country Party coalition Government has done the State a disservice in insisting upon that particular stance. A Minister should have been given this responsibility. No-one is questioning the fact that there would be difficulties in establishing lines of demarcation between different portfolios because we would be breaking new ground.

Certainly a number of important portfolios have direct involvement in the issues relating to new technology and technological change. The Government and the Opposition differ significantly in that for some five or six years the Government has insisted that no specific responsibility be given to a particular Minister and that there shall be no Ministry of technology on the assumption of the great white father who is no longer here—Sir Charles Court—that it was everybody's responsibility rather than the responsibility of a particular Minister.

For many years our concern has been that, if everyone has the responsibility for some particular problem area, nothing will be done. If no particular individual is responsible, the important actions that need to be taken simply will not be taken. That is what has happened here. In my candid view—and it is a view shared by my colleagues—we have lost between four and five very valuable years in regard to the leadership that should have been and could have been given to the development of high technology industries in Western Australia.

Let me explain some of the difficulties with a Government like the one we have at the helm of the affairs of this State. Clearly and obviously high technology involves the portfolios of the Attorney General—law reform; education in a very real way; industrial relations; and more particularly, it impinges upon the areas of responsibility of the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development. Those are the four most important areas of a State Government's administrative responsibilities in regard to technological change and high technology.

It is true that every other sphere of Government decision making and activity will be affected by the introduction of new technology and the im-

portant changes that are occurring about us. However, if we distil that list of State Government portfolios, we must appreciate that at this stage of our development, immediate decisions are necessary in those four most important areas.

Leadership in our view primarily can be established through the area of industrial development. It has an interface with industrial relations, and although there has been no traditional connection with education, clearly there should be a relationship with the State's education system.

The Western Australian Government has said, "We will give each and every one of our Ministers responsibility for this phenomenon". As I said earlier, and my view is shared by my parliamentary colleagues, this has meant that no specific Minister has the responsibility to take care of our responsibilities. We are criticised frequently in this place and in public forums for not coming up with alternatives. Yet I have noticed, in recent days, we have been told that our alternatives could not possibly be afforded.

I intend to suggest to members, through you, Mr Chairman, that when there is a change of Government early next year, one of the first things the new Cabinet will do is to appoint a Cabinet task force, headed by a Minister for Technology. This task force will be given the specific responsibility to establish a strategy for the development of industries for the future in this State.

We saw the great Pilbara plan, and very extensive and sophisticated inquiries have been conducted into numerous other areas of Government in this State. Recommendations have been brought down suggesting the way in which this State should be heading, and yet at this moment WA is not plugged into the future. I am not condemning the Minister personally. The weakness to which I intend to point in this area is that he and his parliamentary colleagues insist on worshipping at the altar of free market forces and allowing the private sector to proceed at its own pace and at the way it chooses to go to suit the forces of the market. That is precisely the reason why we are missing out. I do not suggest that the Minister has done anything specifically to impede this State in developing a practical approach to high technology industries, but over the last six years we have had a Cabinet which has insisted that the force of the market should determine what form of new industries of this type should be encouraged and should develop.

On numerous occasions I have tried to point out to the Minister that the Anglo-American model we have followed in the past is no longer sufficient

or satisfactory for the future. It is time to look at the successes of the Japanese, the Koreans, the Singaporeans, and a number of other outstandingly successful economies in the field of high technology industries. We have the talent, the ability, and the capacity in this State to match the best in the world in this field, and yet we are not amongst the best in the world. We drag a long way behind a number of countries that, only a short time ago, certain individuals in this place would have described and regarded as third world countries. The supreme irony is that many sections of Japanese society today regard Australia as a third world country in many ways. So it is high time that Government, unions, industrial leaders, and Australian citizens across the board are dragged out of their complacency and forced to accept the truth that the world is passing us by in this area.

I would like to draw to the attention of members the words of one of the most outstandingly successful individuals in the Australian computing industry. I am referring to Mr Hartley, who delivered the theme address at this year's Australian computer conference. Mr Hartley, in no uncertain terms, shocked the conference on the opening day when he pointed out that if we did not change our *modus operandi* to the question of industries of the future and the critical role high technology has to play, we will—to use his words and not mine—become the white trash of the Pacific. Our children will inherit a second grade, second quality society. I am concerned that we have not done enough in WA in the last five or six years to prevent that happening. Many of our attitudes have to change. We are in danger of becoming an industrial museum. Many of our industries are very much the industries of the 1950s and 1960s. Some of our industries, and I do not wish to be misunderstood, are up to date; a few of them are at the forefront in regard to technological change, but as a general rule we are in danger of becoming an industrial museum.

For some strange reason we have failed to provide the proper environment. I could refer to a number of countries which have provided the environment for the new high technology to thrive and prosper. I have said many times before that the Scandinavian nations of western Europe, certain other western European nations, and the Scandinavians of South-East Asia are leaving us for dead and we seem to be unperturbed. For almost 80 years or more we have had a Minister for Agriculture, and nobody denies the importance of agriculture. High technology will be of similar importance in the next half century, and yet we resist the challenge. For some unknown

reason we are fighting against the recognition of the importance of appointing a Minister for technology.

How is it that we have a Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife, a Minister for Lands, and a whole heap of other less significant portfolios when we do not have a Minister for Technology? Recently I studied the portfolio groupings of other States and in only a few States of Australia are Governments beginning to recognise the importance of technology. Some States still have a Minister for Soldiers' Settlement, but they do not have a Minister for Technology. Why is it that so many Australians across the country, but particularly in this State, will not accept the significance of where this nation and economy are heading? It would appear to me that too much faith is being placed in the market mechanism.

I shall give the Minister my opinion, for what it is worth. If we stand back and allow the market forces to determine what happens in this country, we will be suffocated by economies such as Japan, Singapore, and South Korea in our own immediate geographical environment. There is no doubt in my mind those economies which have a sophisticated joint venture between Government and private enterprise, are leaving our sort of economies for dead.

For how long do we have to sit back and watch for the signs to prove that this is happening? Let me give the Minister the figures which count. For every \$1 worth of electronic equipment exported from this country, \$14 worth is imported. This country is technologically dependent on what happens outside it. We are the users, the installers, the maintainers, the commissioners, and the sellers of other people's technology and yet we have some of the brightest people in the world capable of designing and developing technology; but what do we do? We sit back and say, "Let the market forces determine what happens in this country."

If we do that for much longer, we will, in the words of Mr Hartley, the famous computer engineer to whom I referred earlier—he is certainly no Labor man—run the risk of finishing up as the "white trash of the Pacific" simply because we are technologically dependent. Members should bear in mind that for every \$1 worth of electronic equipment we send overseas, we import \$14 worth from other countries. That is a staggering imbalance.

A significant change of attitude needs to occur in a number of other respects. For how long have we in this Chamber been dominated by talk about iron ore and the great resources boom, one after

the other? They will not be the determining factors of our prosperity in the future. High technology will be the key to our future and it does not have very much in common with the basic ingredients of the questions which surround the welfare of the iron ore, alumina, or nickel industries.

Mr O'Connor: Surely there is a lot of high technology involved in the operations of the iron ore industry.

Mr BRYCE: A great deal of technology has been applied to the iron ore industry. In fact our iron ore industry is the most productive in the world, bar none, because of the application of technology.

Mr Sibson: Why are you rubbishing it then?

Mr BRYCE: Unfortunately we do not export the technology; we export the iron ore. I do not knock the significance of that to the State's balance of payments, but I suggest we need to change our attitudes in a number of these areas.

Mr Sibson: You need to change your attitude.

Mr BRYCE: The community and the Government need to change their attitudes. For too long we have been preoccupied with the problems which grew out of the fact that we are a long way removed from the consuming markets of Japan and western Europe, because we have traditionally sold the raw materials those economies need. That has been our preoccupation and today it is doing us a disservice, because it has placed a set of blinkers on the thinking of many Australians. I shall illustrate that. The Japanese consider the entire world to be their market. If one asks the average Australian or Western Australian businessman what his market is, he will say that, firstly, his market is Western Australia, secondly and primarily, Australia, and then he makes a great psychological jump to the rest of the world, because customarily we have thought in terms of very bulky commodities which are expensive to transport and which incur a freight differential which makes it difficult for us to compete.

The future will be different in many ways because of high technology products. We should learn the lesson from Japan. We should cast off the impressions of the past; we should think of the world as our marketplace in many of these industries instead of saying, "Let us satisfy Australia first". That tends to presume a certain scale and scope of activities and then, after that—if we want to grow up—presumably we would be able to think in terms of overseas markets. That is an attitude which must certainly change if we are to survive economically.

Mr Sibson: I do not say your comments are wrong, but don't give the impression that we have never been involved or interested in world markets.

Mr BRYCE: Our interest in those world markets has tended to be restricted to important primary products.

Mr Sibson: Well, they are the most important things.

Mr BRYCE: I do not deny a place in the sun in terms of importance of those primary products in the past, the present, and the future; but members should recognise that, if we continue to rely on those products alone, we will become the white trash of the Pacific. I believe Hartley was quite correct in that respect.

Mr Sibson: We need to produce a little more for a little less money.

Mr BRYCE: It does not surprise me the member for Bunbury becomes the first member of this Chamber to make the first oblique criticism and reference to the people who earn wages and salaries; that is, the work force.

Mr Sibson: I referred to everybody.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Bunbury will tell us all our economic problems are related to people who are members of trade unions.

Mr Sibson: I am including everyone in the work force.

Mr BRYCE: In summarising this matter, I point out we need a change in philosophy. I suggest to the Minister we shall have to agree to disagree on a fundamental matter. Conservative members of Parliament when speaking to the Chamber of Commerce, the Confederation of WA Industry (Inc.), or the Australian Mines and Metals Association (Inc.)—those chosen forums—simply delight in climbing on to the podium and condemning the public sector. They love to talk about the exclusive role of the free enterprise private sector.

The difference between us is simply this: We recognise the importance of both sectors, but members opposite do not. The Japanese, the Singaporeans, and other people throughout the world have demonstrated that, without a genuine understanding between both sectors based on mutual trust and co-operation, we will be beaten into second, third, or fourth place in the race.

Funny old conservatives would like to turn back the clock to the 19th century, but the halcyon days when the private sector ran and was responsible for approximately 95 per cent of all economic activity have gone and that simply cannot happen again.

While we argue amongst ourselves in this remote little part of the world, those other economies to which I have referred are leaving us for dead and, in fact, they are making it very difficult for us ever to begin the task of catching up. That is why I hope sincerely for the sake of Western Australians that we have a change of Government in March 1983. We need a change of philosophy and approach.

I indicated to the Minister that not only his portfolio, but also that of the Minister for Education is important to this question, so I shall make a brief reference to the vital connection between high technology and education. I hope the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development does not dismiss it with the inference that it is not related to his department, because it is.

Perhaps you, Sir, would permit me to start from this point with an observation that one of the most serious weaknesses in our economy at the moment is that, although we on both sides of the House, together with the leaders of the union movement and industry, concur that we are going into a very serious economic recession/depression, practically nothing is being done about the critically important question of retraining our work force in preparation for the time that we come out of it.

The reason is that at this moment in this part of the world, the people who make the decisions believe that the marketplace must call the shots. As a result, we will be left for dead, particularly when compared with the Japanese. Is it not ironic that the Japanese consider money spent in human training and skill development is an investment and yet, in this country, the captains of industry—in particular, the conservative politicians—always consider that item to be an expense, a cost, and something that we cannot afford?

Too often we turn to somebody else's backyard and say, "Where are the skills we need? Let us import them." Many of our problems relate to our education system and there is a positive and important connection between industrial development of the future—our industries of the future—and our education system.

It is only countries such as Japan, West Germany, Singapore, South Korea, and a number of others which have recognised the connection between their education systems—their programmes of skills development—and their industrial development systems that are currently enjoying any degree of success.

Mr Sibson: They also realise they have to work. They know they have to work hard.

Mr BRYCE: What disturbs me is that, in this Chamber and in this community, we delude ourselves into believing that we have a high standard of education, indeed, one of the best standards of education in the world. That is fundamentally false and the quicker the decision makers in this community drop that assumption, the better off our economy and society generally will be.

I shall give members an example of countries with which we like to compare ourselves so often in this field. In Japan today, that nation which so many Australians remember was defeated by Australia and her allies—I underline “her allies”—during World War II, 88.1 per cent of 17-year-olds are still engaged in full-time education. I guarantee few members of this Chamber would know what the disastrous figure is in this community.

It shames me to have to tell members that only 31 per cent of all young Australians are full-time engaged in the education process at the age of 17. What an incredible difference. When I say they are devoting an extraordinary percentage of their resources to the development of human skills because they consider that human resources are more important than mineral resources, members will begin to see what I mean.

It is true that the smart people in the world eventually will finish up with the resources of the world whether or not they happen to be in their backyard. At this stage most of the mineral resources of the world happen to be in the backyards of countries like ours. Yet it is only a matter of time before the communities which are rich in terms of human resources will take the benefits from us.

In the United States of America, three times the number of young men and women do science degrees and go into the field of science and engineering than those same youngsters in Australia. Obviously incentive, encouragement, and leadership produces this sort of result. The difference is staggering and important. We cannot afford to turn our backs on this any longer. Consider how much further those science graduates go than our own science graduates and we begin to ask ourselves the question: Why is it that United States industries and Japanese industries are so much more inventive, productive, and positively capable than Australian industries?

Mr Rushton: In recent times they have been down looking at our transport to get ideas relative to costs, because their costs have been running out of control.

Mr BRYCE: Who?

Mr Rushton: The Japanese have had one of their economics professors down here, interviewing us and getting some thoughts. Strangely enough, technology-wise they are amongst the world's best, but economically they are badly off.

Mr BRYCE: I recognise that what the Deputy Premier says happens from time to time. Our standing in the rest of the world in certain important areas of industrial technology is very high, but unfortunately it is on the decline when compared with many parts of the world. We are neglecting this problem. Unfortunately, Australians knock the search for excellence; we knock our education system; we knock almost every important area of human investment because we tend to concentrate on the physical and the financial resources of this community. I am not surprised that a deputation of Japanese has come to this country to look at a particular important success story. I mentioned a week or a fortnight ago that during the 1960s and 1970s approximately a dozen well-recognised significant developments occurred in this country ranging from agriculture and mining, to pure scientific development. Tragically, the rest of the world has developed those ideas and made the big quid out of them while we in this country have sat back and been prepared to take the back seat.

The role the Government has to play in this field is of concern to me. This is where I differ from my counterpart opposite, who tends to extol the virtues of the marketplace and the market mechanism. He says, “Leave it to the private sector; allow it to set the pace, to determine priorities, and ultimately the shape our society will take.” I do not agree; I think we will be pushed back into the third, fourth, or fifth-mark nations if we do that.

We need an intelligent and determined joint venture between the best brains in the private sector and the best brains in the public sector. We need a joint venture which will match the intellectual determination and ruthlessness of those economies with which we have to compete. Each time I visit one of those places, I come home with the same sense of frustration when I realise that back here in Australia the dominating theme is “Whatever will be, will be”. This attitude is taken it seems because these countries are so far away from us that it does not really matter.

As I was saying, in the United States of America, three times the proportion of youngsters on a per capita basis who go into secondary schools go into areas of science and engineering when compared with similar youngsters in this

country and this State. Of all the young people in the United States who graduate in science, 28 per cent go on and become Doctors of Philosophy, attaining a very high degree of excellence in their field.

Do members know what the percentage is in this field in this country? It is a miserable five per cent. Yet when we go from primary school to primary school or from high school to high school in our constituencies we insist on kidding ourselves and the people with whom we meet and talk that we have one of the best education systems in the world. I emphasise the point: It is a very ordinary education system indeed on an international comparison.

The Minister for Education may feel proud of the fact that our buildings look pretty, buildings such as the Education Department headquarters. Perhaps it is the envy of the world now. I am not begrudging the Minister and his senior civil servants this delightful building, but what is the significance of brilliant buildings, good gymnasiums, and other facilities?

Mr Clarko: And good teachers.

Mr BRYCE: What is the good of all these facilities if the end result is a long way behind that of the rest of the world?

Mr Clarko: There is no other State in Australia ahead of us in computer technology. I recently arranged for you to talk with Dr Loudman.

Mr BRYCE: I am not talking about the rest of Australia; I am talking about the rest of the world.

Mr Clarko: But in Australia we are equal to if not the best with computers in schools, both secondary and primary.

Mr BRYCE: We are equal to the best in that field; I am happy to make that admission about our education system. But if we compare ourselves with places such as Minnesota, Ontario, and other provinces in North America—

Mr Young: What about Austria?

Mr BRYCE: I also have visited the socialist Utopia of Europe, and the message I have is pretty diabolical for members sitting opposite.

Mr Young: Wait until your leader comes back.

Mr BRYCE: If we compare ourselves with provinces like Minnesota and no doubt with some of the prefectures in Japan, we find we are not anywhere near the front rank of what is happening in the world. If we had the determination, we could be, because our people are smart enough, our opportunities are good enough, and our facilities basically are there. However, we are not producing the results.

Mr Chairman, I am sorry about the cross-fertilisation of these two areas, but it does happen to be one of these interesting phenomena of the future that education and technology are linked. Unlike the rest of the past where industry and education have never been seen to have very much in common, industry and education will have a great deal in common in the future.

I suggest to the Minister for Education—because I cannot also speak on this subject when his section of the Estimates comes up—that there are a number of areas where he and the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development can work closely together. Those areas should not be seen to be so separate as they have tended to be in the past.

Mr Clarko: I agree with a lot of what you say. I am trying to make changes in the education system which would seek the things you are talking about. We are trying to embrace the best technology and we are encouraging our lecturers to have higher qualifications to do these very things.

Mr BRYCE: Therefore, some of the Minister's educational bureaucrats need a brief course in some form of re-education, because it is only a matter of 18 months ago that I asked the Minister for Education at that time, whose answer to my question was provided presumably by a senior departmental head, just when should children begin the simple process of keyboarding. The answer was, "Never, until they reach high school." It is critically important that primary school children should be encouraged into that field.

Mr Clarko: Has there not been a big change in the last 12 months? Only Tasmania and Western Australia have computers in primary schools, really.

Mr BRYCE: But is it not a poor substitute—and I know this does not offend the Minister's philosophy—when we realise that the most affluent schools in this community can be and will be the schools with computers? They will be years ahead of those other schools which cannot afford them, because the Minister will supply computers on a dollar-for-dollar subsidy basis to a maximum of \$3 000. How easy it is for the people in and around Circe Circle Primary School to find funds for half a dozen or so computers.

Mr Clarko: Our big schools in some suburbs you think are not affluent also have the capacity to raise funds, and they have done this with swimming pools. They have raised more than \$3 000.

Mr BRYCE: Swimming pools have appeared at those schools a long way after they appeared in the more affluent schools, and I am sorry if the

Minister wants to compare swimming pools with computers. In many cases there was a delay of a decade to get swimming pools. It is important to realise that a delay of even a year is one we cannot afford when considering technology.

Quite candidly, I believe we should have technology specialist schools, and we should look at this sooner than later. We should have these schools at both primary and secondary levels if we are to match and live with the Japanese and Singaporeans. We ought to have special screening for youngsters who show a good inclination, whether they come from Dalkeith, Bayswater, Redcliffe, or Jerramungup. We should encourage every human being in this community who shows an inclination in these areas, because it will be people—unlike the sheep of the 19th century—who will carry this community on their backs in so many different ways for the rest of the century.

I might wind up my remarks on this important subject simply by pointing out to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development and the Minister for Education that it will be the quality of people and the quality of skills that will determine our standards of living. I have no doubt that the long-term advantages of this State's mineral wealth will accrue to the Japanese, American, and British peoples before it will accrue to us unless we develop the human skills and unless we invest in human development in a way that we have been taught to do by those countries I have just mentioned.

It was not a good and sound reason for the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development a few days ago to condemn, in answer to a "Dorothy Dixer", the decision of the new South Australian Government to appoint a Minister for Technology. It just so happens in that State they have decided the Minister for Education will also be the Minister for Technology. It could equally be the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development who could be a Minister for technology. Perhaps one day we will have a Minister for economic development and education who will also be the Minister for technology.

We are turning our backs on an incredibly important phenomenon if we condemn the initiatives of other Governments in this country which recognise the importance of appointing Ministries of technology.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Well spoken!

Mr MacKINNON: I will comment briefly on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's remarks on this issue. He and I certainly agree on the import-

ance of technology in the future, but I do not agree, as the member would have us believe this evening, that it will be the be-all and end-all of the future. What he has not explained in respect of world economies which have a great investment in new technology is that that technology represents only one sector of an economy. The member talked about Singapore. I have been to that country and have seen what has been done there. Singapore has five growth sectors within its economy, not one, and of those five sections one is high technology. That illustrates the difference in approaches between the Opposition and the Government; the Government believes our State has more to offer in the future than just one area of industry to encourage and develop, and I do not intend to underestimate the importance of those technologies.

Mr Bryce: You do appreciate I said I was going to talk about only one thing, don't you?

Mr MacKINNON: I must say, with due respect, that I have not heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition talk about any other topic recently.

Mr Bryce: What about small businesses?

Mr MacKINNON: Yes, the member has spoken about small businesses and industrial development in this Chamber recently. When we look at the other advantages our State has such as tourism and resource development, we would agree that this is only one sector of our economy.

Mr Grill: We won't have any manufacturing base at all unless we develop technology.

Mr MacKINNON: It is a matter of approach and my view in relation to the ministry of technology is: What's in a name? As I explained in answer to a question in relation to the South Australian appointment of a technology Ministry, it would be more appropriate to have the Ministry for Technology grouped with industrial development rather than education. I commend South Australia for taking that initiative, but I do not see the necessity for establishing a ministry to show how important the Government regards high technology. In this State we have a Minister, myself, responsible for the development of high technology. Why is it necessary for us to have a Ministry for namesake alone?

Mr Grill: We are lagging so far behind we may never catch up.

Mr MacKINNON: High technology is not a throw-away item in this State, as evidenced by many examples which the Government has been involved in dually with the private sector and the institutions, such as the Systems Research Institute of Australia, the Solar Energy Research

Institute of Western Australia, the technology review group, the technology park, the Electronics Industry Association—we have given a lot of support to that association—and the work we are doing in relation to the local preference committee on performance specifications to encourage the development of high technology services, and the Government computing committee. They are just a few examples. The Government does not believe it is necessary to have a ministry for its sake alone. The attitudes taken towards the development of high technologies is more important. The Government's attitude certainly differs from that of the Opposition because our attitude is one of co-operation and encouragement, not of control or restriction.

I urge the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to give us his policy in black and white from his party platform which tells us of the controls which the ALP, if ever it becomes the Government, would put on the introduction of new technologies and what decisions that company will need to make to explain exactly what that new technology will do before it is allowed to be implemented. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to give us that information.

Mr Bryce: Can I ask you a question? One very big area is that of attitudinal change which must exist on the part of management wanting to introduce a new technology; rather than saying it is a *fait accompli*, here it is, bang, it is established tomorrow; it should take its work force into its confidence to achieve a smooth transition based on mutual self-respect and co-operation.

Mr MacKINNON: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition got out to industry rather than sitting in Parliament or wherever else he sits as regularly as he does, he would realise that in this State that is the attitude taken.

Mr Bryce: It is not.

Mr MacKINNON: That just shows how abysmal the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's ignorance of industry in this State is.

Mr Pearce: It shows how rose tinted your spectacles are.

Mr MacKINNON: I get out into industry regularly and speak with the people and I have observed that to be the case. The Government believes in free enterprise ethics and the operation of market forces. The Government at times must provide a lead and co-operate with the private sector and institutions, as has been done in many areas as I have outlined. The Government believes in encouragement and incentive, not in control or the acquisition of profitable sectors or of ownership or restriction.

I mention another point which was touched on by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I am sure he agrees that the biggest problem in relation to high technology development in Australia today is the sad lack of investment, research, and development in this country by the private sector. If we look at Australian statistics we see that Government provides the majority of research and development expenditure in this country as opposed to the private sector. In those countries of the world which are leaders in the technology field, the reverse is true.

Mr Pearce: That just proves the point the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made.

Mr MacKINNON: I don't think it does, and I think he would agree with me on that. We have put forward that viewpoint regularly to the Federal Government because it is the Federal Government's role through the taxation system and by other means to provide that incentive to the private sector. I do not think it is within the means of State Governments to provide those sorts of incentives which would be effective across the board. We can provide the infrastructure, as we are doing in the technology park; we can provide the encouragement and co-operation in the research and development area, but there needs to be a bigger and bolder approach given to the taxation system by the Federal Government. The Government continually has represented that point to the Federal Government as an area which requires attention.

I mention the area of education which was the last topic discussed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Government believes education is important in the overall area of technology. The Minister for Education already has given some indication of how policies in this State are leading in this area and how the Technical Education Division is providing a lead in this State and a link between educators and industry. I mention for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's information that the technology review group has appointed an education subcommittee for the reasons he outlined. It has carried out a study and has conveyed a recommendation through me to the Minister for Education who has in turn provided me with a response; and now those two groups, the Education Department and the technology review group educational subcommittee, will soon get together and discuss those things outlined by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

As I indicated the other day in answer to a question, I believe the time has come when we need to look deeply at the overall organisation of high technology development in this State. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition missed several

key areas when he said there are four areas of involvement in departmental activities in this State.

Mr Bryce: Four primarily, I said.

Mr MacKINNON: There are many more that are perhaps more important. Two in this State are the involvement of Treasury and health. As the member would be aware, Dennis Moore and the technology and computer unit of the State Government are leaders in Australia in the application of computing technologies to the handling of Government services and they are now looking to sell some of that technology overseas.

Mr Bryce: Yes, but that is really basically administration, isn't it?

Mr MacKINNON: No, it is not.

Mr Bryce: Treasury and health are.

Mr MacKINNON: That is where we differ.

Mr Bryce: I have had a briefing with those fellows and I have seen and appreciate what they are doing.

Mr MacKINNON: That is good. It is not administration; it is certainly development. The amount of money that is spent in the area of computing, as outlined in the Premier's Budget speech this year—I think the figure was \$9 million—does lead to an encouragement of development and industry in this State. It is time we looked at the overall organisation of technology in this State. That is why we sent an officer to the Eastern States recently; he will advise us on how this is handled in other States. Dennis Moore will represent that section of Treasury involved and liaise with officers of my department and have a good look at the situation to see if it can be improved. Once again, the approach the Government is using is that of encouragement and incentive in an endeavour to encourage—I agree with the member—an important industry in this State.

The high technology industries are very important sectors of industry in this State and they will aid many of our industries to create and explore the opportunities available in this field so we do not become—I do not like using these words—the "white trash of the Pacific". That will not happen in this State, unless we have an ALP Government.

Mr Bryce: That has a nasty sting.

Division 67 put and passed.

Division 68: Office of the North West, \$269 000—put and passed.

Division 69: Tourism, \$5 443 000—

Mr PEARCE: About this time last year I rose to speak on the tourism division and I do not want to go over the same ground again, except to make

a point that when I spoke last year, I made what I consider to be a serious point; that is, that the Department of Tourism—I am not critical of that department; in fact I praised it in many ways last year—operates as a kind of public relations outfit with jazzy promotions of Western Australia being held in other States. Because of the relative isolation of Western Australia, we have the situation where the bulk of our tourists should really be our own people. Western Australia is a vast State with a lot of tourist potential. Three-quarters of the population of Western Australia are jammed into a few square miles around Perth. These are potential tourists and people who go away for their holidays. We have to travel an awfully long way before we get out of Western Australia and there ought to be greater encouragement to tourists to visit their own State first. I am sorry that there has not been in the time since I first raised it, a real emphasis on even the public relations side of the Department of Tourism on the aspect of getting Western Australians to see their own State.

Last year I adverted to the fact that it costs so much more to travel within Western Australia than it does to go overseas. One can, for example, purchase a seven-day ticket—which includes air fare and accommodation—to Bali for considerably less than the cost of travelling to Port Hedland, Kununurra, or even, I suppose, Kalgoorlie. Those places are desirable tourist locations, and yet the cost of overseas trips, particularly to Bali and Singapore, is so much cheaper that Western Australians are choosing those options and not seeing their own State. One of the reasons for this is that potential tourist facilities in this State are so underdeveloped.

In that connection I mention historic places like Denham and Shark Bay where every year there is a large tourist turnover; large numbers of people go there every year to fish. The tourist facilities are minimal, and I raised this aspect last year. I particularly want to re-emphasise my attitude to Denham. I do not want to be critical of the tourist development there, but it seems to me that when we develop these tourist complexes, our tourist developers or the tourist industry people should be more imaginative than they are.

My point about Denham illustrates fairly neatly what needs to be done. Some 15 000 or 20 000 people would visit Denham for a week or so every year and usually bring their boats from the south and do some fishing—I hope they do better than I do when I go there—but the facilities are really too small. There are only two groups of chalets and two caravan parks and a hotel which offer relatively low-class accommo-

dation. As I mentioned when the estimates for water resources were being considered in this House there is no water in Denham. No effort is being undertaken to upgrade the water supply. A person who operates the chalets in Denham has been wanting to extend her business, but has been unable to do so because of the water supply.

Shark Bay has a vast expanse of reasonably shallow and peaceful strips of water and it has the facility for a bare boat charter operation similar to those that operate in the Eastern States. These bare boat charter operations provide on-board living accommodation and it has surprised me that no-one has seen the potential for them in this State. Perhaps someone has investigated the matter, but because of the restrictions on the water supply and the lack of development in that area they have decided not to go ahead with such a proposal.

I was stunned to read only two months ago of the proposed tourist development north of Denham which seems to me to be the epitome of what the north-west does not need. It will mean that the tourist development proposal will be undertaken nine miles to the north of Denham in an area which is known as Big Lagoon. It is one of the most attractive areas in the north-west. Although it is called a lagoon it is a lengthy estuary which runs parallel to the coast for several miles and it is surrounded by sandhills—some red sand and some white sand. It is also a breeding place for whiting. The proposal is to build a 300-bed hotel on the edge of the lagoon, to turn the lagoon into a marina, and to provide caravan parks etc., around it.

If the proposals were agreed to, the difficulties of finding water would have to be overcome and it would ruin the natural features of that area. That is one of the reasons that tourists go to Big Lagoon. I cannot comprehend the idiocy of anyone's turning the lagoon into a marina. It is a foolish approach. The Government is not co-ordinating the development of the small tourist facilities that we have in WA. It seems that it has to pick the nicest places and allow hotchpotch developments to be constructed. The Government does not develop its tourist centres away from the scenic areas.

Mr MacKinnon: What is your example?

Mr PEARCE: My example is Denham. If a golf course is to be built on the sandhills between Big Lagoon and the ocean—and that is one of the proposals that has been put forward—the attractiveness of the area will be ruined.

The Big Lagoon area has a very fragile environment and it is the most attractive area in the

north-west. In order that tourist development does not destroy the natural beauty of Big Lagoon, tourist facilities should be established in Denham. It already has the facilities that would be required and with better water supplies it would be ideal. The restriction on development in Denham appears to be the water supply.

Tourist developers should be looking towards establishing tourist facilities such as the bare boat charter in areas of this kind. However, the proposal is to build a new town on top of one of the most attractive parts of WA and it will kill the town of Denham. If a town is built a few miles north of an existing town which is miles away from anything else, because the new town is a better place to service tourists, the original town will go into a state of decline. The proposal was put forward some 12 months ago, but a decision has not yet been made. I am hopeful that the Government will turn down this proposal. This does not take away from the Government and the Tourist Bureau the opportunity to have a more imaginative look at the tourist areas in our State and to make better use of them so that Western Australians will spend more time in this State.

It requires a specific commitment by the Government to develop tourist facilities and to recognise the tourist industry in terms of Government guarantees and the like. I understand there have been some Government guarantees for tourist facilities and no doubt the Minister will list them.

The Government, through the Tourist Bureau, must be prepared to promote the facilities set up by entrepreneurs around the State. We have a long way to go before greater use is made of our own tourist facilities and an even greater effort is required to get Western Australians to spend their holiday money in their own State.

Mr MacKINNON: In response to the member for Gosnells, I shall make a couple of comments. Firstly, he certainly has my support when he says there is a great deal of potential for intrastate tourist development in Western Australia and the Government has done much recently to encourage this.

The Government recently undertook a television advertising campaign for the first time in the Eastern States and in Western Australia. Within the State we have four advertisements, one for the goldfields region, and the others for the city, the north of the State, and the south of the State. To encourage movement within the State, the Government has provided grants to country tourist bureaus in Western Australia to improve tourist facilities in their towns and to

provide tourist services. The total grant in this year's Budget is \$263 000.

Regional tourism associations have been encouraged and it is considered that the best way to promote tourism is not by way of individual destination promotion, but by promoting regional destinations. Consequently we have established these organisations throughout the State and financial support has been provided. They have been successful and an officer has been appointed to the south-west region. The Government soon will be announcing the appointment of a second officer for regional areas.

This year's Estimates also provide \$424 000 for tourist facilities grants. In the past, we have provided funds to attractions like the Albany whaling station, the Hotham Valley railway, and the like, because we believed such attractions develop tourism in those areas. I have initiated a campaign to try to encourage the community to realise the value of tourism to this State. In my view, the industry has an identity crisis; it is not recognised by many people, whether they live in the metropolitan area, or in the regional towns. However, tourism is of great value to our community.

The Government agrees with the member's comments and is taking positive steps to encourage intrastate tourism. Obviously, there is room for improvement, and I will keep the honourable member's comment in mind when we are considering this area in the future.

I agree with the member for Gosnells that Denham is an outstanding tourist area. Indeed, I believe it is one of the best little tourist towns in Western Australia. The two immediate factors affecting that town are the lack of a water supply—and the cost of providing one—and the poor road leading into the town. We have made a commitment to seal the road by, I think, 1985-86. Once the road is sealed, I believe what happened to Broome this year also will happen to Denham; namely, a great influx of tourists will occur, with additional facilities needing to be provided. However, we must watch the situation closely to ensure that what happened to Broome when the road went through does not also happen at Denham. Broome was not ready for the sudden influx of visitors.

Mr Pearce: Denham will not be ready unless a water supply is provided. That is the prime requirement.

Mr MacKINNON: As I understand the situation, the Department of Tourism does not have a great involvement with the Perron Lagoon project. At this stage, it is only a concept; the conceptual plans have been shown to us. Basically, it is a

matter for the Minister for Lands, because no freehold land is available in the area. Obviously, until such time as the developer has access to land over which he has some tenure, he will not spend a great deal of money on the project. So, it is a matter of negotiation with the Minister for Lands, and that is continuing. Even if the developer does get access to the land, he still will have to jump over a lot of other hurdles. For example, he will have to satisfy the Government that environmental considerations have been taken into account, that he has a satisfactory water supply, and all the other things which accompany a development of this sort before the Government will approve the project.

I assure the member for Gosnells we will take account of the impact of the proposal on the Town of Denham, if the development goes ahead. I believe Denham is a great town, and when the black top goes through, it will have great potential as a tourist area.

I thank the member for his general comments on this division.

Division 69 put and passed.

Divisions 70 to 72—Chief Secretary's Department, \$1 421 000; Registrar General's Office, \$948 000; Astronomical Services, \$510 000—put and passed.

Division 73: Electoral, \$2 612 000—

Mr JAMIESON: As in the past, I wish to comment on this division. In previous years, I have complained that Western Australia cannot afford the luxury of maintaining electoral rolls separate from those of the Commonwealth, involving as it does a great deal of duplication and a lot of work for the State Electoral Department. A large sum of money would be saved by the State and Commonwealth electoral rolls being combined, as has been done in most other States. The Government always complains about the lack of finances. However each year, it squanders hundreds of thousands of dollars on maintaining a separate electoral roll.

I notice from this year's New South Wales Budget papers that the Electoral Office in that State comprises one electoral commissioner and 28 administrative and clerical division officers—a total complement of 29 people.

We can see from the salary and wages component of the Electoral Department vote that there are no fewer than 31 people on the staff. That may not sound to be very different from the situation in NSW, but the population in that State as at 1 April 1982 was 5 125 683 as against 1 273 420 for WA. So the population of NSW is about 4½ times the population of WA. It is

reasonable to assume that if we had an agreement with the Commonwealth about the creation of a single roll, we would be able to cut this vote to at least one-third.

Last year was a non-election year for both NSW and WA, and New South Wales expended \$677 538 for the electoral office salaries and WA expended \$483 646. So it took NSW a little more to maintain the rolls for a State the population of which is $4\frac{1}{2}$ times that of our State.

Mr Sibson: What about the geographical size?

Mr Bryce: Computers do the lot.

Mr JAMIESON: It is all a matter of storage—the geographical size would make no difference.

Just a few years ago the Government Printer kept the rolls for both the Commonwealth and the State. The lead for the rolls took up acres of floor space in the old building which housed the Government Printer. Now two computers do the work of categorising the people into districts. One machine and one department could do the job for both rolls.

A short while ago some Liberal Party candidates were rash enough to suggest a combined role. Mr Mitchell, who seems to be outspoken on all manner of things from bottom-of-the-harbour schemes to the top of the WASA, suggested a joint roll. He was quickly brought into line by the Chief Secretary. For some obscure reason which the Chief Secretary has not made clear to the public, he seems to feel the proper course to take is to maintain a separate roll and to waste hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

In all other States except SA, the Commonwealth maintains the roll and the States pay for the service. In SA the Commonwealth pays the State to maintain the dual roll. I believe it is better for us to pay the Commonwealth to do the work as it is very difficult to obtain money from Canberra. Both rolls deal with the one population, and it is ridiculous to do the work twice.

This dual system was never intended. A look at section 31 of the Electoral Act of 1907—when it was introduced originally—shows that this section has hardly changed. When eligibility for voting for the Legislative Council was altered to adult franchise, the words "Assembly roll" were amended to "State Elections". At that time the margin note to the section was, "Arrangements with the Commonwealth". Section 31 reads as follows—

31. (1) The Governor may arrange with the Governor General of the Commonwealth

for the preparation, alteration, and revision of the rolls, in any manner consistent with the provisions of this Act, jointly by the State and the Commonwealth, to the intent that the rolls may be used as electoral rolls for the Commonwealth elections as well as State elections.

(2) When any such arrangement has been made, the rolls may contain, for the purposes of such Commonwealth election—

- (a) the names and descriptions of persons who are not entitled to be enrolled thereon as electors of the State, provided that it is clearly indicated in the prescribed manner that those persons are not enrolled thereon as State electors;
- (b) distinguishing marks against the names of persons enrolled as State electors, to show that those persons are, or are not also enrolled as Commonwealth electors;
- (c) other particulars in addition to the prescribed particulars;

and for the purpose of this Act the names and descriptions, marks, and particulars so contained, shall not be deemed part of the roll.

All that information could be encoded on the one computer. It would then be relatively easy to determine discrepancies. Distinguishing marks would identify those people who were on one roll and not the other.

It is interesting to note that the Commonwealth Electoral Act contains a similar section which has been there since the parent Act was enacted in 1918, except that we see a reference to the Governor General rather than to the Governor. Obviously it was always intended that there be co-operation.

No legislation is necessary to create a joint master roll. It would not be necessary to amend the Electoral Act. One card could be produced for people to enrol for both the State and the Commonwealth. As long as a person's name appeared on one roll, it would not be necessary to have an enrolment witnessed by a policeman, an electoral officer, a justice of the peace, or a clerk of courts for the person to become enrolled on the other. It has been pointed out that the Liberal Party seems to have no trouble getting justices of the peace appointed, but this suggestion would obviate the need to have two lots of enrolment cards witnessed. As I said, the Government would save money, and this is apparent from the figures I quoted.

There is no reason for this Government's attitude. It is just a matter of bull-headedness or pig-

headedness indulged in by the Government. Sooner or later it will have to be done by the Government, because its activities will cause revulsion in the country if unemployment keeps increasing, and we duplicate facilities, and spend money on such duplication.

We are not entitled to do that. We have no authority from the people to have duplication in these circumstances. The Government should look quickly to its laurels. I am sure if we have a change next year, we will move quickly to implement a provision such as this in the circumstances. We would say to the Governor, "These negotiations have taken too long. We want a uniform list so we know exactly where we are." Nothing is more simple than that. It would be an instruction to the Governor which, in effect, means the Cabinet makes a decision in Executive Council. We have no reason not to go ahead with that and overcome the situation that is now causing us to lose so much money unnecessarily.

I turn now to another aspect. Sooner or later the Liberal Party will have to face up to the concept of one-vote-one-value. It is just as well that the expert on one-vote-one-value is not here, because he starts talking about the Senate situation, and all kinds of spurious circumstances that do not come into it. When we talk about one-vote-one-value, we mean we want each citizen in the State to be equal.

It might not be a bad opportunity for the Liberal Party to score off its own conscience by having a look at the fact that we now have 11 Federal seats. It so happens that after the election we will have 57 members in the Assembly. It would not be a bad opportunity to put into operation a system of proportional representation which would give one-vote-one-value. It might still give the member for Mt. Marshall a seat, if that is all he is worrying about.

We have the situation of obtaining another point of view from a biased electorate. Just imagine the situation in Nedlands if it had a Labor representative. Perhaps Fremantle would have a Liberal representative. It seems an appalling thought; but nevertheless we could see how it worked out.

Mr Williams: You just lost the member for Fremantle from your party.

Mr JAMIESON: He would have at least two, and possibly some other acquaintances that he could rely on at most times. It depends on the feeling of the electorate at the time of the election.

It is a great pity that the previous Government restricted the right to lower the numbers in the

other Chamber. We could have reduced the Legislative Council by one, and done exactly the same thing in this Chamber by contiguous alterations of the boundaries, to suit the provincial requirements.

These are all suggestions that should be looked at in some way. The Liberals in South Australia went out of power recently; but they were the masters of their own destiny. I often hear our fellows talking about what Dunstan did, and what others did. Sure, that led up to the situation where Steele Hall, as Premier, could not resist the thrust of the people in demanding vote-value justice. He went to the people on it and said that he was convinced it was the right thing to do. It was Steele Hall who put through the final legislation. At the time, the President of the Liberal Party in that State made the very clear statement that any party which won 50 per cent of the votes plus one should be entitled to be the Government of that State, if it had won enough seats. That is the salient point that escapes the minds of members on the Government side.

That could not happen in Western Australia, and it will not occur until we have some type of revision—whether we have proportional representation or otherwise does not matter much. I know what sort of policy my party adopts at present in connection with the Legislative Council. We have considered the list system, with half of the councillors being on the list at each election. Some people complain about that system and say it confines the representatives to the metropolitan area. It does not, because the parties nominate people who attract the extra votes in the outlying centres. That is not the idea of it. Anyone who has studied the list system in Israel and other places would know that is not the situation. The parties put people from minority groups on their lists. They know that they will attract the minority group vote.

The suggestion that the representation would be confined to the metropolitan area is ridiculous. The only way that the Labor Party can have a rural representative from this State in the Federal Parliament is by putting one into the Senate. That is hardly a good argument for suggesting that we would put all of the force into the metropolitan area. If the unions and others of whom the Government is afraid concentrated on confining their members to the metropolitan area, the Government would find that that was a problem.

Let us consider the various Liberal Party Senate teams from time to time. They do not have much country input. They are usually dominated by businessmen or activists who are centred in Perth. The last country candidate put up was

Sampson, and he had a very unfortunate experience. He was from down Esperance way, and at that time the Liberals did not even put two members into the Senate. That was almost unbelievable.

The candidates who won the first and second places on the Labor or Liberal tickets would virtually have a mortgage on a seat in the Senate, but that did not happen with Sampson. That shows the state of the Liberal Party. The members did not support him very well, yet the people who endorsed that team are tied up in the St. Georges Terrace syndrome. It would be fair if we were able to disperse representatives throughout the length and breadth of the State, representing both points of the party political view, and we would find ourselves much better off. At least we could cease the argument about vote-value, because it would apply under some proportional representation system.

Many things could be done; and it is high time the Electoral Act was revised properly.

Mr Bryce: Consolidated.

Mr JAMIESON: I would say revised. The problem with the Electoral Act—I think Sir Charles Court said this on one occasion when he was speaking to an amending Bill—the Constitution Act, or the Constitution Act Amendment Act is that as soon as someone puts up an amendment, everyone looks suspiciously at it and says, "We will not have a bar of it." That applies whether it is any good or not, because the people become suspicious that they will have less advantage than they have, or more advantage than they have.

It is high time that our whole electoral system was considered by a proper open inquiry with input from all political parties. We could consider the changes that were needed.

Any review of the Electoral Act would have to include a review of the Electoral Districts Act. This legislation has not been reviewed substantially for a long time. A limited review occurred by a judge who was brought here for that purpose from the Eastern States. He has since returned and I should imagine he would now be in a mental institution, bearing in mind some of the decisions he made which indicated that, if he conducted his life in that way, he would not remain sane for very long.

Apart from that limited inquiry, no major review into the Electoral Act and associated legislation has occurred in this State since Adam was born. The legislation has been concocted over the years by political parties.

Until approximately 1947, boundaries were determined in this Chamber. Members would horse trade over boundary changes, and members can imagine that very few redistributions occurred in those days. However, at least we have got away from that situation.

Bearing in mind the limited scope of the electoral commissioners who must operate within the terms of the Act, we realise they try to do a good job. We should retain the commission to carry out the redistribution of boundaries, but if we accepted my suggestions in relation to public relations exercises, using Commonwealth boundaries we would not need the commission. It is likely someone would say, "What happens when we get the 12th seat?" A formula would be established to deal with that and it could be worked out in such a way that we would not move too far away from the basic principle of one-vote-one-value.

We should not have a position where a bank manager from Mt. Hawthorn can be transferred to Mt. Magnet and, as a result, the value of his vote is 14 times greater. Conversely, if a bank clerk or teller is transferred from Mt. Magnet to Mt. Hawthorn, the value of his vote should not be 14 times less than it was previously. The situation is ridiculous. He is the same person and he should be entitled to the same vote regardless of where he lives.

Mr Bryce: These blokes opposite steal votes, I think that is what it is. They are vote thieves.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course that is the reason. Members opposite say that a member representing an electorate in a country area should not represent as many people as a member in a city electorate. The electorate of the member for Kimberley is the furthest away from the metropolitan area and yet he represents more members than the Speaker in his electorate of Kalamunda. An independent commission would deal with these anomalies and, after a thorough examination, it could report, highlighting the problems and suggesting amendments to the legislation which would overcome them. By that means the people of this State would have a reasonable chance to change the Government.

If the people want a Labor Government, members opposite must step down. If the people wanted a Liberal Government, we would have to do the same if we were in office. That has happened in the last two elections in South Australia and it easily could happen here.

The people should be entitled to elect the Government they want, not the Government that is imposed on them by a malapportioned system.

It is high time we had a system of one-vote-one-value. Soon the only other State which does not have such a system will be Queensland and anything is likely to happen there. When the Gare Government became over-arrogant it did many of the things that the present Bjelke-Petersen administration is doing. It does no good for the electorate, because the situation always reverts to what it was previously and it causes more humiliation and frustration in the long term than would have been the case under a just and equitable system.

We hope the electorate takes this matter into consideration in the next few months and votes in the ALP which will endeavour to carry out what I have just been advocating.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr BRYCE: I support my good friend and colleague, the member for Welshpool, on this subject. Although in the last couple of contributions I have made to this debate in the Legislative Assembly, I have had cause to congratulate members opposite for certain things they have done, it is now time for a little bit of plain talking.

I shall be harsher than was the member for Welshpool and suggest that some members opposite who smile—possibly even snigger—when this subject is debated, find it very hard to accept the reality that they do things which are corrupt and crooked in relation to electoral laws. They immerse themselves in the body politic; they involve themselves in many hobbies from one section of politics to another, but when it comes to electoral affairs, they have a blind spot. They pretend that what they do, which is so bad, does not really exist and they believe that, if they do it quickly and only once every three or four years, it does not matter and they can meet all the lovely people in their constituencies, boardrooms, and elsewhere in between times and they can be seen to be clean, decent, and honest.

I suggest to members opposite that the member for Welshpool was perfectly correct when he said a few moments ago that this department constitutes an item of fat on the land that could be pruned.

Members opposite say, "Where is the money to come from?" I suggest that, if members adhered to the advice of the member for Welshpool, they would accept this is an area in which money can be saved. At a State level we do not need to duplicate the work of the Electoral Office, because it is done more efficiently, in more detail and more thoroughly by the Commonwealth Electoral Office.

This begs the question, "Why is it necessary to have a State Electoral Department?" The answer to that rhetorical question is simply the perceived need by conservative politicians in this State to corrupt the electoral system. To do this they must have an enrolment system which is different from other States.

I have sat back and listened to the spokesman for the Government, the Chief Secretary, explain away the Government position, and he does indeed become very tied up in his arguments. He even resorts to a little slander about socialist centralisation when we suggest a single authority to handle Western Australia's electoral roll.

I take the greatest of pleasure at shopping centres in my constituency when I meet 18-year-olds who are not on the State roll who simply cannot believe they have to go away and ferret out a justice of the peace or a police officer to witness their enrolment card in order that they might go on the State roll when I have just witnessed their Commonwealth enrolment card. I take great delight in explaining to them that the Court Government introduced this new requirement in order to frustrate the Aboriginal people of this State, in order to distort the electoral system, and in order to make it difficult for certain people to vote—people the Government did not want to get on the roll.

Let us consider the figures—at this late hour of the night and at this stage of the session perhaps not in too much detail—just a simple comparison between WA and SA, where an election was held just a couple of weeks ago. The population of these two States is roughly the same but for a few thousand. In SA, 64 per cent of the population is on the electoral roll. Around 850 000 people had the opportunity to determine the destiny of South Australia for the next three years when they went to the polls two weeks ago. In this State, where our population is roughly the same, and demographically not very different, we have only 55 per cent of our people on the roll and 730 000-odd Western Australians are entitled to vote. This means 120 000 fewer Western Australians will be entitled to vote at the forthcoming State election, and that is no accident.

This is a deliberately contrived position, because members opposite are simply not confident or prepared to face the people of this State on an equal basis. They deliberately have not only manufactured extra politicians, but also juggled with the electoral boundaries when they have found it necessary and juggled with the rules when they have found it necessary. This has meant 120 000 Western Australians are not entitled to participate at the next State election. The

Government has said it would bluff these people and cajole them so that effectively they are deprived of their right to vote.

So we see at this time of the year each year when we consider the Estimates, members opposite sniggering and smiling in their comfort that they have juggled the boundaries, juggled the politicians, and juggled the electoral roll so that they may fancy their chances of surviving when they have to answer to their masters on the next occasion.

I suggest there will be a change of Government next year. This Government will go down in history as the last of the crooked Governments, because in the next Parliament or two there will be electoral reform. I will make a prediction about the future and the credibility of members opposite: If they compare themselves with those Liberals who grovelled at the bottom of the harbour to avoid taxation and who have witnessed the community blow-back, tax evaders will appear like clean skins.

Mr McPharlin: What about the painters and dockers?

Mr BRYCE: I have no pardon to offer them; but for every painter and docker there were 10 Liberals and, more importantly, in this State they were housed in the treasury of the Liberal Party, the fund-raising committees; they were the fund-raising chairmen, the fund-raising individuals. There is no doubt that issue itself is one of the issues that has detracted from the electoral credibility of members opposite.

Mr Clarko: Liberals were in front in the Gallup poll—47 per cent to 46 per cent.

Mr BRYCE: That is federally.

Mr Clarko: And you know how well they are going and how well we are going.

Mr BRYCE: I am proud to say that in WA all the polling done indicates a swing of between five per cent and 10 per cent to the Opposition. That is enough to make all the nervous Nellies opposite quake in their boots. It is enough to make the member for Karrinyup a marginal prospect.

Mr Clarko: Where will you find an opponent for me?

Mr BRYCE: The member will get the shock of his life when he finds out the quality of the opponent we have for him.

Mr Clarko: He must be a sprinter.

Mr BRYCE: All we need to beat the member for Karrinyup is a sprinter; there is no need for a long distance runner.

Mr Clarko: You could hardly win Ascot, a blue-ribbon seat, just like the man next to you; he had a blue-ribbon seat also and won by just a handful of votes.

Mr Brian Burke: You didn't win at all the first time you ran.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr BRYCE: I would scarcely regard the Minister for Education as the No. 1 psephologist in WA. Very few members in this Chamber would put him in that category, so we will not waste too much time dealing with his interpretation of yesteryear. We are concerned about next year. Members on this side know, just as members opposite know, that Government members are doomed. The warning I want to give them is this—

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr BRYCE: Those Liberals who have grovelled at the bottom of the harbour with their taxation schemes and who now are aware of the community blow-back are in a position to be able to explain to the respectable men who sit opposite what the community blow-back will be when people outside this little star Chamber discover how members opposite have sat in those smoke-filled rooms over the years to work out where the boundary between the city and the country will be, how they juggled the numbers on the electoral roll, and how they have done it so dishonestly time in and time out. Members opposite will use the same excuses; they will say, "It was par for the course; everyone was doing it; every conservative Government in the country was doing it." Members opposite will be just like the tax dodgers who claim as their excuse that everyone was doing it. But the electoral blow-back is about to suffocate the State Liberal Party in about 1984 or possibly 1986 or 1987.

The point is this: This administration will go down as the last of the crooked Governments; it will go down as the last of the rigged Parliaments, because as we sit here in the dying hours of the 30th Parliament we are about to see the eclipse of an era, because what happens in this place from 1983 on will be a breath of reform. It may take more than one Parliament, but it will take only the persistence of logic and determination as it did in other States of Australia eventually to place the Liberal Party in an impossible electoral position.

Mr Young: Why are you smiling?

Mr BRYCE: Because the day has arrived. I have sat in this place for a decade waiting for the day to arrive when members opposite were about to face their electoral accounting day. Most assuredly, that day has arrived.

Mr Clarko: We won seven out of the last eight.

Mr BRYCE: I know that.

Mr Jamieson: But you nobbled all the other horses.

Mr BRYCE: It is only the next election which counts. We have heard stories of Ministers conceding one after the other that they do not have a hope, so much so that they are busy developing their defence mechanisms in their own constituencies to fight for places as members of a shadow Cabinet—that is, the ones who are left after the next State election.

Government members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: Did you see the assessment of *The Sunday Times* of the leadership? When they went to the Minister for Health they thought, "Oops, he won't be here", and went to the Minister for Education.

Government members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: When even *The Sunday Times* begins to run articles about who it thinks will take over the leadership of the Liberal Party after its demise from Government after the next State election, there must be some credibility in the assertion that the Liberal Party will not be in Government next year.

Mr Deputy Chairman (Mr Watt), I ask you to forgive me for bordering on the use of the, perhaps, unparliamentary suggestion that members opposite, under ordinary circumstances, would be perceived to be corrupt and crooked men because they have sat here and increased the number of politicians and juggled the electoral boundaries, the rolls, and everything else that they have been capable of juggling, in order to remain in office. But they can no longer juggle the people. There are three very good reasons that the Liberal Party will go out on its neck. I will give them straight.

Government members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: The first is that the economic climate is absolutely disastrous.

Mr Clarko: That is international causes.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Karrinyup and his colleagues manage the economy of this State, and must accept that responsibility, whether they like it or not. It is traditional that they accept that responsibility. The second reason relates to tax cheats, the Liberal Party's allies, and Liberal

Party members, who made the turn of phrase "bottom-of-the-harbour" currency in Western Australia. Everybody in this State knows for the first time what tax cheats, tax dodgers, and bottom-of-the-harbour negotiators are.

That is the second reason for the destruction of the Liberal Party's credibility, but there is the third reason—the most critical. The change of leadership on both sides of the House has irrevocably switched the fortunes from a stage where the most competent and effective member of the Parliament was the leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr Sibson: You didn't admit that before.

Mr BRYCE: He no longer is with us. Now the most competent and effective member of this Parliament is the leader of the Labor Party.

Government members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: That is the embarrassing reality for members who sit opposite. They are now led by a goose, and we are led by the most politically effective individual in the Parliament.

Government members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: They are the three irrevocable reasons for our saying that the members of the Liberal Party who remain when this Parliament resumes will be sitting on this side of the Chamber.

At that time they will have to face the reality that the first and foremost priority for legislation—

Mr O'Connor: Can I ask you one question?

Mr BRYCE: Not yet; question time is at 10.30. The first amending legislation on the list of priorities will relate to electoral reform. We will ensure that the Electoral Department is fundamentally altered in structure and purpose, as the member for Welshpool suggested. No need exists for people to sit around unnecessarily fiddling with a second computer tape and, therefore, wasting taxpayers' money. This State should be covered by a single electoral roll, but it has not been because one of the advance mechanisms this Government invented to keep itself in office was the rigged and crooked electoral roll. We will set that right in early 1983, which will be the beginning of a decade, at least, of refreshing reform and change from a Liberal Government.

Mr GORDON HILL: I support the remarks of the member for Welshpool and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The speech by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is a hard act to follow. He eloquently put the case of the Opposition.

Government members interjected.

Mr GORDON HILL: He referred to what has happened in the past, and what will happen in the future.

Government members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! I ask the member for Swan not to try to follow the act of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This division refers to the Electoral Department, and while much of what the previous speaker said was quite appropriate to the reorganisation of that department, a considerable amount of what he said was quite unrelated to the division. I ask that those who debate this division stick to the matter of the Electoral Department.

Mr GORDON HILL: I agree entirely, but it is difficult to proceed when inane interjections are made by the member for Bunbury and others on that side. It was difficult to ignore those interjections.

I intend to make a couple of comments about this Division, and in so doing draw particular attention to Item 1. I want to relate this item to other matters concerning the Division. The vote for electoral registrars in 1982-83 is one area of Government expenditure to suffer a marked decline. This occurs at a time when fewer people are listed on the electoral roll of this State than are listed on the electoral roll for South Australia, which has a smaller population than has Western Australia. Approximately 120 000 more names are listed on the electoral roll for South Australia than are listed on our roll. This decrease in expenditure occurs when great disparities exist between our State roll and the Federal roll. This expenditure should have been increased rather than decreased.

The Government's intention is clear in regard to maintaining the State roll. It intends to maintain power at any cost, and one of the methods it uses is to adopt crooked electoral procedures. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, the former Premier introduced changes to the Electoral Act to require enrolments to be witnessed by either a justice of the peace, a clerk of the court, an electoral officer, or a police officer. The sole purpose of that legislation was to make it more difficult for our citizens to have their names placed on the electoral roll. It is ridiculous that a 16-year-old clerk employed by the State Electoral Department could witness an enrolment, yet the Premier of this State, unless he were a JP, could not witness that enrolment.

Mr Sibson: That's good; it leaves us out of the arena.

Mr GORDON HILL: What a joke. I would like the member for Bunbury to speak a little

louder so that I can be sure his inane comments are recorded in *Hansard* in order that the people of this State will know how stupid his remarks are.

Government members interjected.

Mr GORDON HILL: I have referred to one method used by this Government to try to maintain power. Many other methods have been used. One is the crooked Legislative Council. Members opposite—

Government members interjected.

Mr GORDON HILL: —are mendacious. That word is a newly acceptable word for this Chamber.

Mr MacKinnon: What does it mean?

Mr GORDON HILL: It means they are liars. Members opposite are mendacious.

Government members interjected.

Mr GORDON HILL: The Council is supposed to be a House of Review, but we are all aware what the performance of that House has been. One needs only to consider the history of that House to be aware of its performance.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! The member for Swan is endeavouring to make a speech and the *Hansard* reporter is having some difficulty hearing because there is so much light banter being exchanged across the Chamber which is adding nothing to the debate. It is highly disorderly and I ask members to have some recognition of the fact that we are in the last hours of the Parliament. Everyone seems to be in a frivolous mood and I ask members to co-operate with the Chair so that the members who are making their speeches can be heard. I ask the member making his speech to direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr GORDON HILL: Of course there is nothing frivolous about this debate and members of the Government will realise that in the future. I said the members opposite are mendacious because they try to indicate to the people of Western Australia that the Legislative Council, the House of fossils is in fact a House of Review. That clearly is not the case. The House of fossils, in the last three years of the Brand Government, rejected one piece of legislation, but in the three years of Labor Government rejected 21 pieces of legislation. That House has not rejected any legislation since so that clearly indicates it is not a House of Review. It sits there to do the job of the Liberal Party members opposite. It is there to frustrate the electors of Western Australia. Whenever they elect a majority of Labor members—in the 88 years of elections, the Labor

Party has not governed once in the Legislative Council—because of corrupt and crooked electoral laws and corrupt and crooked boundaries, which are maintained by the corrupt and crooked members opposite—

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Swan is reflecting on the credibility and integrity of the members on this side of the House—

Mr Tonkin: Because of your corrupt laws.

Mr RUSHTON: —and I ask that he withdraw those remarks.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! The Committee will come to order! I very much regret that my attention was drawn—

Mr RUSHTON: He made the remark, "corrupt and crooked members" on this side of the House and I do not think he is entitled to do that; it is unparliamentary.

Mr Pearce: You could not lie straight in bed.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Tonkin: It is high time we got to the truth of the matter.

Mr Barnett: Can you deny it?

Mr Tonkin: Dale is not country, and you know that.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Tonkin: If you acted correctly we would not have to say it.

Mr Barnett: Are you or are you not mendacious?

Mr I. F. Taylor: Are you or are you not awake?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! The exercise of judgment from the Chair as to what words are unparliamentary and ought to be withdrawn is always a delicate area. It makes it difficult for those of us who are required to try to adjudicate on this matter to decide what is unparliamentary and what is not. Perhaps I should read from the Standing Order which applies to this situation. It states—

When any Member objects to words used in debate by another Member, the Speaker, or Chairman of Committees shall, if either considers the words to be objectionable, or unparliamentary, order them to be withdrawn; and, if necessary, an apology made.

It would be a shame, if every time strong or provocative language were used, the Speaker or

Chairman was asked to demand a withdrawal. The onus is entirely on the members of this House to use more temperate language. I think it sometimes becomes a game of one-upmanship to see who can use the most offensive word and get away with it. It is not always the word that is used; it is often a connotation and a voice inflection which is used. I ask members to co-operate with the Chair and be more temperate in their language.

Committee Resumed

Mr GORDON HILL: It is impossible not to be able to speak on this subject without telling the truth and it is my view that the members opposite have imposed on us and maintained a corrupt and crooked system and because of this corrupt and crooked system they are corrupt and crooked.

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! It would appear I did not make myself very clear when I was on my feet a few moments ago. I allowed the member some latitude, in saying the electoral laws, or system, is corrupt and crooked but the member cannot say that Government members are corrupt and crooked—

Mr Gordon Hill: Because it is.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no need for the member to interject on me while I am on my feet. I will not allow the member to say the members opposite are corrupt and crooked and I ask him to withdraw those words.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have asked the member for Swan—

Mr GORDON HILL: If the system is corrupt and if the system is imposed on us—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked the member to withdraw those words and I ask him to do so without any explanation or other comment. He must withdraw.

Mr GORDON HILL: I will not be silenced by the Government and I will not withdraw the comments because I believe the system is corrupt and crooked.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! The member has been asked to withdraw the words "corrupt and crooked" and the words "the members of the Government are corrupt and crooked". I warn him if he fails to do so I will have to take action against him. I take exception also to his reflection on me as Chairman. He is not going to be silenced by the Government. When I sit in this Chair, I am unbiased as I can

be and I am not the Government. Therefore, I ask the member to withdraw those words also. I expect two withdrawals.

Mr I. F. Taylor: On a point of order—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot take a further point of order until I have received a withdrawal.

Mr GORDON HILL: I apologise to you, Mr Chairman, because it was not my intention to reflect on your job as Chairman. My comment was directed at members opposite.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I accept that.

Mr GORDON HILL: I believe that the members opposite are trying to play on this system and I will not withdraw.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I invite the member for Swan, for the last time, to withdraw the words which I have asked him to withdraw.

Mr Pearce: Which words are you seeking a withdrawal of?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The member for Swan knows. I will not entertain any other point.

Mr I. F. Taylor interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for Swan again if he intends to withdraw the words.

Mr GORDON HILL: No, Mr Chairman, I will not withdraw those words because it is an attack on my credibility by you and the people opposite. The system is corrupt.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As the member will not withdraw the words, I name the member for Swan. Order! I will now report to the House.

[The Speaker (Mr Thompson) resumed the Chair]

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Mr Speaker, during discussions on the Estimates the member for Swan accused members of the Government of being crooked and corrupt. I explained to him that such words were unparliamentary and asked him on a number of occasions to withdraw. He refused to do so after several requests and I had no alternative but to name him.

Suspension of Member

Mr O'CONNOR: I move—

That the member for Swan be suspended from the service of the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 20

Mr Blaikie	Mr McPharlin
Mr Clarko	Mr Mensaros
Mrs Craig	Mr O'Connor
Mr Crane	Mr Old
Dr Dadour	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shalders
Mr Grewar	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Watt
Mr Laurance	Mr Young
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Nanovich

(Teller)

Noes 16

Mr Barnett	Mr Hodge
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bridge	Mr Parker
Mr Bryce	Mr Pearce
Mr Brian Burke	Mr A. D. Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr Tonkin
Mr Grill	Mr Wilson
Mr Gordon Hill	Mr I. F. Taylor

(Teller)

Pairs

Noes

Mr Hassell	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Trethowan	Mr Carr
Mr Court	Mr Terry Burke
Mr Sodeman	Mr Evans
Mr Spriggs	Mr McIver
Mr Williams	Mr Harman
Mr Sibson	Mr Bateman

Question thus passed.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Swan please retire?

The member for Swan left the Chamber.

Committee Resumed

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members will resume their seats. I advise the member for Swan that he will be obliged to leave the gallery.

The member for Swan left the Speaker's Gallery.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I had not intended to speak on this part of the Estimates and I do so to make one or two brief points about what has just happened, and to indicate to members of the Government it must be clear even to them that the gerrymandered, unfair and dishonest electoral system in this State has become a festering sore. I do not know whether members on that side realise it, but in those cases in recent times when members have been suspended from the service of the Chamber it has invariably been in relation to electoral laws and matters. Yet we still have not heard from any member on the Government side a rational or sensible defence of the present situation.

Among those most notable by his absence from this fray is the Treasurer whom I have not heard address himself on one occasion to this matter of the electoral laws that confiscate from the people

in big parts of the State the value of the votes they exercise. At least the previous Treasurer made some attempt, deficient as it was, to explain the ideology or the philosophy behind the action which succeeded in depriving people of the value of their votes. I cannot recall—and perhaps the Treasurer will correct me if I am wrong—the Treasurer taking part on any occasion in a debate on the electoral system that is the cornerstone of the democracy which members opposite claim we enjoy.

The truth is that so long as this State is subordinated to the unfair and dishonest electoral laws that invariably secured in recent times the election of conservative Governments there will continue to be attached to the debates on this subject tumult which is not appropriate in this place. The truth of the matter is the Liberal Party has persisted in Government in this State as a result of an electoral system that is unfair, dishonest, and undemocratic. It is an affront to every decent man and woman in Western Australia.

The Premier parades himself as a good natured, genuine, and honest Western Australian, without front and without side, and yet in this matter he makes no response for perpetrating what is the cruellest of hoaxes on the people—the confiscation of their right to change Governments and to have reflected in the results of elections the wishes they attempt to express.

Mr Clarko: The wishes of the people have been carried in eight elections. The parties with the most votes won.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If one takes the results one by one and looks at the last result one sees that on a fair one-vote-one-value system the party which formed Government, still would have formed the Government. We admit and concede that, but we say the Government would not have been formed with a majority of five, but more likely with a majority of one or two. If the member for Karrinyup now says that despite the system being unfair the result is a Government that in no way would have been changed, we do not deny that. We address ourselves to the unfairness of the system that coincidentally on this occasion resulted in the election of a Government which would have been elected had the system been fair. Why cannot Government members realise that in decency and honesty they have nothing to fear from a fair system?

When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was speaking a short while ago the guffaws from the Government side were most pronounced when he referred to the nature of the system and indicated it would not be sufficient at the next election to

allow this Government to retain power. I do not know what will be the result of the next election. I suspect it will be a close-run thing, and I suspect too, for the first time in nine years, the Labor Party may well form a Government in this State. I do not know what will be the result, but I know that for a range of reasons, not the least of which is the electoral system, the people of Western Australia will be voting against the Government to express their discontent or disapproval in a way they have not done in the last two elections. That is the reason the Premier says in public the Labor Party cannot win; he says the Labor Party needs to win six seats and that is too many. Implicit in that sort of concession from the Premier is that there will be a swing from the Government and the Labor Party will win seats, but it will not win enough.

It is difficult for the Labor Party to win marginal seats to gain power because they are seats which have half the number of electors as those seats we manage to win frequently in the metropolitan area and in Kimberley, where, despite its distance from Perth, an electoral roll exists which approaches the numbers on electoral rolls in the metropolitan area. The Minister for Health challenged me during the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in a way I cannot understand to run against him in Scarborough.

Mr Young: That would be a good idea.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: When I said I was quite happy to represent the electorate I have represented for a number of years the Minister for Health, in his rational and intelligent fashion, said, "You have not got the guts." What sort of rational, intelligent debate or response is that from a Minister of the Crown?

Mr MacKinnon: Read some of your comments.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I said at the time no reason existed for me to rouse myself from my electorate because Graham Burkett is absolutely stitching up the Minister in a fashion that demonstrates a professionalism of which the Minister is not capable.

Mr Young: Do that and it will free your seat for some Mickey Mouse character.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Mr Chairman, have you heard it suggested seriously in this place that because a member will not relinquish his seat and run—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is endeavouring to speak to Division 73—

Mr Hodge: And doing a good job.

The CHAIRMAN:—and the member for Melville will keep order as well. If members wish to indulge in cross-Chamber chatter, I suggest that they do it outside. Otherwise I will be obliged to take some strong action. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I was attempting to explain that it was because of the electoral system that the Labor Party rightly can complain about the difficulty in winning the marginal seats in order to win Government. In that respect I am sure the Minister would agree it is absolutely absurd to say that I lack guts because I will not resign to contest his seat. For a whole range of reasons—apart from wanting to demonstrate that I do not lack guts—I have no intention whatever to run for his seat. If the reason was that we wanted to win the seat, our present candidate would satisfy that reason. It just happens that for many other compelling reasons I want to represent the electorate I represent presently in this place.

I conclude by saying that despite the electoral system, the guffaws of members on the Government bench, and the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development—who, in his "Rotaryish" fashion mumbles for fear that he can be heard and for fear that I will answer him—at the next election, despite the polls which the Minister has conducted in his own electorate, there will be exhibited in this State a significant swing against the Government, and it will be for a number of reasons.

I have been at pains previously to try to point out to the Treasurer the nature of the reasons that will support the swing that inevitably will be shown against this Government. Despite the electoral boundaries that keep the member for Mundaring here with a margin of about 2.3 per cent, the Minister for Health with something approaching 2.9 per cent, the member for Bunbury with a margin of about 2.8 per cent, and the member for Pilbara—about to depart as he is—with a margin of about 5.5 to 6 per cent, the seats of those people will be placed in peril. I have been at pains previously to try to explain to the Treasurer but obviously, with his lack of comprehension, he does not realise there are some things he can do—

Mr O'Connor: Are you the only one in this Chamber who can comprehend? You have an ego as big as a football.

Mr Bertram: He is very competent.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It seems strange that in my absence the Treasurer is more wont to say—

Mr O'Connor: That is because you are absent so often.

Mr BRIAN BURKE:—all sorts of things that make the things I say pale into insignificance. Because I choose to say some things when he is present, and not when he is absent, the Treasurer apparently cannot resist reacting.

I say again: I have tried consistently to explain to the Treasurer, with his apparent inability to comprehend, that some things can be done. It would not matter whether Opposition members departed from this place and travelled overseas for three weeks immediately before the election; things left undone in the areas to which I referred will bring this Government down, and I know the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development is well aware of their compelling nature.

It will not matter about the Opposition's stance in many areas, unless unemployment is tackled in an intelligent and sensible fashion. It will not matter about the marginal expression by the Opposition in areas that are not compelling to the electorate, if we continue to see in this place a lack of action in the face of policies that are confiscating from people the ability to retain their own homes or, in the case of young married people, the right to purchase the homes to which they previously had a right.

It will not matter what the Opposition does or fails to do if this Government does not start dissociating itself from those within its ranks like Mr W. W. Mitchell, Mr Warner, and Mr Chrichton-Browne, to whom we have referred as the ugly face of the Liberal Party. The sort of morality that is implicit in the campaigns carried out by those people is a morality that time and time again has been rejected by Australians and by this community.

It would not matter whether the Opposition was mute in the weeks leading up to the next election, if this Government continues to be inactive about things like Government taxes and charges, about the delinquencies of the Metropolitan Water Authority, and about the lack of control exhibited over so many areas by this Government. Dishonest electoral laws and lopsided boundaries will not save the seats of the Minister for Health, the member for Mundaring, the member for Bunbury, the member for Pilbara, the member for Murdoch, the member for Murchison-Eyre, and the member for Whitford.

Mr MacKinnon: Or the member for Avon and the member for Gosnells.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am trying seriously to put the situation to the Government, a situation

which it has seen reflected in other States. It is true, despite what is said, that in SA for example, the inactivity and the incompetence of the Tonkin Government made it certain that the full effects of the Fraser Government's policies were wrought upon the State Government.

Government members can scoff, scorn, and say what they will, but they will see after next March who is right and who is wrong. I am not saying that at the next election we will be elected with a landslide, but I am saying all the signs are there, all the signs that tell people who want to be told.

Mr MacKinnon: You are starting to make excuses already.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Government continues to take for granted the intelligence of the electorate, it will pay the penalty for that error in terms of seats at the next election.

Mr MacKinnon: Read that back next week yourself.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not care what the Minister for Education says, I do not care how the Treasurer carries on, and I do not care that the Minister for Health wants to interject and the member for Mundaring tends to nastiness. We will see the result at the next election, and I am sure that unless the Government begins to lift its game and proposes some positive policies that go to solving these problems, it will not get by with idle excuses about international recessions. The people have woken up to the fact that international recessions are no alibi for incompetence at home.

There are things State Governments can do that this Government is leaving undone. The signs are there in other States, and in by-elections in this State. I do not know how the Government can turn around a swing of 17 per cent in the Pilbara part of the North Province seat—and that was the size of the swing at the last by-election. If it can swing those figures around, well and good, but I suspect that it cannot. If it cannot, the five most marginal seats we need to win are seats we have won already.

Mr PEARCE: I took considerable exception to the series of events leading up to the suspension of the member for Swan when it was the Deputy Premier who had initiated them.

Mr Rushton: I have been as quiet as a mouse all night.

Mr Wilson: He's been asleep all day.

Mr MacKinnon: He took a point of order.

Mr PEARCE: The Deputy Premier took a point of order in order to defend Government

members for the way in which the boundaries were drawn.

Mr Rushton: No I didn't, it was about their integrity.

Mr PEARCE: If there is one member of the Government side who should be a little chary of doing that, it would be the Deputy Premier.

Mr Rushton: A falsehood again.

Mr PEARCE: He will be withdrawing a few words himself if he does not watch his tongue.

Mr Young: You had better watch it, Cyril. You are in trouble—the headmaster is after you.

Mr PEARCE: The Deputy Premier was a member of the Government when the last boundaries were drawn. It is well known that certain parts of the boundaries are drawn by the Government. One important line is that drawn to separate the metropolitan zone from the so-called agricultural, pastoral, and mining zones.

Mr Young: "Dial a lip" is back!

Mr PEARCE: The biggest single change to that boundary from the time of the 1977 election is the boundary line in Armadale; that is to say, where some sections of the electorate of Dale are now to be part of Gosnells. It is hard not to believe that the Deputy Premier was sitting there pen in hand when the Government drew the line.

I have undertaken with some degree of care a statistical analysis of these two new seats, and I do not believe it is simply coincidence that the portions of the seat of Dale that the Deputy Premier is to lose contained boxes where the Liberal Party vote was approximately 51 per cent to an ALP vote of 49 per cent. In the rest of the seat of Armadale—the Bedforddale and Byford booths—the Liberal Party vote was substantially greater. So all the areas where the vote was approximately 50:50 have been extracted from the seat of Dale and added into the metropolitan area. Who is to say that the Deputy Premier had no hand in that? That was exactly the point made by the member for Swan, so it is hardly surprising that it was the Deputy Premier who took exception to his statement. I suppose it was his conscience which was the first to be touched by that allegation.

Mr Rushton: It had nothing to do with electoral boundaries. It was to do with integrity, and I am entitled to defend Government members.

Mr PEARCE: I would like to hear a few denials.

Mr Rushton: I just told you about the integrity of members on this side of the Chamber.

Mr PEARCE: If someone has a hand in the way boundaries are drawn because it will affect his seat, that raises considerable questions about his integrity.

Mr Young: You ought to be in the SS. I love the way you do it. You come forth with a statement and then you say, "I want to hear some denials." Well, now come up with some facts.

Mr PEARCE: I just gave you a fact.

Mr Young: You just make statements accusing people. You are a creep.

Mr PEARCE: The metropolitan boundary line is drawn by the Government. The Minister for Health was in the Cabinet at the time—maybe he drew the line.

Mr Young: I'll show you how well I drew it—just look at my electorate.

Mr Tonkin: Don't be stupid—that is the commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Tonkin: Don't be dishonest.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Morley kept on interjecting when I called order. For the member for Morley's benefit, I invite him to look at Standing Order No. 131. This debate has ample time to run yet. Probably members are becoming a little testy because of the lengthy sitting hours. My aim is to see that the Chamber maintains order. The member for Gosnells.

Mr PEARCE: Thank you, Sir. The difference between the seats of the member for Scarborough and the member for Dale—and I am not being discourteous; I am referring to their electorates because they are important in this debate—is that it is not possible to alter the boundaries for the seat of Scarborough by changing the metropolitan zone, unless we were prepared to put the area to the north of Scarborough into the country zone. However, it is possible, and it has been done, to alter the boundary of the seat of the Deputy Premier by this process. These are the facts: Firstly, the Government drew the line between the metropolitan and the rural seats; secondly, the Deputy Premier was a senior member of the Cabinet at the time the line was drawn, and, thirdly, the major recipient in terms of beneficial voting importance of the redrawing of the line in that area was the member for Dale who was a member of the Government that redrew the line.

Mr Tonkin: That is indisputable.

Mr PEARCE: I will add a fourth fact to prove the member for Dale was the beneficiary. The old 1980 seat of Dale falls into two clearly defined areas. The first area is the metropolitan part of Armadale which voted at the last election, in gen-

eral terms, 50 per cent Labor and 50 per cent Liberal Party. That almost deprived the member for Dale of his seat. The second area is the surrounding hills area, a little to the south and to the east, and the electors in this area voted more substantially for the Liberal Party. It was approximately 58 to 60 per cent Liberal Party and 40 to 42 per cent Labor Party.

What happened was that the evenly divided section, metropolitan Armadale, was added into the metropolitan area and the rural sections were left in the Minister's seat of Dale and a seat which he would otherwise have lost on the smallest of swings at the forthcoming election became something like five or six per cent safer for the Minister.

Mr Rushton: Your people have been saying that for six elections.

Mr PEARCE: That is the second point. This is not the first time the member for Dale has been the beneficiary of such boundary changes. This is at least the second, if not the third time. One of the interesting features of my new seat of Armadale is that something like 60 to 70 per cent of it is made up from areas which were represented previously by the Deputy Premier; that is to say, all the areas of Kelmscott, Westfield, and Armadale.

Much of the Deputy Premier's former seat now is in the seat of Armadale which is why I challenge him to run against me in that seat and prove to people he did not intend to be a beneficiary of these boundary changes.

Mr Herzfeld interjected.

Mr PEARCE: That particular matter has been dealt with and the Treasurer is in more trouble in regard to that than I am.

Mr Herzfeld: Rubbish!

Mr PEARCE: The arrangement I had with the Treasurer was he would prove to me he did not say the words and, if he could not prove that, he would resign his seat.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: The Treasurer raised the whole matter when he attacked the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr O'Connor: You raised the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Gosnells will continue his speech and direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr PEARCE: I am quite happy to do that. I wonder if the interjectors could confine themselves to matters before the Chair also, because I am quite prepared to deal with interjections.

However, I should not be reproved by the Chair for dealing with interjections because they are not germane to the subject if non-germane interjections are allowed to continue.

The point raised is simply this: The Leader of the Opposition pointed out quite accurately that, in an interview, the Treasurer had been caught in the position of saying that he was the best Treasurer the State had ever had.

Mr O'Connor: That is untrue.

Mr PEARCE: The Treasurer denied that.

Mr Brian Burke: It was in your interview with Howard Sattler.

Mr O'Connor: The member for Gosnells said it was on television.

Mr Brian Burke: In that interview, Howard Sattler said, "The Treasurer said he was the best Treasurer the State had ever had." He asked me if I agreed with that. I said, "Knowing the previous Treasurer, I am sure he would have something to say about that."

Mr O'Connor: It has gone from television to radio!

Mr Brian Burke: I did not say it was on television.

Mr Young: The accuser did.

Mr Brian Burke: I am telling you exactly what happened. This is going to be one of the few opportunities you have to debate it in this place. That is what happened. I then said, "Are you sure?" and he said, "Yes". Mr Sattler confirmed it again and I said he was one of the worst Treasurers—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call on the member for Gosnells, if he has any further remarks to make.

Mr PEARCE: In fact after that little exchange between the Treasurer and me, I went to the Leader of the Opposition and raised this matter with him. The Leader of the Opposition said to me exactly what he has told the House.

Mr O'Connor: You told me it was on television.

Mr PEARCE: I am coming to that. When the Treasurer said that, I said to him, "Of course you said it. I saw you on television myself." I maintain that is why I could easily have replied to the ridiculous notes the Treasurer has been sending me. They specified exactly what the Leader of the Opposition told me. He told me that an hour after the whole business took place and I could easily have said that.

A week ago the Treasurer and I discussed this over in the seat of the member for Kimberley and I told the Treasurer that I did in fact see that on

television and I saw it in this form. The Treasurer was saying—I am quoting from what I remember—

Mr O'Connor: You do not have the decency to adhere to a promise you gave in this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Before the member for Gosnells continues, I would be extremely interested if he could advise me as to how his remarks which appear to relate to a television interview are related to Division 73, because if he does not do that I shall call on another speaker.

Mr PEARCE: I shall return to that. I was answering—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked the member to indicate how his remarks relate to Division 73.

Mr PEARCE: I started to do that and I got a few words out and you, Sir, called me to order. I was answering an interjection made by the member for Mundaring when I was discussing Division 73.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the member wants to answer interjections and not confine his remarks to the matters contained within Division 73, I will be obliged to sit him down and call on another member.

Mr PEARCE: I will be quite happy to go back to the division. I have all but finished. The point is—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Brian Burke: He said, "The point is . . ."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will listen with great interest to ensure that the member relates his remarks to Division 73, otherwise I will sit him down.

Mr PEARCE: I heard you the first two times and, when I said, "I have all but finished" I meant I had all but finished my speech.

In all the gerrymandering that has been going on—I use that term deliberately to indicate the deliberate drawing of boundaries by the Government—the main beneficiary has been the Deputy Premier and he was right in there at the meetings with the pencils and maps when these changes were made. It is hardly surprising he was leaping to his feet tonight to cut off the member for Swan in his prime when he suggested these practices occurred. I am sorry the member for Swan has been suspended for using those words, but the facts to which he was drawing attention were obvious. If the Deputy Premier does not like the conclusion that was drawn, the answer lies not in getting members suspended, but in ensuring his own behaviour is more in accordance with the honesty

and integrity one would expect from a participant in the Westminster system.

Mr TONKIN: The member for Swan who has been suspended from the House is a very fine person. I knew him for a number of years before he came into the House and, of course, he annoys some members of the House because he does not believe in hypocrisy, but rather in calling a spade a spade and to make it quite clear—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the member for Morley that the House is considering Division 73.

Mr TONKIN: Which is?

The CHAIRMAN: The House is considering Division 73 and, as such, the member will need to confine his remarks to that division.

Mr TONKIN: I said, "Which is" and I hoped you would indicate it related to electoral matters.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it does.

Mr TONKIN: I just wanted to confirm that we both know what it is. This is a debate in the Chamber, Mr Chairman, and that means one replies to things that have happened previously. When speaking to this division, the member for Swan was suspended. I would have thought my reference to the member for Swan, which lasted about one minute, would be quite appropriate bearing in mind his suspension occurred in this debate.

I refer also to the member for Gosnells who answered many interjections. He was asked to return to the division, but there was no requirement that the interjectors stick to the division. As this is a debating Chamber, members may reply, if they wish—and they certainly should—to debate which has taken place, but not necessarily to interjections.

If members want to reply to interjections, that should be acceptable, otherwise a person may make a point by way of interjection and if the member on his feet chooses to ignore it, he can be accused of not being able to answer it. This is a debating Chamber and if members are permitted to interject, the member on his feet should be permitted to reply to those interjections.

I conclude my remarks with respect to the member for Swan by indicating he is a very fine person. He annoys many people in this Chamber, unfortunately from both sides, because he speaks the truth and he is not inclined to come along here with the kind of "double speak" that we have learnt to develop in this Chamber. We talk about "the Hon. Minister", "the Hon. Treasurer", and "the honourable member", and I would have thought, if a person was really "honourable" it

would not be necessary to call him "honourable". That kind of nonsense annoys the member for Swan and it also annoys me.

The member for Swan was pulled up in this place, because he said some people were corrupt. What kind of a place is it if it is permissible to be corrupt, but it is not permissible to say that someone is corrupt? What is worse—to act in a corrupt fashion or to catch someone at it and say that it is corrupt?

Mr Young: It depends on who is the judge.

Mr TONKIN: Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would like the member for Morley to resume his seat. I ask members to refer to their Standing Orders and, in particular, to Standing Orders Nos. 131 and 132. Standing Order No. 131 reads as follows—

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

Standing Order No. 132 reads as follows—

All imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on Members, shall be considered highly disorderly.

That is the basis laid down in the Standing Orders and a degree of latitude is provided to members in the cut and thrust of debate. However, on occasions, members take offence at words which are used and, that being the case, the offended member has the right to ask for the withdrawal of those words.

In the spirit of co-operation, I call on the member for Morley and members of the House to have an understanding of the Standing Orders and the traditions under which this House operates.

Mr TONKIN: I would not have thought it was necessary to draw my attention to Standing Orders. I would imagine I know my Standing Orders better than most members of the House. In fact, I have been appalled at the lack of knowledge of Standing Orders of some members.

Standing Orders are only the rules of this House and we have a higher type of standing order, if you like, which is the "standing order of natural justice". If people can act in a corrupt manner, but members cannot refer to them as being corrupt, that is nonsense. It is like allowing a person to commit murder, but not allowing someone to call him a "murderer". It is like allowing someone to steal, but not allowing someone to call him a "thief".

Members act in high dudgeon, and the Deputy Premier says he is defending the integrity of members on that side, but it is pertinent to note the only way one can defend the integrity of

members opposite is for them to act with integrity, not to play games by demanding the withdrawal of words and asking for members to be suspended.

When Sir Ross Hutchinson was the Speaker I was suspended and at the time I said to him, "Things will change. This corrupt system will not stay." Truth and justice will continue when we have left the scene. If members opposite want to be treated as men of integrity and honour, they have to act as befits men of integrity and honour.

I am disgusted with the Minister for Health. When the member for Gosnells was talking about the Deputy Premier benefiting from the lines drawn on the map, the Minister for Health said, "I suppose I benefited by it as the member for Scarborough." Does he know, or is he colossally ignorant—he is now affecting not to listen—

Mr Young: I am listening.

Mr TONKIN: Is he saying that the way in which the boundaries of Scarborough are drawn is the same as the way in which the boundaries for the metropolitan area are drawn?

Mr Young: I am obviously not going to encourage you, am I? You need only a little encouragement and you go on for half an hour.

Mr TONKIN: That is a very poor answer. I will answer the question for the Minister for Health. I suspect he is not moronic.

Mr Pearce: I don't know.

Mr TONKIN: I suspect he knows that the boundaries of Scarborough are drawn by the commissioners in a way different from the boundaries for the metropolitan area, therefore, the two situations are not analogous at all. That is why the Minister for Health did not answer my question. If he did, he would be condemning himself out of his own mouth. If the Minister for Health admits—which he does, in my opinion—that the boundaries for Scarborough are drawn in a way quite different from the boundaries for the metropolitan area which benefited the Deputy Premier, he would be admitting also that the argument he was using was dishonest. He would say, "Come on, we are honest people over here. If I were drawing the boundaries for electorates, wouldn't I draw them to benefit me as the member for Scarborough?" I have no doubt he would, but, as we know, the electoral commissioners draw those boundaries. I am not talking about the boundaries drawn by the commissioners; however, I am talking about the boundaries for the metropolitan area which are drawn by the Liberal Party and that explains why we have the amazing situation of that supposedly remote country seat of Kalamunda having fewer voters than the seat of

Kimberley. How can the Government justify that position? The answer is that it cannot justify it.

When a member such as the member for Swan rises in righteous indignation to talk about the corruption in this place, Government members rise in their places to demand a withdrawal. Normally we will withdraw the remarks we make to which the Government takes exception, but we do that only because the Government has the numbers; we do not do so merely to abide by Standing Orders, or because we think that what we said was not the truth. The Liberal Party draws dishonest boundaries between the metropolitan and country areas, and is able to do so because it has the numbers in both Chambers. It is as simple as that, and members opposite know that is the case.

The member for Mundaring benefits by a line drawn on the map. I cannot understand the lack of pride of members opposite prepared to win seats when they know they do so by cheating. They can win those seats because of a line drawn on the map. Mundaring, Kalamunda, Darling Range, and Dale are classified as country electorates, but Rockingham, which happens to be held by a Labor member, is classified as a metropolitan electorate. Can anyone say that that is not dishonest?

Certain members of the Government drew the metropolitan boundary. I do not know who actually took a pencil and drew that boundary, but by the Government's bringing forward legislation approved by Cabinet to be passed in this place and the other place, it drew a boundary to benefit its members.

I cannot understand the lack of pride of members opposite who would help their colleagues to draw boundaries to ensure that a seat is held, instead of ensuring that those colleagues take their chances with the electors of this State. They should take their chances in a fair and equal system to determine whether they will hold their seats and be able to form a Government. What kind of Australians do members opposite think they are when they are prepared to make up the rules of a contest to ensure its outcome before it is held? That is what they do.

If they want respect from this side of the Chamber and from the community, if they do not want to be called cheats or crooks, and be tagged as corrupt, they will have to start acting in an uncorrupt and honest fashion. The way to do that is to ensure that when the line is drawn it is drawn properly.

Of course, we on this side of the Chamber do not agree with the drawing of any such line, but if

it is to be drawn it should be drawn with regard for the facts of the matter. The facts are that no justification exists for Kalamunda having fewer voters than Kimberley, for Mundaring having fewer voters than Rockingham, or for Dale having fewer voters than the new seat of Armadale. Members opposite know that no justification exists for those inconsistencies.

Members opposite know they benefit from this kind of action. If they want to be respected by us and by the people, and if they want to have respect for themselves, which is the most important kind of respect of all, they must stop the kind of practice in which they have indulged, and must be prepared to allow an electoral system to be devised which does not benefit any particular member, even though he may be as lofty as the Treasurer of this State. They must be prepared to take their chances with the electorate.

Not one member on this side of the Chamber has had any influence over the drawing of this boundary between the metropolitan and country areas. We object to its being drawn, but certainly have not been able to stop the Government's drawing it. We take our chances with the electorate; some of us win and some of us lose. I thought that was part of the democratic system we are supposed to have, so that the people can decide who should be in Government.

As I have said, this Government can be related more closely than members opposite expect to Governments of the eastern bloc, in its making it difficult for the people of this State to change the Government. Nations of the eastern bloc have made it more difficult than it is here to change the Government, and, in fact, have made it very difficult to change a Government. The Government of this State has made that change rather difficult. Although members opposite are not as bad as Government members in those other nations, they have made it difficult for the people of this State to have the Government they wish. To that degree members opposite have departed from democracy and justice, and forfeited the right to be called honourable, honest, and uncorrupt. They may rise to their feet to throw us out when we use such words, but that does not in any way alter the truth of the matter. The truth will stand; it does not matter what members opposite say, or what we say in this place, facts are facts.

If members opposite can put valid reasons for having Kalamunda in the country with fewer voters than Kimberley, and Rockingham in the metropolitan area compared with Mundaring in the country, I will listen to those arguments; but they have never put them forward because they know no such arguments exist. The only reason

they put this boundary forward was to ensure they had a majority, and they ensured this boundary change by the sheer brutality of numbers.

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Welshpool raised a number of items debated many times in this Chamber, which at this time I do not intend to go over. Claims have been made by the Opposition, and counter claims have been made by the Government; and at this time it would not be to anyone's advantage to extend the debate by answering all of the member's comments. However, I will refer to the proposition he put in regard to one-vote-one-value. I well remember the comments of the Hon. Bert Hawke about this matter.

Mr Bryce: That was 30 years ago.

Mr RUSHTON: It is the same issue. He would not have a bar of one-vote-one-value; he knew the entitlements of country people.

Mr Tonkin: Talk about Kalamunda, not the country.

Mr RUSHTON: The Hon. Bert Hawke was aware of the care that should be taken to ensure that country people have proper representation. The Opposition is fully entitled to claim it will have electoral success, but it is quite contradictory when it next violently claims that everything is wrong with the electoral system, and that everything is against it. On the one hand the Opposition claims that the Government has done everything it can to disadvantage the Opposition, yet on the other it claims great success. These claims contradict themselves. The sad thing about the proceedings tonight in this Chamber is that there has been a demonstration of bad manners and intemperate language.

Mr Tonkin: Why don't you answer about Kalamunda?

Division 73 put and passed.

Divisions 74 to 80—Licensing, \$603 000; Aboriginal Cultural Materials Preservation Committee, \$397 000; Art Gallery of Western Australia, \$2 930 000; Library Board of Western Australia, \$8 296 000; Museum of Western Australia, \$4 373 000; Perth Theatre Trust, \$217 000; Western Australian Arts Council, \$2 513 000—put and passed.

Division 81: Youth, Sport and Recreation, \$4 090 000—

Mr WILSON: I speak on this division to draw attention to the fact that Western Australia has missed out on nearly \$1 million of Commonwealth funds for international standard sports facilities as a result of the procrastination over the past three years by this Government. According to information provided by the Federal Liberal

Minister for Home Affairs, of the \$25 million made available by the Commonwealth to the States over the three year period from 1980, the Western Australian Government has so far taken up only \$480 000, for the development of a base-ball facility at Belmont.

This funding had been made available to the States on a matching dollar-for-dollar basis. It seems that unfortunately at this stage it is likely \$1 422 500, which should have been available to this State for allocation on the basis I have outlined, will go by the board. This is in spite of a commitment in this Budget to take up a further \$500 000 from these funds proffered by the Commonwealth.

This is the case at present: Of that \$25 million to be available for all the States for that three-year period, just under \$3 million remains uncommitted. The Federal Minister for Home Affairs has announced his intention to commit fully the remaining amount by the end of this month. It has become evident in answers by the Federal Minister to questions in the Federal Parliament that the Western Australian Government has not yet submitted for approval further proposals to the Commonwealth, and, to use his words, "This is despite requests by the Commonwealth at both ministerial and departmental level."

Working on the basis that the Commonwealth is to close off this option this month, it seems that we will lose even that \$500 000 in the current Budget. The mishandling of the situation with regard to these votes for international standard sporting facilities in Western Australia is to be regretted for a number of reasons; firstly, a survey of existing facilities which was conducted recently—a survey to determine whether these facilities are suitable for the conduct of world championships or Commonwealth Games—showed that fewer than 10 sports met the necessary competition and ancillary requirements. We must understand that Western Australia is in a certain position in this regard. We all realise that sportsmen and women of Western Australia have less opportunity to compete at an international level than sportsmen and women in any other comparable Western country, simply by virtue of the distance it is necessary to travel in order to compete at that level. It is also significant in the case of sportsmen and women at top levels in Western Australia that not only should these facilities be provided so that competitions of an international standard can be conducted in Western Australia, but also that they have the opportunity to compete on surfaces of international standards to enable them to overcome the disadvantage they suffer because of the isolation of this

State from other venues where competition of this kind can take place. We realise the significance of this fact, particularly in respect of Western Australia's ability to provide a suitable venue for the bi-annual Australian Games. In 1990, Western Australia is likely to be the host State for the fourth bi-annual Australian Games. The inaugural Australian Games will be conducted in Sydney in January 1984.

Given the time lags that occur between policy decisions, planning, and implementation, particularly for capital works facilities, and given the State Government's present inadequate commitment to sport and recreation as evidenced in the failure to take up these Commonwealth funds, Western Australia may end up with egg on its face in respect of the ability of this State to host the Australian Games in 1990.

The second reason for our regretting the mishandling of the allocation of these Commonwealth funds to Western Australia is that international competitions give a boost and provide financial spin-offs to the host State or host country. Such competitions combined with a well-presented tourist package can result in a distinct economic advantage for the host State. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, for instance, is using a \$1 million budget to promote four sports events to be conducted over one week-end in late June 1983. If that could be done in Queensland, it raises the question of what the Western Australian Government is doing to give that sort of boost to tourism and to our economy in a similar way. We regret the mishandling of this opportunity by the State Government especially at this time when we realise that capital works associated with the development of such international standard sporting facilities would and could provide much needed additional employment opportunities in this State. It seems we have a State Government at this time which has not been prepared to stir itself to take advantage of this opportunity which has now gone begging, it seems, and I hope some member of Parliament on the Government side, although I realise the Minister is in another place, will draw to his attention this expression of concern about lost opportunity. I hope we receive some answers from the Government side to explain the gross mishandling of this lost opportunity.

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Dianella's claim is that the Minister has been remiss in not taking every opportunity to obtain funds for which the State is eligible from the Commonwealth. After reading the notes I have, I certainly cannot maintain that opinion. I do not feel that

the member made the claim strongly enough for me to be able to agree with his point of view.

Mr Wilson: I quoted answers given by Federal Ministers providing the facts of the situation.

Mr RUSHTON: We need to deal with the State Minister.

Mr Wilson: We surely do.

Mr RUSHTON: I have written a memo on the member's claim which I will give to the Minister. I will let the member know what the Minister's reply is. I think that is what the member was seeking. I hope that is satisfactory to the member.

Division 81 put and passed.

Division 82: Education, \$549 477 000—

Mr PEARCE: I wish to discuss a number of items on the education estimates; however, in deference, not so much to the House, but to the attendants, the *Hansard* reporters, and others, it is not my intention to spend a lot of time on it this evening. It is a great pity that we are discussing a quarter of the State's Budget at 11.10 p.m. on the night that has been set down for Parliament to rise.

Mr Brian Burke: That is fairly much in keeping with the way this place is managed.

Mr PEARCE: I will come to that. It is much in keeping with the way this Chamber is managed. There was a little trick today which was designed to take members off their guard.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): If we confine our remarks to the matter before the Chair—that is the matter of general debate on the education estimates—we will proceed much quicker.

Mr PEARCE: I am making some general comments.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): The member is not going to make those general comments and get away from the item before the Chair.

Mr Brian Burke: We are discussing this item in the debate.

Mr PEARCE: What I could do, Mr Deputy Chairman, if you prefer—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I prefer the member to speak on the general debate on education.

Mr PEARCE: I have unlimited time and I have indicated already to members that I have a significant number of matters which I would normally seek to raise under this section of the debate because it represents a quarter of this State's Budget; however, if I was to do that we would be here until 2.00 a.m. on the education estimate

alone. I am not going to be in a position of truncating those remarks in order to satisfy the commitments of *Hansard* and other attendants of the Chamber, only to have the Minister rise after my speech and say that the Opposition has not taken this matter seriously because it has spent only half an hour on it. I have general philosophical questions and serious concerns about our State's present educational policy, but it is inappropriate in terms of the concentration span required of members and *Hansard* reporters, which concentration could not or should not be expected after the incredible day we worked yesterday and the long day we have had today. In the normal course of events I would be commenting in more detail; but I will make these comments in the forthcoming election. The reason for my making those general comments is to make clear the context in which I am discussing the education section of the Budget.

I want to raise two things specifically with regard to this. One is a particular point with regard to a certain high school and the way in which Liberal members have attempted to misinterpret my comments. The second relates to philosophical questions with regard to the Priest report. I will deal firstly with the Bunbury Senior High School and explain very clearly to the Committee and to the State exactly what the situation is in regard to that high school. Two weeks ago I went down to Bunbury and toured a number of Bunbury schools. I was due to attend the Bunbury Senior High School, but the timetable which was set for me was a little too ambitious and I was unable to get to that school at the allotted time. Later the principal and the staff were involved in a meeting so I was unable to speak to them. I have visited the Bunbury Senior High School before; last year was the last time I went there, but I have visited that school on other previous occasions. I am familiar with some of the rebuilding programmes though I do not claim to be an expert on them. During discussions with a journalist from the *South Western Times*, I said I was dubious about the very grandiose figure of \$1.4 million—claimed by the member for Bunbury in this Chamber to have been allocated for works to be carried out at the Bunbury Senior High School—which would be hard for the Government to deliver considering that only \$20 000 has been allocated in the Budget for that school.

I pointed out to the House on a previous occasion that in the Loan Estimates seven schools will receive \$20 000 in the current Budget and all of them, it seems, have been promised large sums up to the \$1.4 million as was promised apparently to the Bunbury Senior High School. I explained

to the journalist during the course of a very long conversation in which many matters were canvassed, that I did not believe it would be possible for the Government to deliver on all the promises made to the seven "\$20 000" schools even though an effort was being made to spend out of next year's capital works programme for schools in the pork barrelling which is going on prior to the election. Even despite that, I do not believe it is possible for the Government to deliver on all the promises it has made to the schools; in particular on the promises made to the Bunbury Senior High School. There may be some doubt when it comes to actually getting the cheque signed or the tender form signed for the work that has been promised. I put that to the Committee on the basis that some doubt could be entertained with regard to the Albany Senior High School, the Northampton school, or any of the other schools in that group of seven.

The reporter wrote the article up that way in a fairly brief fashion, but apparently it has been interpreted by some people in an incorrect way. I was first aware of the possibility of this interpretation when I received a letter from the principal of the high school asking me to explain whether or not the article meant that the progress of repairs and refurbishing of the Bunbury Senior High School would be in doubt if there is a Labor Government next year; that is to say, those involved from that school apparently read the article—with what prompting I know not—to mean that any threat to or doubt cast over the future of the Bunbury Senior High School renovations would be if the Labor Party were elected, and that is not what I said. What I said to the people of Bunbury was quite the reverse. I criticised those promises for capital works being made on the eve of an election in this year's Budget, and I said they should be treated with caution.

Mr Davies: They are allocating about one per cent.

Mr PEARCE: That is right, a tiny proportion of it is being allocated. It could be that the Government intends to give the entire \$1.4 million to the Bunbury Senior High School this year, but it can do that only at the expense of the other schools in the group of seven which have been promised \$20 000. That is the situation in Bunbury. There is no doubt whatsoever that Bunbury Senior High School would receive those renovations under a Labor Government.

Bunbury Senior High School and Albany Senior High School are on the high priority list for repairs. They are two of the oldest high schools in the State and they are set aside year

after year for much-needed renovations because new schools are being built from capital funds in the metropolitan area. This will continue. How it will be done next year is anyone's guess. There will be no allocations left for schools because of the promises made for next year's Budget.

Those are the points that need to be made which concern the Bunbury area. I will be writing to the principal of the Bunbury Senior High School and I will include a copy of the commitments I have given in this House. It was my intention to visit the area on Tuesday but because of the changed sitting hours of this House my plans were altered. However, I will visit the area shortly.

The second point concerns the structure of lower secondary education in schools in this State. It is a complex matter and historical and philosophical questions are involved that require a great deal of discussion.

It was a great pity that the Government shelved all but one of the recommendations of the Priest report. The committee was set up in a less than sincere way. It was established by the Minister for Education before the last Minister in the context of the 1980 elections in an attempt to suggest that something was being done to review the standards—and in a context, I might add, that the Minister criticised—of education in our schools. The main suggestion was that there needed to be a return to the three "Rs" and with an election looming, the Minister set up a committee to inquire into the declining standards.

Shortly after that election, a new Minister was appointed to that portfolio and that was the member for South Perth. He put the committee in motion. I contacted the Minister and asked if I could be a member of that committee so that the Labor Party would have an input into the decisions made.

Mr Clarko: You wrote to be part of the proposed committee?

Mr PEARCE: Yes, I did. A promise was made before the 1980 election that the committee would be formed, but it was not set up until after the election.

Mr Clarko: The terms of reference were set in February 1980.

Mr PEARCE: The election was held on 23 February that year.

My understanding was that it was probably March. The membership of the committee was established shortly after the election.

Mr Clarko: I was not discounting that.

Mr PEARCE: I offered to be on the committee because the committee was inquiring, not in a partisan way, into the whole business. The Government was to appoint the members of the committee and I suggested that the Opposition should be given an opportunity to have some input as well. I accepted the rejection I received to that request because it was my view the committee was not being set up in a serious manner to look at the education system in our schools and to consider what needed to be done to improve the instruction courses. I believe the committee was set up in the hope to prove there was a decline in the standards of our schools and that would continue to be the Government's attack both verbally and in relation to financial cutbacks.

As my request was rejected, I made the statement that the Opposition would not be bound by the recommendations of the committee. It is also my view that the committee was composed of people who thought there had been a decline in the standards of schools. However, the committee did not find that at all. It found the reverse; that there was no decline in literacy and numeracy although it appeared there was a lack of hard evidence on these matters.

Nevertheless, it was able to point to some evidence which tended to suggest there had been a slight, but notable improvement in the levels of literacy and numeracy in our schools over the last decade. The committee made progressive recommendations and some of the committee's discussions lead to conclusions which I thought would have resulted in more thoroughgoing recommendations. However, the recommendations are reasonable ones.

Probably the committee was more politically astute in those circumstances than to bring down the recommendations which their evidence would have led to, but a compromise was arrived at between that and what it thought might be politically acceptable.

The committee was wrong in its judgment. Almost all of its recommendations have been shelved except the recommendation which deals with the year 11 certificate. After the announcement about the year 11 certificate I asked the Minister what other decisions would be made in relation to the rest of the report. The answer I was given was that the matter was still being considered. I indicated that, as far as the Opposition was concerned, the report was not dead and that the Government should work on the proposals of that report, based on further studies.

I hope the Minister does not have a closed mind in relation to these matters and that he will look

again at the recommendations he has shelved. I refer particularly to the recommendation suggesting that established schools should be free from moderation procedures and produce a certificate of their own. I am not suggesting that individual schools produce individual school certificates, but that each school should have the ability to produce an achievement certificate.

I have no objection to the implementation of year 11 certificates provided the assessment is totally school-based and that no external examinations are enforced at the year 11 level.

As I have said, I could elaborate on these matters, but given the lateness of the hour and the session, I will not do so.

Mr WILSON: I raise a small matter which is of particular concern to the staff and the parents of the students attending Morley Senior High School. It concerns the very uncomfortably hot conditions they have to suffer in the school library. This has been a problem at the school ever since the library was completed. It is, of course, like many public buildings that seem to have originated in an architect's mind, planned to be an amazing structure with the western wall almost completely of glass.

As members can imagine, at the height, or the beginning of the Western Australian summer this situation does not readily lend itself to the comforts of the staff and students.

I first raised this matter in the Parliament earlier this year by way of question to the Minister. He advised at that stage that the north-east education region minor works committee had the project of cooling the library listed for consideration in 1981-82, subject to funds being available. In answer to an application from the PCA, the Minister advised that the work could be expected to be done after 1 July, if funds could be made available. The date of the installation of the units would be determined at that time.

Subsequent to that answer and in the absence of any further definite information, I again raised the matter with the Minister on 6 July by way of a letter that referred to previous correspondence which had been received by the PCA, in a letter of 24 May, from the director of building services. The letter discounted the viability of the air-cooling units proposed by the association in its submission and advised that the matter had been referred to the Public Works Department for an alternative solution at Government expense.

I raised in my letter the concern of the parents about the fact that this posed further delays which possibly meant no solution would be reached prior to the onset of the coming summer.

In reply to that letter, the Minister advised that the schools design and investigation branch of the PWD at the end of July was currently being considered and a detailed report and recommendation should be available shortly.

Mr Davies: That answer meant that they were reminding them about it.

Mr WILSON: Unfortunately, before any further action took place, the library was seriously damaged in a fire. That meant that everything was set back, naturally, and installation of cooling in the library building became a secondary consideration.

The damage done by the fire in the library has been repaired. I suppose it was reasonable to assume that, in the process of repairing the damage, it might have been possible to incorporate in the reconstruction process some cooling provision for the library. That seemed to be a fairly intense expectation on the part of the parents and staff, and other people associated with the school.

Unfortunately that has not eventuated, so I raised the matter with the Minister by way of a question on 10 November. I referred to his advice in the letter of July that the schools design and investigation branch of the Public Works Department had been investigating the provision of the cooling system for the library, and that a detailed report and recommendation would be available shortly. That was at the end of July.

Mr Davies: Again that means, "Thanks for reminding us about it."

Mr WILSON: I asked what progress had been made, and what action was proposed in the 1982-83 financial year to overcome the problems associated with the use of the library in the summer months, with those months now almost upon us.

The Minister was able to advise that the report and the recommendations had been received, and that the Public Works Department had recommended that an evaporative cooling system should be provided to all areas of the library, together with associated building, electrical, and plumbing works. He said that an estimated cost of \$55 000 had been provided by the Public Works Department for the current standards and specifications to be applied to school libraries. He advised further that the recommendation of the PWD was being reviewed by the Education Department. It is that matter that concerns me.

When departments talk about reviewing recommendations, it often means that the recommendations will be delayed further. Obviously the expenditure of \$55 000 is quite major; but in view of the fact that the problem has been going on for such a long time, and that the P. & C. has

tried to put forward submissions including contributions from its own funds towards the solution of the problem, which solution has been rejected by the PWD, it is high time that a definite decision and commitment of funds were made to overcome the problem.

Therefore, I raise it again with the Minister in the hope that firm consideration will be given to the problem, and that a decision will be made to install the cooling system, at least before the beginning of the new school year, in order to overcome this very irritating and inconvenient problem which over the years has been suffered by the students and staff at the school.

Mr CLARKO: I address firstly the point made by the member for Gosnells in respect of the Bunbury Senior High School. It is significant that he said tonight some misunderstanding has existed in the community in regard to the very remote possibility—it is hard to contemplate it—of a Labor Government in this State next year, and the assertion that the Bunbury project of over \$1 million would still go ahead. I think some people had doubts. In a speech made by the member on 19 October, he said—

The point involved here is that the money is not shown in this Budget as the member for Bunbury claims it is. The only suggestion he can make is that the grant may appear in next year's Budget. However,—

I draw the attention of members to this particular point, as follows—

—as I have indicated, it will not be possible to deliver on all the promises made in this regard.

The people of Bunbury probably have not read the member's speech. Probably they worked on the Press release; so it is important, from the point of view of the people involved in education, to assure them that, with the very fanciful, remote possibility of a change of Government, the Labor Party would not stop the work at Bunbury.

The amount of money estimated to be spent on the project is \$1 147 000, and the expenditure anticipated in 1982-83 is \$20 000, as the member has pointed out. The estimated expenditure in 1983-84 is \$1 127 000. The proposed tender date is 23 February 1983; the proposed tender acceptance date is 25 April 1983; and the anticipated completion date of the construction is 20 January 1984.

The alterations to the Bunbury Senior High School are extensive, and it is important for members to know the facts. The member for Gosnells said it was not possible for this Government to commit funds for the next Government. The

funds for building projects at our schools come from both State and Commonwealth sources. The amount of money allocated under the Federal State-grants legislation for Western Australia in the calendar year 1983—contrasted with the financial year that the State Government uses—is \$13 million. As at 1 January next year, we have \$13 million available from the Federal Government for building schools, and we have committed \$6 million of that. We have a further \$7 million available there.

Our works in progress for this year, which we inherited from last year, will be completed next year. This is a traditional provision which has been going on for a long time.

If we look at the period of the Tonkin Government, when the first Court Government came in, it had works in progress totalling \$9.3 million left to it.

Mr Pearce: I hope you will be as generous.

Mr CLARKO: I will not deal with the first year of the Tonkin Government, because it inherited works in progress of \$3 million from the Liberal Government. In the first of its three years, the Tonkin Government had works in progress totalling \$4.9 million. The figure was \$5.7 million the next year. In the third year, just before an election, interestingly enough, a sum of \$9.7 million was involved.

Mr Pearce: What you are claiming is that you learned the trick from the Tonkin Labor Government.

Mr CLARKO: All Governments have known of this sort of thing for a long time. It will not change. I would be surprised if a Labor Government changed that.

Our Government inherited from the Labor Government works in progress totalling \$9.3 million in 1974-75. This year the figure was \$8.3 million; the one for next year is estimated to be \$15 million.

As I said, \$7 million will be available from the Commonwealth once we get into the first days of January 1983. So, when people say they have a doubt that the money is available, that is not true because the money is available from the start of the year. We know that \$7 million will be available for these projects. That clarifies the position. Irrespective of what the Opposition might say, the project worth \$20 000 is assured, because the money is available.

As I said before, this is a normal procedure. It was done in the time of the Tonkin Labor Government, and I suggest it will be done for ever more because it is a logical process by which we can

plan the work through the year. Great credit must be given to our previous Treasurer, Sir Charles Court, because during his time we saw a very significant improvement in the way schools are built. It was during his time that we ceased to have the dreadful situation, other than in the exceptional case, of schools not being ready for the school year.

Sir Charles Court made money available so that the projects started earlier. In most cases, the schools were available at the beginning of the year, whereas previously the Press always had a field day because of schools that were not completed.

We are expending substantial amounts of money on building projects. It is a difficult business to try to achieve all the maintenance and extensions required by our schools.

The member for Gosnells also referred to the Priest report, which was an examination of lower secondary education in this State. He implied some criticism of the terms of reference of that report where it said there was a need to check literacy and numeracy standards, and so on.

Mr Pearce: There is a need to check them; what I was saying is that that was politically based.

Mr CLARKO: I do not think that was answered fully by the Priest report. The report said, "We found no evidence one way or the other." In a sense, the Priest committee begged the question.

Mr Pearce: They did not come up with the political things that were hoped of them. They came up with some decent suggestions.

Mr CLARKO: As I say, I think the committee begged the question.

The Government has not taken the view that it should abolish all moderation. It does not support the view that comparability tests should be abolished totally. Neither the Board of Secondary Education, nor the Education Department for that matter—

Mr Pearce: The Priest report suggested further moderation for country schools.

Mr CLARKO: The committee supported a reduction in the number of comparability tests, but it suggested that we have at least one test. In regard to accreditation, we do not endorse the situation in which separate schools should have automatic entree to total accreditation and any form of central moderation. The department does not support that.

The Priest report did not really go into that point because, as the member knows, it supported

the provision of regular money for the item bank development. Now, we have already accepted that, and we are now establishing item banks in the required way. As they develop, obviously we would be able to reconsider the question of comparability testing.

One of the recommendations of the Priest committee is that moderators should spend more time at smaller schools. That statement implies that the committee did not seek to abolish the whole system of moderation and central control. That may be too strong a word. I believe that in time there will be movements along the line where there will be variations of this moderation.

I have strongly proposed a year 11 certificate, which I think goes further than what the Priest committee sought. I am opposed to the Achievement Certificate going beyond year 10, although some people would support the idea. The member for Gosnells seems to be saying he would like a system, when it is appropriate—I do not want to be too harsh—where we do away with central controls, moderation, and so on, and ideally he is including all the schools. I think that is some way down the track yet.

I am keen to see a year 11 certificate which has the strong support of a central organisation of standing in our community. I would like a year 11 certificate for which all students would sit. It seems to me the report did not recommend that; certainly it did not overtly include all pupils. I would not like this certificate to fall into the same situation of the high school certificate, where high school students of lesser ability sat for the certificate and it very quickly lost support in the community.

Mr PEARCE: The problem with moderation is that it comes in the wrong place in the system. I do not know whether you taught in schools where comparability tests were held. Either they have to be basically IQ tests or they have to be based on fairly common grounds for all the schools. The tests come at a time which is removed from the time when the final assessment is made. It is not a very workable system.

Mr CLARKO: The parents and the business people of our community still have a very strong desire for a standard which, when they look at the certificate, will assure them that no matter what school in Western Australia the students attended, they are all equal.

Mr PEARCE: I agree that parents and employers have that desire, but I think their desire is based on a misapprehension of what is happening in schools.

Mr CLARKO: Neither I nor the Government is prepared to move to a situation where we abolish this central overview.

I finish on the point that the year 11 certificates hopefully will come into operation in 1984. It should improve the situation both for the academic students and the non-academic students, for those who are going for two years of upper school secondary education or one year. Currently there is a very marked fallout in the number of pupils who embark on year 11 studies. Presently 13 000 students start year 11 and only 7 500 complete year 12. That leaves a gap of 5 500 students, most of whom get no certificate, and the reports they get from schools are such that many employers are unsure of their value. In addition, of those 13 000 students, only 3 500 go on to post-secondary education, and that is a very small proportion; only one in four who set out at the start of year 11 go on to post-secondary education.

The Government is addressing the situation strongly and is looking to improve the situation in upper secondary schools for academic students, transitional students, and those involved in any way at all, so that we can give them an upper secondary education of quality and relevance.

I indicate to the member for Dianella that I have noted what he said and that if he would write to me, I will look at the matter in detail.

Division 82 put and passed.

Divisions 83 and 84—Board of Secondary Education, \$924 000; Western Australian Post Secondary Education Commission, \$703 000—put and passed.

Division 85: Academy of Performing Arts, \$687 000—

Mr PEARCE: The Academy of Performing Arts was established by the current Government as an institution which was to be autonomous and which had as its aim the establishment of something that would earn an Australia-wide reputation in the area of training people in the performing arts; specifically, actors, dancers, and musicians. I was a little dubious about it at first because it was our policy to have a conservatorium and I believed the academy was likely to fall a little short of concert-standard performance development in musicians. I must admit that the performance of the academy has been remarkably impressive; the three-way combination of the training of actors, dancers, and musicians has proved to be not only very viable and capable of providing very high standards in each of those areas, but also very able to provide trainees in each of those areas to work together in a way that

is very beneficial. Given the development of modern theatre, which involves all those areas, the combination is very necessary.

The academy has a separate budgetary allocation because it is a separate institution. Although it was built on the grounds of the Mt. Lawley College of Advanced Education, it was never intended to be a part of that college. It has a separate principal and a separate council. In the past the member for Victoria Park and I have raised the matter of there being no statutory base for the academy; that is to say, although it has its own council, staffing, principal, and money, in every other sense it does not have any formalisation of its entity. However, it has developed very well despite its slightly nebulous situation until a few weeks ago. I adverted to this briefly in the eight minutes left to me last week after that unbelievable performance by Government members when I was first speaking on the Heathridge tavern which forced me to run out of time when I was discussing the effect of the Liddelow report on the WA College of Advanced Education.

Last year in this State, four separate teachers' training colleges or colleges of advanced education—viz., Mt. Lawley, Nedlands, Churchlands, and Claremont—were forced to amalgamate into a single college—the Western Australian College of Advanced Education—by the Federal Government, which insisted that, for reasons of economy, these small CAEs should be amalgamated into one large college.

That attitude taken by the Federal Government has been destructive in the tertiary sector and it was not confined to Western Australia; it was forced on institutions in the other States, and for once in the very troubled times of education last year the then Minister and I were in complete agreement that the Commonwealth ought to be resisted in this matter. It is a matter of history that the resistance was unsuccessful in the face of a dogmatic and ideological Commonwealth Government which was not prepared to shift on one thing, as so frequently is the case.

Mr Davies: Big is best.

Mr PEARCE: As far as I know, none of the people who made the decision in the Commonwealth had any idea of what was happening in the education system over here. The decision was forced on us; not only was it bad for education here, but also ironically it proved to be more costly than the previous arrangement.

To rationalise the four campuses, a committee of inquiry chaired by the deputy director of the college (Mr Liddelow) was established. The committee produced a very comprehensive report

which, as I pointed out last week, is a real blueprint for an empire. Not only did it look at how it could restructure all the colleges in order to centralise very heavily power in the top echelon in the hands of the director and the council and to take away a great deal of autonomy from each of the individual sections of the college, which was bad enough, but it was also done in a quite vicious way without any regard for the feelings of the people who found their positions altered by the new arrangement.

I am told that the other three of the four college principals, all of whom were previously equal to Dr Jecks until he was appointed to the super post, now get summoned along to meetings of the staff generally and I have been told it was announced publicly that their positions were to be downgraded yet the gentlemen concerned had not been told in advance what was to be announced. The way staff and students have been dealt with by the WA College of Advanced Education shows gross discourtesy and is building up a very real problem in the college. There is a tremendous amount of staff disaffection and discontent because of the high-handed attitude and the authoritarian stance adopted by Dr Jecks. All these matters will lead to further problems in these areas.

Mr Davies: From where does he get his authority?

Mr PEARCE: I am told that Dr Jecks is in the habit of making prognostications of what the Legislative Council will do to the legislative efforts of the Opposition should it become the Government next year in order to alter things at the college. Apparently he is in the habit of saying to people that efforts I might make to improve the situation legislatively will be kicked out by the Legislative Council.

It is well known he is a senior member of the Liberal Party; in fact he is a divisional president and has nominated for the position of vice-president of the organisation.

Mr Jamieson: He was on the electoral committee with the Minister when they drew up their programme.

Mr Grewar: He is a very qualified person, and very capable.

Mr PEARCE: I do not dispute that, although I do not believe he is capable of handling his job.

Mr Grewar: You are often wrong.

Mr PEARCE: Dr Jecks is often wrong. I do not claim infallibility, but I must admit that I find it ironic for the member for Roe to be suggesting I might be wrong; I thought perhaps a more infal-

lible Government member than he might have made such a comment.

I do not deny that Dr Jecks has the right to participate in the political processes of this State. He is perfectly entitled to join a political party, and for that matter to go as far as he can in that party, and to use his influence. However, I think there comes a time when a person has to choose where his greater loyalty lies. I would think that if we have the situation where the director of a tertiary institution was seeking to use his political position in order to frustrate the legislative efforts of his own Minister, we would have a very serious situation indeed. I am not able to assert that Dr Jecks is doing that because I am not the Minister. Nevertheless he is saying to people what the attitude of the Legislative Council is likely to be on some of these issues. That raises the very serious question of whether Dr Jecks should continue to hold his position under a Labor Government. I am not suggesting we would dump him from the very beginning on the basis of things he is saying now, but he would have to exercise a great deal of discretion otherwise he would have to decide where his loyalties lay.

However, the Liddelow committee made recommendations affecting the Academy of Performing Arts. Not only has the committee attempted to rationalise the operations of the four colleges, but also it has cast around to see what other bodies could be drawn into the ambit. One of the institutions is the Academy of Performing Arts. The Liddelow report contains a series of recommendations that the academy should be drawn more closely under the ambit of the WA College of Advanced Education. It seems to me that the best that can be said of these things is that they are recommendations being proposed by the WA College of Advanced Education which have not yet been accepted by the Government or anyone else. Unless the Government were to make some deliberate effort to change the status of the Academy of Performing Arts, I would have thought the Liddelow committee was off base in attempting to add organisations like the academy to its empire. However, there is no doubt from the report that that is what is being attempted.

It is proposed to put the director of the college on to the staff appointment board of the academy, a situation which currently does not apply. The reason given is that it would help to redeploy people from other sections of the college into the Academy of Performing Arts, which cuts across what the academy was set up for in the first place. The College of Advanced Education recruits people involved in general education, humanities education, and teacher training.

The areas of humanities education and teacher training require a certain amount of expertise even in the performing arts area and of course greater expertise in the area of education. The Academy of Performing Arts is set up as an institution of excellence; that is to say, it is to train performers to very high standards, and one would normally expect to have its recruiting based on different criteria than that which would prevail in the performing arts section or sections of the College of Advanced Education. A move has been suggested to put Dr Jecks on the staff appointment body of the Academy of Performing Arts in order that people might be re-employed from other sections of the College of Advanced Education. I am told that moves also are afoot to place over the Principal of the Academy of Performing Arts a kind of superior principal; and a name already has been given to me in that regard—and it seems to be a fairly horrifying set of moves, to absorb the Academy of Performing Arts into the WA College of Advanced Education at this time. The college accepted the Liddelow report only yesterday, without any alteration, despite 156 pages of submissions which have been ignored in the process; so firmly were the original recommendations laid down, and so firmly did the college authorities—and I mean Dr Jecks—agree to the recommendations which the committee made, that I find it totally abhorrent. Most, if not all, of that would be scrapped under a Labor Government.

Mr Clarko: What would you scrap?

Mr PEARCE: We would scrap a large part of the Liddelow report recommendations. I do not have the report in front of me, nor do I have several hours to spare, otherwise I would go through it with the Minister. The degree of centralisation in administrative terms is totally unnecessary; for example, directors of colleges, now campus principals, are not able to spend any money on their college without sending the receipts and invoices to Churchlands to be dealt with.

Mr Davies: I think they have to get the nod before they even spend it.

Mr PEARCE: That is right. A campus principal, a person who a year ago was the equivalent of Dr Jecks, an autonomous director, could not buy a bottle of beer for his hospitality fridge without first getting the approval of the central administration; in fact, it had to be paid for by the administration of Churchlands College. Centralisation is unsuitable in terms of administration and that is why the college is costing a quarter of a million dollars more a year to run than it would if the colleges were retained as four separate institutions. Most of that money is

wasted on administration, money that could have been used towards educating our young people. It is no surprise to me to find that at a time when more administrators are being recruited to the College of Advanced Education—up to 60 staff members—teachers and educators are being sacked. The bureaucrats are proliferating when the teachers are being sacked. The imbalance is building up between administrators and educators in this institution, but the fundamental point in my discussion is in relation to the Academy of Performing Arts, an asset to this State. It has established an exceptionally fine reputation in Australia for the excellence of its graduates and indeed the quality of its staff, and it now may be absorbed into the bureaucracy of the WA College of Advanced Education, and moves are being made now to achieve that well before the Government has had time to make any submissions about whether it is prepared to even agree to the recommendations of the Liddelow report in that regard.

Mr Davies: Dr Jecks will be dictating to the Government, by the sound of it.

Mr PEARCE: It certainly sounds like Dr Jecks is not paying any great courtesy to the Minister with regard to the moves he is making here, unless it is the case that the Minister already has agreed to the general thrust of these proposals.

Mr Davies: The Minister may need him.

Mr PEARCE: The Minister may care to answer these questions. I can be quite clear that the reservations I once expressed about the WA Academy of Performing Arts have been completely dispelled by the performance and the excellence of that institution. It is important for the continued excellence of that institution that it remains autonomous. Grave damage will be done to it if it is thrown into the WA college's super bureaucracy.

It may be the case that the view of the Minister for Education is the same as mine on this matter. He has not made any pronouncement about his view one way or the other. He will have the opportunity in the course of this evening's debate to dispel the fears some people have about the future of the Academy of Performing Arts; he will suggest either that the WA college should not be allowed to get away with this absorption into its empire of the Academy of Performing Arts, which the Government watched very closely.

I hope the Minister also will assure me, if that is his view, that he is prepared to look into the proposition that steps be taken to implement many aspects of the Liddelow report, including this one, before the Government has made a de-

cision on it. Dr Jecks has probably read the wind and wants to get as much done as he can before March next year. If he is doing that, he is showing a considerable discourtesy to his own Minister. It is important that the Minister for Education maintains an overview of our educational institutions in order to prevent an abuse of power such as that which is now occurring.

Mr DAVIES: I merely want to say that as the member responsible on the Opposition side of Parliament for matters associated with arts and culture, I endorse the well expressed sentiments of the member for Gosnells. As the member for Gosnells said, the work that is being done by the academy has been applauded throughout the length and breadth of Australia. It is innovative and very exciting. Last year during the debate on the Estimates I asked the then Minister whether he could tell me about the academy—whether it was autonomous, why there was an increase in the allocation for it, and several other questions, and the Minister was good enough to stand up and say he did not know. I appreciated his bluntness on that occasion. Because of that and what has happened since, I have been interested in the work of the academy and the training it provides. I endorse the remarks made by the member for Gosnells.

Mr CLARKO: I thank members for their comments on the Academy of Performing Arts, which I regard as an important institution and which has produced excellent work.

In regard to the Liddelow report it should be realised that it is an internal report from the organisation or institution and it has that amount of standing alone. Initially it was discussed at one meeting of the WA College of Advanced Education council and I understand that consideration has not been finalised; the council is still looking at the report.

Mr Pearce: My understanding is that it was agreed to yesterday by the college council without amendment, and that is the end of their concern.

Mr CLARKO: I am sorry. My comments were based on information I received prior to yesterday. I was referring to the previous meeting. Before the Liddelow report was anything more than a report, it was put to a group within an organisation and if, as the member for Gosnells says, it has now been adopted by the council of WACAE, I look forward to seeing it in the near future. It certainly has not been endorsed by WAPSEC and it certainly has not come to me in any form stronger than that initial report.

If the member looks at the amount of money allocated, he will see nearly twice as much money

is provided this year compared with the amendment for last year and that is a fairly powerful indicator of the Government's confidence in that institution. Its actual standing and stature, I discussed recently with the Chairman of WAPSEC because I was not clear exactly what its standing was, and he advised me that it is part of WACAE and the relationship is similar to that of the WA School of Mines and WAIT. It has a degree of independence, but is currently part of the WA College of Advanced Education.

Mr Pearce: Could I ask you how he is able to advise you of that?

Mr CLARKO: A good question; I do not know.

Mr Pearce: Seriously, from the budgetary allocation, it appears to be like the Hedland College or the Karratha College which immediately follow it.

Mr CLARKO: As the member would know, the State Government does not wholly fund the WA College of Advanced Education.

Mr Pearce: Because it is tertiary funded; funded by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr CLARKO: We discussed this some weeks ago and I said my understanding was that it has a loose relationship with the Mt. Lawley College, but that it had a significant degree of independence; in terms of finance, it was associated with other bodies.

Mr Pearce: I do not want to upset you, but I want to persist with this; it seems to me that answer must be wrong because the WA college is funded by the Commonwealth Government, and the amalgamation of the allocations was forced by the Commonwealth Government because it was paying the money. You pay the money for the Academy of Performing Arts in this State and there is no Commonwealth money involved.

Mr CLARKO: I understand moneys for buildings and things of that sort come from the Commonwealth source.

Mr Pearce: You may be right on that. The amalgamated college was not gazetted under the powers given to your predecessor or exercised by your predecessor under the Colleges Act whereby colleges may be gazetted or ungazetted and the former gazette of the WA college may not have taken on that notification.

Mr CLARKO: I will tell the member my understanding of it and will check the situation out. The Government has not formally considered the recommendations of the Liddelov report. In regard to the question of Dr Jecks, I was very disappointed with the member for Gosnells for

being so eager to attack him. The member admits he has considerable academic qualifications.

Mr Jamieson: He hasn't got a very nice personality.

Mr CLARKO: I regard him as an outstanding person, a real educator in this State. The member is entitled to his opinion. It is a dangerous thing when the shadow spokesman on education makes the very deliberate threat that there would be a serious question as to whether he could hold his position under a Labor Government. A change of Government could lead to the termination of the employment of a person who is the Director of the WA College of Advanced Education which would be very serious, but it goes further than that because it would place in jeopardy the Vice Chancellor of the University of WA, the Vice Chancellor of Murdoch, and the Director of WAIT and, taking it to its logical conclusion, it would place in jeopardy every other member of staff in post-secondary institutions.

Mr Davies: Are you saying they are all members of the Liberal Party?

Mr CLARKO: In the United States, the new President dictated right down to the doormen at the White House, and that is a very serious thing. I hope the Press picked this up. It would be a very serious situation.

Several members interjected.

Mr CLARKO: Two things are of concern. One is that employment could be terminated, and the other one is that they are using this very deliberate and overt threat against the person who is considered to be a man of great ability.

Mr Parker: Jobs for the boys! Will you give them a job?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): Order!

Mr CLARKO: What the Opposition does not like is the fact that he belongs to the Liberal Party. Many people holding senior positions in this State are employed by the Liberal Party.

Mr Pearce: They never sought to use the Legislative Council to block their legislation by their own Minister.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr CLARKO: It would be a reprehensible thing.

Mr Bertram: It certainly is.

Mr CLARKO: What has been said tonight by the shadow spokesman on education has resulted in a threat being put on the job of every person on the staff of a post-secondary institution.

Mr Davies: What did you say about this shadow Minister? They made a recommendation in the Murray report.

Mr Pearce: Right.

Mr CLARKO: It is quite likely. I am not aware of the situation or of the recommendation that deals with Dr Jecks.

It is a great pity that a fine institution such as the Academy of Performing Arts, of which the Government is proud and to which it has allocated twice as much this year as last year—and that indicates the Government's support—has been dragged into the gutter in this debate by threats having been made against a person who is a man of outstanding ability.

Mr PEARCE: The difference between the positions of the Academy of Performing Arts and the WA College of Advanced Education is that the academy is funded by the State and the college by the Commonwealth.

The academy has its own budgetary allocation and thus ought to be autonomous. There is an uneasy balance of authority at the college, because while it is established under a State Act, the Commonwealth provides the money. The State Minister is responsible for staffing and administration, the Commonwealth for accountability of funds and accreditation of courses.

The position of the Principal of the Academy of Performing Arts, ensures his autonomy. I am not just raising speculation about what might happen because of the Liddelow report or Dr Jecks' comments, but the Minister for Education, in his desire to score political points—

Mr Clarko: That is the second time you have tried to slander him.

Mr PEARCE: I have no confidence in the man for the reasons I have stated. The reason I raised the question about whether or not Dr Jecks should continue as principal of the college under a Labor Government was not to do with whether or not he is an active member of the Liberal Party.

He has every right to participate in the Liberal Party and at a high level, but the question that would be raised is his loyalty in the job. We could have the situation in this State whereby the head of the department or an institution could use his political position in order to influence a vote in the Legislative Council to frustrate his own Minister's legislation. That would not be accepted and there would be a clear conflict of interest. I am not saying he would do that or that he would be able to do that, but clearly the situation could be that the Labor Government would not have a majority in the Legislative Council. The legislative

initiatives of the Government could be rejected by the Legislative Council because of his influence as a senior member of the Liberal Party. This is where the Minister is failing to meet the point head on. The Minister took a single comment out of the context in which I placed it and Dr Jecks has been singled out in the discussion, but that could apply to other members of the Liberal Party.

Mr Clarko: Because he is a key Liberal.

Mr PEARCE: Other people are Liberals and I say in all honesty that there are many directors of these institutions who would not vote for the Labor Party.

Mr Clarko: That is a different question.

Mr PEARCE: Dr Jecks could continue to be an active participant in the political processes under a Labor Government. What he could not do is attempt directly to frustrate legislation emanating from his own Minister in another place. A person who was disloyal would have to make a choice of what he wanted—

Mr Grewar: He is a bigger man than that.

Mr PEARCE: In that case there would be no difficulty. If he were a bigger man he would not be talking in that way at present.

Mr Clarko: How about naming the person who said this? You were insistent upon naming people the other day.

Mr PEARCE: I have spoken to a significant number of people at the College of Advanced Education, many of whom have rung me at my office—not here. Many are reluctant to give their names and will do so only after I have given them the strictest undertaking that their names will not be used in any context whatsoever.

Mr Clarko: Perhaps you should not smear him, then.

Mr PEARCE: A person said to me last Monday—a member of the staff—that Dr Jecks is running a reign of terror in the college and people are fearful of their jobs.

Mr Grewar: You are denigrating this man in Parliament under privilege.

Mr PEARCE: Dr Jecks is not slow in putting forward his opinion about me.

Mr Clarko: To be fair, you should say that he is a man who ran the Churchlands College remarkably. He did a remarkable job in a few years and lifted the reputation of business education.

Mr PEARCE: I do not particularly accept that. Running the Churchlands College is not comparable with running the three other colleges involved in the amalgamation.

Mr Clarko: He did start it off and that is a big difference.

Mr PEARCE: It is the role of a principal to see that harmony is maintained in a college. It is quite different from the situation in a university. The students must participate in the decision-making process. Another point about the Churchlands College for example is that Dr Jecks has not been slow in leaning on members of the student council to make sure they do not participate in the Australian Union of Students.

I am going back to my own personal knowledge and experience of 1975-76. Dr Jecks certainly has not been averse to making his political views known and restricting the autonomy of the students' organisation. He has done this in an attempt to have the student organisation reflect his attitudes.

That is not the proper attitude for a director of a tertiary institution. Dr Jecks is highly qualified and highly respected in a theoretical sense for his knowledge of education, but not for the tight administration he habitually runs. I do not believe he has what it takes to be a director of a tertiary institution. His attitude towards the ethos of a tertiary institution is not what it should be. The role of a tertiary institution is to encourage the development of students.

Dr Jecks runs his institution along strict lines, with a minimum of consultation amongst staff and students. He feels that dissension needs to be crushed and he is known to do that.

Mr Clarko: Why was he chosen by an independent committee? The Government did not sit on that committee.

Mr PEARCE: That may well be. These matters are not normally public knowledge. It may be that he was the best of the applicants, I do not know.

Mr Clarko: I think he got his position because of his ability and reputation.

Mr PEARCE: I do not believe that is so. He certainly has strengths in certain areas of administration and academic qualifications. I think he is inferior to Dr Vickery who was the principal of the Nedlands college and is now the Director General of Education. Dr Vickery has excellent qualifications both academically and administratively.

Mr Clarko: You won't get any argument from me on that.

Mr PEARCE: My point about Dr Jecks is simply that provided he comports himself in a proper responsible way as Director of the Western Australian College of Advanced Education, no matter what outside political activities he may be

engaged in, and provided he does not attempt to subvert legislation of his own Minister by using political influence in another place—he would have to make a choice as to where his loyalties lay, and if not, he would find his services would be terminated—

Mr Clarko: That is dreadful. If that is the case, should we have sacked David Carson at Belmont?

Mr PEARCE: He was not trying to subvert—

Mr Clarko: He was an active member of the Labor Party and made it hot for the Government.

Mr PEARCE: The fact is that if the Labor Government were elected to office, it would not have a majority in the upper House and that simple point causes us concern when we consider the statements that Dr Jecks has made. Because of the gerrymander of the boundaries, it does not look like we could ever have a majority in the upper House.

The remarks I made about Dr Jecks were reported to me and I am sure he will know the people to whom he made these comments.

I simply have illustrated a problem which may arise, and I seriously hope it will not arise next April.

Division 85 put and passed.

Division 86: Hedland College, \$2 102 000—

Mr PEARCE: Last year when I rose to speak on this division I discussed at some length the position of the Hedland College and the Karratha College. Around the north-west, this led to some deliberate misinterpretation or distortion of what I said. As a result, I have been to the Hedland College twice and the Karratha College once to assure the people that there would be no intention on the part of an incoming Labor Government to diminish funding or compulsorily to place them under the care of the Technical Education Division of the Education Department.

I do not depart from my original belief that the colleges would have been better set up under that division in the first place. However, they now have a special place in the Education Department system, and that place will be maintained by a Labor Government as long as they want to remain in an autonomous position. If they are looking to change, that would be considered.

I have been forthright in saying that we would not be prepared to accept the conversion of the Eastern Goldfields College into an autonomous college, but there is no intention on the part of an incoming Labor Government to interfere with the autonomous status of the Karratha College or the Hedland College, or to diminish their funding in any way.

Mr CLARKO: This Government which established the Hedland College is very proud of it and what is happening there. Although the staff has been criticised, I believe they are very competent. Because this college is expanding and moving further forward, the allocation is a 150 per cent increase on last year. It will be a fine college. It is interesting to now hear the member for Gosnells say that he has confidence in it.

Mr Pearce: I said that last year—you distorted it.

Division 86 put and passed.

Divisions 87 to 93—Karratha College, \$1 434 000; Rural Youth Movement Council, \$256 000; Community Welfare, \$40 115 000; Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority, \$366 000; Government Employees' Housing Authority, \$8 251 000; Rural Housing Authority, \$191 000; Consumer Affairs, \$1 196 000—put and passed.

Schedules 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Rushton (Deputy Premier), and transmitted to the Council.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION BILL

Council's Amendments

Amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr Rushton (Deputy Premier) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the council were as follows—

No. 1.

Clause 3, page 2, line 7—Insert after—

“dismissal” the following—

“ (but not including a dismissal under section 669(1)(a) of The Criminal Code) ”.

Clause 3, page 2, lines 31 to 34—To delete—

“ Welfare Act 1947; and

(b) a finding of guilt referred to in section 34 or 34B of the Child Welfare Act 1947; ”

and substitute the following—

“ Welfare Act 1947;

(b) a finding of guilt referred to in section 34 or 34B of the Child Welfare Act 1947; and

(c) a dismissal under section 669 (1)(a) of The Criminal Code; ”.

No 2.

Clause 5, page 4, line 25—Insert after “person” the following—

“ who is a practitioner (as defined by the Legal Practitioners Act 1893), of not less than 8 years' standing and practice. ”.

No. 3.

Clause 21, page 11, line 31—Delete “alleged offence” and substitute the following—

“ committed the act or made the omission alleged to constitute the offence ”.

No. 4.

Clause 22, page 12, line 29—Delete “alleged” and substitute the following—

“ act or made the omission alleged to constitute the ”.

No. 5.

Clause 22, page 12, line 34—Delete “alleged offence” and substitute the following—

“ act or made that omission ”.

No. 6.

Clause 22, page 13, line 4—Delete “alleged” and substitute the following—

“ act or made an omission alleged to constitute an ”.

No. 7.

Clause 22, page 13, line 13—Delete “alleged offence” and substitute the following—

“ act or made that omission ”.

No. 8.

Clause 32, page 15, lines 31 to 37 and page 16, lines 1 to 4—Delete the clause and substitute the following—

Liability
of offender
or alleged
offender to
the Crown.

" 32.(1) Where a payment of compensation is ordered, the amount of the payment may be recovered by the Crown in a court of competent jurisdiction in the following manner—

- (a) in the case of a person stated by the Assessor pursuant to section 22(1) to have committed the offence to which the payment relates, the amount, or a proportion thereof as fixed under section 21(3), shall constitute a debt due to the Crown by that person;
- (b) in the case of a person found by the Assessor pursuant to section 22(2) or (3) to have committed the act or made the omission alleged to constitute the offence to which the payment relates, such amount may be recovered by the Crown from that person by way of proceedings brought in accordance with subsection (2).

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (b) of subsection (1), the Crown has, and may exercise, to the extent of the compensation paid, any right of action in relation to the act or omission in question which the person for whose benefit the payment was made has against the person referred to in that paragraph; and the rights of the firstmentioned person shall be to that extent divested from that person and vested in the Crown.

(3) In any proceedings referred to in subsection (1)(b) the court shall be bound by—

- (a) the finding of the Assessor made under section 22(2) or (3), as the case may be; or
- (b) when more than one person is found to be liable, the amount or proportion fixed by the Assessor under section 21(3),

unless it is satisfied that the finding was made or the amount or proportion was fixed in error.

(4) All money recovered by the Crown under this section shall be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. "

No. 9.

Clause 34, page 16, lines 25 to 29—Delete the subclause and substitute the following—

" (1) Where a person interested in an application, or the Under Secretary for Law, is dissatisfied with an order of the Assessor under section 19, he may, in accordance with this section, appeal to a Judge of the District Court against that order. "

No. 10.

Clause 34, page 17, line 1—Delete "The Judge" and substitute the following—

" On an appeal under this section, the Judge shall determine the application afresh without being fettered by the determination of the Assessor, and "

No. 11.

Clause 35, page 17, lines 21 to 23—Delete the subclause.

No. 12.

Clause 36, page 17, lines 32 and 33—Delete "Part IV (other than section 12(1)) of this Act and of" and substitute the following—

" section 10, Parts IV (other than section 12(1)) and V of this Act, and "

No. 13.

Clause 39, page 18, lines 19 to 31—Delete the subclauses.

No. 14.

Clause 39, page 18, line 32—Delete "Subject to this section, a" and substitute the following—

"A".

No. 15.

Clause 42, page 20, after line 10—Insert the following paragraph—

" (a) make provision for the substituted service of notices required to be given by section 12 or 16 or on an appeal, in cases where it is impossible or impracticable to effect service by other means: "

No. 16.

Schedule

Clause 3(1), page 21—Insert after "appoint a person" the following—

" who would be eligible for appointment as Assessor under section 5(1) "

Mr RUSHTON: I move—

That the amendments made by the Council be agreed to.

It is my understanding that the amendments which appear on the notice paper have been considered at length in another place, and I believe also that the Opposition agrees to them.

Mr GRILL: This Bill initiated in this Chamber, and it is now returned with amendments. When we were discussing the Bill, the Opposition expressed concern about several areas. It is our understanding the Police Union submitted a letter to the Government indicating certain amendments it thought desirable. The Parliamentary Draftsman is responsible for some consequential amendments, and the result is the 16 amendments before us which will improve the Bill substantially, but it is still not perfect.

I would like to congratulate the Government on its being prepared to move these amendments. The Minister in this place gave an undertaking which he has honoured. I also thank the Attorney General who seems to be very reasonable about accepting amendments. It is a pity there is not more co-operation. It seems to me that on many occasions Ministers' egos come between bad legislation and good sense. Nonetheless, it is refreshing that the Government was prepared to amend the Bill in such a substantial way, and the amendments have our support.

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

Report

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

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Amendments

Amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mrs Craig (Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Council were as follows—

No. 1.

Clause 8, page 6, lines 32 to 34—Delete "have effect as if it had been published in the *Gazette* in accordance with section 7(4) (b)" and substitute the following—

" come into operation as provided by section 18B "

No. 2.

New clause, page 8, after line 26—Insert a new clause as follows—

Section
18B
inserted.

" 8A. After section 18B of the principal Act the following section is inserted—

Amend-
ment
under
section
18A to be
laid
before
Parliament.

" 18B. (1) A copy of an amendment published in the *Gazette* under section 18A (6) of this Act shall be laid before each House of Parliament within six sitting days of the House next following the date of the publication of the amendment in the *Gazette*.

(2) Either House may, by resolution of which notice has been given within 12 sitting days of such House after a copy of the amendment has been laid before it, disallow the amendment.

(3) As soon as the amendment is no longer subject to disallowance under subsection (2) of this section, the amendment shall have effect as if it had been published in the *Gazette* in accordance with section 7(4) (b) of this Act.

(4) If either House of Parliament passes a resolution disallowing the amendment the Minister shall cause notice of the disallowance to be published in the *Gazette* within 21 days of the passing of the resolution. "

Mrs CRAIG: I move—

That the amendments made by the Council be agreed to.

The effect of the amendments is to require that an amendment that has been initiated by a Minister has a further mechanism built into it whereby it

must be tabled in both Houses of Parliament for a period of 12 days not less than six days after the amendment has been gazetted. I believe this will overcome largely many of the problems referred to during the debate. It will provide a defence mechanism, as Opposition members believed a Minister should not be able to take this power entirely unto himself or herself.

Mr DAVIES: I understand that some surprise was expressed that this amendment was included when the Bill was introduced in another place. I understand that the Bill had been already re-printed incorporating the amendment before the amendment had actually been accepted. That was a bit of impertinence on the Minister's part. Obviously she was quite certain she had the numbers to have the amendment passed, but she should not presuppose the feeling of members here.

The amendments refer to proposed section 18A which provides that once an amendment initiated by the Minister becomes law, after the Minister has suspended the rights of the local authority to make an amendment, it must be promulgated in accordance with the usual procedures applying under section 7(4) (b).

Now we find that the Minister is prepared to say, "We will not promulgate it in the usual way. We will lay it on the Table in the same way as other matters, just as major amendments to the MRPA legislation and the like are laid on the Table and members can protest about it." In effect, the Minister probably is killing any initiative an applicant might hope to have by using the Minister for a town planning review. Members will notice I am careful not to use the word "appeal".

Let us look at the timetabling. A person applies to a local authority for an amendment to the town planning scheme. If the local authority does not want to be co-operative, the person has to wait at least six months until the authority says, "No", because the amendment must be taken for preliminary approval within at least six months of an applicant's approaching a local authority. Then the usual procedures must be carried out. The Minister must consult the Town Planning Board and the local authority and then follow the usual procedures associated with an amendment to a scheme. It may be a further six months before the advertising has been carried out. So we have three months for advertising, review by the local authority, and review by the Town Planning Board, and by that stage 12 months could have passed.

After the Minister arrives at a decision in relation to the amendment, even if she agrees it is likely some other procedures might need to be fol-

lowed before approval finally is reached, the matter must then be brought to the Parliament. If such an amendment were brought to finality tomorrow, say, had we been working under the previous proposed provision, it could not get to Parliament until next August, which is another nine months away.

Having got to Parliament, the amendment would have to lie on the Table for 12 sitting days which would amount to one calendar month. Therefore, we have six months to start with, another six months for processing and procedures, and another couple of months to bring the amendment to finality. That adds up to approximately 14 months. In the extreme, we could add another nine months on top of that which would take it to 23 months.

There is little advantage in that situation if it is going to take 23 months, because it would not be safe for a person to assume that such an amendment would automatically be accepted by the House. To be fair, 99 per cent of the time it would be, but anyone who wished to act on a rezoning or amendment would be silly to assume that, particularly bearing in mind the costs involved.

Instead of hastening the process, we might be slowing it down. For example, if an applicant was knocked back initially, but was able to lobby successfully—we know the right kind of lobbying goes on—he could then put the amendment to the council a month later and it would be finalised much more quickly. It would be a matter of selecting the best way to go about it.

Although an applicant can approach the Minister after six months, it would be 12 months before an applicant got to the Minister if a council decided initially to go ahead and obtain preliminary approval, but not take it to final approval within 12 months. In that case the time span I mentioned of 23 months would be taken to 29 months and one wonders whether it would be worth the effort.

Perhaps the amendment will in some way placate local authorities. However, I do not believe it will, because further protests have arisen even as late as today. Local authorities still are unhappy about the power the Minister is taking unto herself. I do not think it will please local authorities that the Minister now is able to say, "I am going to do these things, but in the ultimate Parliament will have the say as to whether what I have done is right." It probably is a slight improvement on the position we were at this time last night, but we are faced with a rather strange amendment.

We do not oppose the amendment. In considering the time span it must be remembered also that

no requirement exists as to when an applicant can apply; that is, nothing is written into the legislation to say whether, having been knocked back by a shire, an applicant can seek a review by the minister after six months, 12 months, or whenever. Perhaps the Minister might look at this when she is writing the regulations, because she has that power. She could indicate when the person is precluded from going to the Minister. If a local authority has not acted after six months, does the matter have to go to the Minister within one, two, three or more months?

Mrs Craig: That will be prescribed by regulations. The machinery will be prescribed.

Mr DAVIES: It is not clear.

Mrs Craig: If you refer back to my second reading speech you will see that I said it will be necessary to prescribe the precise procedures by way of regulation.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister said she intended to take it upon herself to write regulations and we have given up arguing with Ministers about that, because the regulations will be tabled in due course. However, that is another matter which needs attention.

We do not object to the amendment. It is a surprising one and it will do nothing to hasten town planning amendment procedures which, in some respects, was the reason for the power the Minister was taking unto herself.

Mr NANOVIICH: I am a little disappointed the Legislative Council did not accept the Bill in the form in which it passed through this Chamber, because I felt it was quite acceptable and it was reasonable that the powers should remain with the Minister.

The amendment under consideration will weaken the Bill and I do not believe it will improve the situation. It would have been more effective in its original form. No responsible Minister would abuse the powers in the Bill. The provisions would be used only where a council was not acting properly, in which case the Minister would adjudicate.

I turn now to the time involved in the preparation of a zoning application. A term of six months is provided and, during that period, if the proposed development was found not to be acceptable I am sure the council and ratepayers would make that clear to the Minister.

The Bill has been watered down by this amendment, but perhaps it will be more acceptable now to the local authorities who objected to it previously. I did not believe the Bill was offensive in its original form and it is possible the local

authorities who opposed it, particularly the amendment to section 18, did not understand the correct position.

I am disappointed the Bill did not receive the blessing from the Legislative Council that it received from this Chamber.

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

Report

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

BREAD BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 5 May.

MR PARKER (Fremantle) [12.58 a.m.]: This Bill was before the Legislative Council in April or May of this year. At that time the Hon. Joe Berinson and I spent a considerable period discussing aspects of it with people in the industry, including the two major unions—the Transport Workers' Union and the Bakers', Pastrycooks' and Confectioners' Union of Workers—the Country Bread Manufacturers Association, and the metropolitan bread manufacturers organisation.

At that time those organisations were seriously concerned about the effects of the Bread Bill on their various spheres of operation. The unions were concerned about the broadening of hours of work and the fact that the Bill would make it possible for much longer hours to be worked than was possible previously. The Transport Workers' Union was concerned about the same point in regard to deliveries.

The metropolitan bread manufacturers were worried that some of the changes would enable multinational companies involved in the industry to introduce technology and plant which would ensure they could produce huge quantities of bread at a much lower labour cost, thereby forcing out of the market the more traditional suppliers of bread.

Country bread manufacturers were concerned that the Bill would allow metropolitan bread manufacturers with their high technology apparatus to flood the country bread market, which would ensure the downfall of country bakeries.

Country bread manufacturers referred to the experiences with similar legislation in Victoria and Queensland, and indicated that in those States a large number of country bread shops and bakeries were closed down as a result of the ability of metropolitan bakeries to deliver to

country areas. In those situations, the cost of bread was not affected; in fact, the cost of bread in those States is higher than it is in others. The effect of metropolitan bakeries flooding the country market was a decrease in employment opportunities with country bakeries. In my opinion, country bakeries produce by far the best bread; but in Queensland and Victoria many country bakeries closed down.

Considerable concern had been expressed by the country bread manufacturers about this situation, and they were strongly opposed to the Bill. They made their comments known to the Minister at the time, who said vehemently that the Bill would go through. I am advised that on some occasions when he spoke to representatives of the Country Bread Manufacturer's Association of WA Incorporated he thumped his hand on the table and shouted that the Bill would go through there and then.

Mr Davies: Who was that Minister?

Mr PARKER: It was the present Minister for Labour and Industry, the Hon. G. E. Masters. The Hon. J. M. Berinson moved amendments to that Bill. They were, if not the same as the proposed amendments we have before us, similar in intent.

As a result of the concerns raised by the industry, I understand common sense prevailed in the party room and the Minister was persuaded not to proceed with that legislation at that stage. The Bill languished at the bottom of the notice paper until just recently. At about 10.00 a.m. on Tuesday last, I received a phone call from the Minister for Health and was told that it was contemplated the Bill would be discussed this week by the Parliament. I had been under the impression from comments made that it would not go through in this session. Certain things had been said, and certainly our spokesman on these matters in the Council, the Hon. Des Dans, believed that the Bill would not go through in this session.

Mr Davies: The Government said it would not proceed with it.

Mr PARKER: That was the assumption. However, apparently questions in regard to the amendments were resolved after a conference held by the Minister with the various components of the industry, which impressed their views upon him.

I will clarify a couple of points. The Minister's view at the time of the original amendments was that he was attempting to legalise the activities of hot bread shops which had been operating illegally by trading on Saturday mornings. A considerable public demand existed for these shops to

operate at that time, and it was conceded that they be allowed to operate at that time. He said it was necessary to have the undesirable features of the legislation in order to enable those hot bread shops to operate at that time. However, their situation could have been legalised without havoc being created to the rest of the industry.

At the conference to which I refer, the Minister apparently was persuaded that it was desirable to have the amendments foreshadowed by others in the debate in the upper House. In this place, amendments were foreshadowed by the member for Moore that would have restricted in a different way the ability of metropolitan bakeries to flood the country market.

In any event, as I have been advised, all sectors of the industry which I have contacted—I was able to contact all of them in the last couple of days—are happy with the proposed amendments and that the Bill should proceed this session. In fact, they want it to be passed this session. That being the case, I will support the Bill, and I will raise a couple of minor matters during the Committee stage. The amendments are absolutely in line with the views put by the Opposition, in particular, by the Hon. J. M. Berinson in the Legislative Council. It is our view that the Bill should proceed and should have our support because the industry has asked us to do so.

MR CRANE (Moore) [1.07 a.m.]: I was responsible for proposing certain amendments to this Bill as a result of representations made to me by several country bakers. Possibly that caused some of the protracted delay in the deliberation on this Bill.

Much of what the member for Fremantle said is correct. Country bakers have been concerned about the possibility of metropolitan bakeries flooding the country market. While we on this side support free enterprise, we must admit that at times certain inherent problems in that system arise. One is that big fish tend to eat little fish.

It was felt that city bakeries with their greater ability to produce bread, and their connections with flour mills to obtain flour at a more competitive price than can country bakeries, could flood the country market if they were allowed to operate unchecked. The price of bread in country areas would have been cheaper for a while, but as in similar situations, that would not have lasted for long. Once the competition had been destroyed, the price would have increased to the detriment of country people, and the closure of country bakeries would have meant less employment in country areas and people leaving country areas. This side adheres to the policy of decentra-

lisation, and, therefore, could not support the proposition that the country market be flooded by metropolitan bakeries.

I had proposed certain amendments, but I will not proceed with those. I hope the Minister's proposed amendments and the provisions in the Bill will do the job we would like to see done. I understand some of the bread companies in the metropolitan area have been gearing up in a big way, and that is why the legislation must be passed tonight.

Some country bakers are still concerned and, as I said, big fish eat little fish. This situation occurs not only with metropolitan producers flooding country markets, but also with producers in regional centres operating in outlying areas.

Mr Bryce: Freedom to the mackerel is death to the minnow.

Mr CRANE: It would not be fair to say that only large metropolitan bakeries attempt to swamp country bakeries; regional centre bakeries attempt to swamp small outlying bakeries. The Country Bread Manufacturer's Association of WA Incorporated, to which I gave notice that I intended to withdraw my proposed amendments, and asked for its opinion as to whether I should, wrote to me on 1 November. The letter gave me a fair indication that country bakers approve of the Minister's proposed amendments. The letter states—

I wish to advise that this Association is in agreement that you withdraw your amendments to the proposed new Bread Bill 1982 on the condition that the hours and new amendments, as discussed by Mr Harman with you, will be written into the Bread Bill.

Yours sincerely,

(R. O. Darby)

Secretary

I hope the proposed amendments achieve what they are intended to achieve. However, we must watch closely during the next year—I am sure the member for Fremantle would agree with me—what happens in the bread manufacturing industry.

Mr Parker: I do agree with you.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr Young (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 7 put and passed.

Clause 8: Hours of baking—

Mr YOUNG: In my name on the notice paper stand the proposed amendments to which the member for Fremantle already has referred. The member for Clontarf was the chairman of the Government parties parliamentary subcommittee handling this matter, and probably he has done more work on this matter than has any other member. Instead of my moving the amendments, it is intended that he move them on behalf of the Government.

Mr WILLIAMS: I move an amendment—

Page 11, lines 5 to 8—Delete the passage "time from one minute past midnight on the Monday morning to 12 noon on the succeeding Saturday" and substitute the following—

"time—

- (i) from one minute past midnight on a Monday morning to 6 p.m. on that day;
- (ii) from 2 a.m. to 6 p.m. on any Tuesday or Wednesday; and
- (iii) from one minute past midnight on a Thursday morning to 12 noon on the succeeding Saturday".

As the member for Fremantle has said, the Bill was introduced mainly to overcome an anomaly in regard to Saturday morning baking, particularly by hot bread shops. That baking has been illegal under the Act. The amendments in the Bill were designed to allow baking in the metropolitan area on a Saturday morning only, and the provision of the Bill to effect that change referred to trading from the Monday morning to noon on a Saturday. Initially the committee concerned with this matter thought that provision would be best. However, a round-table conference was held at a later stage, and the member for Fremantle and I attended it.

It was an amicable round-table conference where all parties agreed to make these amendments to the Act. It was considered that the city bakeries could swamp the country bakeries and that is a matter upon which the committee did not agree.

Mr PARKER: I support the amendment, but wish to make a number of comments which relate to the point made by the member for Moore in his contribution. I endorse completely what he said and in fact I think the industry is convinced that this amendment will solve completely the problems about which he spoke.

I am not 100 per cent convinced, but I hope they are right. As the member for Moore said,

some major bakeries are looking to exploit the situation and to move into the area. I hope this matter receives close scrutiny from members who represent country areas.

I understand some guarantee has been given that there will be a review in six months. I hope my fears are found to be baseless and the confidence in the industry is justified. I would not want to do anything other than respect what appears to be the unanimous view of the industry.

The country bread manufacturers are still given the ability to bake from Monday to 12.00 noon on Saturday, but excluding Sunday. It was suggested to me by some of the country bread manufacturers that they would have preferred there not to be dissimilar restrictions on hours through the week on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in the country areas to bring them into conformity with other bakeries. They suggested they preferred the legislation to go through and that this matter could be considered when the legislation came up for review.

Mr WATT: This clause relates specifically to hours of baking which have a fairly distinct effect on hours of delivery, especially in the country. I want to place on record my concern which is similar to that expressed by the member for Moore and the member for Fremantle.

After consultation with two bakeries in my electorate, I was far from happy with the Bill in its original form. The reason for that was the experience in Victoria and Queensland where some of the larger bakeries have been able to install large and modern baking equipment including ovens which can bake for 24 hours a day. These bakeries were taking on consignments of bread right through country areas and delivering to supermarkets in the regional centres, as well as the larger towns, and this was to the detriment of small bakeries in the country areas. In many cases those larger bakeries were part of a large food chain and they bought up the country bakeries and then in a short time closed them.

Those of us who live in country areas are keen to ensure that the employment numbers are not reduced because of these sorts of activities.

Tip Top Bakers, which is part of the George Western food group, which includes Thomas Flour Mills, is a very large organisation, and Mothers Pride, which operates in the metropolitan area, is part of Allied Industries, which also includes Great Southern Flour Mills, which has Dingo Flour brand and is another large organisation—

Mr Parker: I understand Mothers Pride is geared up in the way the member for Moore has suggested.

Mr WATT: We understand there are interests in Western Australia which have the potential for the same sort of activities as those I have mentioned.

I am happy about the new hours to be included in the amendment which the member for Clontarf will move. I want to place on record that having held discussions with bakers in my electorate, who expressed some concern about the matter, the member for Moore and I were working together to draft an amendment, but we were persuaded to withhold it.

I will be looking to the Government to make sure that this practice of dumping large consignments of baked bread will not occur, because it will be detrimental to the country areas.

Mr Davies: How were you thinking of attacking it? What was the nature of the amendment?

Mr WATT: The nature of the amendment proposed was to place an 80-kilometre radius restriction on the delivery of bread. I discussed the amendment with Mr May of the Department of Labour and Industry and even though there was a ministerial discretion which could provide for certain situations where the 80-kilometre restriction was not appropriate—one of the bakeries in Albany takes bread to Walpole which is a distance greater than 80 kilometres—I was told that the amendment would have been administratively difficult to enforce. I support the amendment proposed.

Mr DAVIES: I was of the opinion that the Government was not intending to proceed with this Bill, and I had not noticed the amendments on the notice paper. However, because some opinion has been expressed by the owners of bakeries in my electorate I want it clarified that the nature of the amendment is that all bakeries within the radius of 45 kilometres of the GPO will be able to bake bread up to 12 noon on Saturday.

Mr Parker: The hot bread shops are not able to deliver bread after 8.00 p.m. on Friday.

Mr DAVIES: The bakeries will be forced into a position where they will have to bake up to 12 noon on Saturday, but cannot deliver or sell after 8.00 p.m. on Fridays.

Mr Williams: If you are asking me whether they can bake up until midday Saturday the answer is, "Yes" they can although they cannot deliver after 8.00 p.m. on Friday night.

They have the alternative of knocking a wall out of the bakery and making it into a shop on

site and they can sell from the shop as long as they sell a loaf at a time, not in bulk.

Mr DAVIES: I cannot see that in the Bill.

Mr Williams: They cannot deliver after 8.00 p.m. on Friday but, as I have mentioned earlier, they can bake and sell up until midday Saturday on their premises.

Mr O'Connor: The unions do not want them to deliver it.

Mr DAVIES: They can sell it from their own bakehouse. They can open their bakery as a shop and sell like a hot bread shop then.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 9: Hours of sale or delivery—

Mr WILLIAMS: I move an amendment—

Page 11, lines 31 and 32—Delete the passage “12 noon on the succeeding Saturday” and substitute the passage “8 p.m. on the succeeding Friday”.

Mr DAVIES: I have been assured that bakeries can bake up to 12 noon on a Saturday and sell from their premises. This clause clearly says that a person who sells outside after 8.00 p.m. on a Friday commits an offence.

Mr Young: Paragraph (b) deals with bread sold in a shop.

Mr DAVIES: As far as I know a bakehouse is not a shop.

Mr Young: It is registered under the Factories and Shops Act.

Mr DAVIES: The intent of the clause is still as was explained earlier. A person can bake to 12 noon on a Saturday and sell from his premises where it is baked. It has been indicated to me that this particular clause allows a person to bake and sell from his premises. As far as the committee understands a bakehouse is a shop. I would not go back and blame the committee.

Mr Young: We will look at what you have said.

Mr DAVIES: Thank you.

Mr PARKER: The Bill was intended to take care of the hot bread shop situation and is not to take care of objections raised by the industry. It certainly meets with the approval of the Opposition and the metropolitan bakehouses in this instance. It could have an impact in the country if they want to deliver bread after 8.00 p.m. on Fridays. The time limit at the present time is 6.00 p.m. and this amendment will not make any difference and it will not allow for the extension from a five to a six-day week for bakehouses.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 19 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Young (Minister for Health), and returned to the Council with amendments.

HUMAN TISSUE AND TRANSPLANT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION: PERFORMANCE AUDITS

Motion

MR I. F. TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie) [1.34 a.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the State Government should introduce a system of regular performance audits for all Government administration and programmes, including the provision of services, in order to:

- (a) regularly assess Government performance with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of administration, programmes and services;
- (b) ensure that programmes and services are relevant and responsive to the changing needs of the community, commerce and industry; and
- (c) determine whether programmes and/or services are necessary or whether the functions of Government require redefinition.

In the 90 years of Government in this place there has been no real and proper assessment of the performance and operations of Government as such, and any consideration of performance and operations that has taken place has occurred only after problems have arisen. One of the major factors we have to come to grips with in Government today is that we have to act instead of reacting to situations that arise. If the Government were capable of acting there would be no problems of this kind facing it. We need positive and ongoing

action over a long period of time in the WA State Public Service. Proper management would ensure the resources and personnel available would be put to their best possible use.

The Opposition is suggesting the Government should adopt a system of performance auditing which involves a systematic review of all Government agencies and it probably would take place over five-yearly intervals or perhaps less if it should be considered necessary.

The Opposition believes that the results of performance auditing on a regular basis would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the State Government. It would improve the quality and level of performance of Government departments. In addition, we would ensure that the State Government initiatives in respect of the co-ordination of services would be much better handled than they are under the present circumstances.

Mr Rushton: You do not know what we do.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I am aware of what the Minister for Transport does. I will assure him that when I get on to what he is doing, it will not take long at all.

Mr Rushton: You do not know what I am doing in transport.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: That is the problem. The Minister for Transport does not understand the situation with respect to performance auditing because it does not take place from within, but from outside.

We are suggesting that Government departments and similar agencies will be audited on a regular basis and will be undertaken by a board or tribunal headed by an independent chairman and also made up of representatives from the Treasury, the Public Service Board, the Auditor General's Department, and probably in most circumstances a representative from the Civil Service Association or appropriate union.

Business undertakings such as the SEC and the Metropolitan Water Authority would be audited by independent consultants rather than from within. As I understand it at present, authorities such as the SEC and the Metropolitan Water Authority do have a system of performance auditing which is done from within and is probably far less effective than an independent body undertaking auditing.

The current situation in this State is that we do have various committees which consider ongoing operations. We have the Cabinet Expenditure Review Committee, the standing committee of the Legislative Council on government agencies, the

Public Accounts Committee, the Auditor General, and the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations.

The razor gang, as it was known to the Press, did not necessarily go into the efficiency and effectiveness of the many organisations it was supposed to investigate.

Mr O'Connor: It would be impossible.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is suggested that we must look into all organisations.

Just because the Government is cutting expenditure it does not necessarily mean it is improving efficiency and effectiveness in the organisations involved.

The razor gang was an expenditure control body rather than a performance audit-type body.

The Standing Committee on Government Agencies in the Legislative Council has the task of investigating and evaluating some 200 to 300 Government agencies and the total expenditure of those agencies and bodies is in the vicinity of \$800 million to \$1 000 million on an annual basis. The charter of that committee is totally inadequate and certainly does not come to grips with the problem before the Government in this State and, in fact, the Governments throughout the world. The committee has no given systematic review on the basis before it. I understand the committee will wind up now that Parliament is drawing to a conclusion. However, the secretary of the committee will continue in his role and the actual people appointed to that committee will no longer have any standing as such. Therefore, the effectiveness of the committee is totally downgraded. The committee excludes some 47 major Government departments which accounts for some 70 per cent of the total CRF expenditure by the Government in this State. Those organisations also employ half of the Government employees under the Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget. That committee is limited in its operations and does not go anywhere near being a committee that can undertake a performance auditing role.

The next committee to which I refer is the Public Accounts Committee and being a member of it I am familiar with its operations. Its major role is to ensure this House knows whether the people of this State are receiving value for money. The committee also tends to react to problems rather than act. A typical example of this was when the committee met with representatives from the SEC. It might be said that the Government members who are on that committee were satisfied with the answers given by the representatives. However, as deputy chairman of the committee, I felt that the SEC had not answered correctly all

the questions put forward. It is appropriate to say that since then the SEC has come to the committee and has said it is unable to answer the questions put forward. That is totally unsatisfactory. The questions could not be answered because they were outside the scope of its operations according to the SEC. I would suggest they were far from being outside the scope of it. Briefly, some of those questions put forward concerned matters such as the pricing of electricity as far as the SEC was concerned; the role of the consultants; the peak and low capacity of the SEC; the demand for energy; matters concerning the contract with Alcoa in relation to the North-West Shelf, and others.

In fact 22 questions were asked and the SEC chose to answer none of them.

Point of Order

Mr PEARCE: Could I ask that the member table the document from which he is quoting?

The SPEAKER: I will ask the member to table the document at the conclusion of his speech.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: In his answer to the Public Accounts Committee, the SEC suggested that the general thrust of the committee did not relate—despite the general terms of reference to the committee—to the letter which the member for Yilgarn-Dundas put before the committee. It is appropriate to say that the member suggested we should examine the efficiency and effectiveness of the total SEC operations. I suggest that the inquiry of the Public Accounts Committee as it relates to the auditing of Government departments was shown to be totally inadequate in these circumstances.

The SEC adopted effective delaying tactics which stopped us obtaining the information as to whether or not the SEC was operating as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Another aspect of performance auditing which is taking place in the Government today is in the Auditor General's Department. The Auditor General's concern is mainly in regard to the actual finances of the Government and whether money is being spent as it should be spent, from the point of view of balancing budgets.

The Auditor General, in his annual report, said that he sees the audit responsibility of his department to cover 480 departments and instrumentalities and also 560 outstations. He said also that at 30 June 1982 the shortfall on the approved establishment remained at 20. It seems that the Auditor General has insufficient staff to

undertake this auditing role because his staff is approximately 20 persons under strength.

In referring to audit methodology, he said that it is not practical for auditors to undertake transaction-based audits of all departments and authorities, and therefore system-based audit procedures were introduced. This methodology has no relationship to the performance audit the Opposition is calling on the Government to adopt in the motion before us.

In commenting on the Audit Act, the Auditor General said—

An interdepartmental committee comprising representatives of the Treasury, Public Service Board and the Audit Department has been established to undertake a major review of the Audit Act and Treasury Regulations.

The Audit Act was enacted in 1904 and has remained substantially unaltered since that time. The existing legislation does not adequately provide for modern accounting and auditing practices.

The Auditor General admits that he is working under an Act which has been unaltered substantially since 1904.

Mr Davies: Is not a former Auditor General undertaking a review of that Act?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Yes, the report refers to the fact that Mr Tonks is presently undertaking a review.

The fifth aspect of performance auditing that takes place in Government today in a limited way is that undertaken by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations. The commission was established by a Tonkin Government initiative in 1972. The trouble is of course that the Ombudsman enters into a problem after it has occurred, when some redress is sought. That is totally inadequate.

The Ombudsman is forced to react to problems, rather than to ensure that the problems do not arise.

We therefore have the Cabinet Expenditure Review Committee, the Legislative Council Standing Committee on Government Agencies, the Public Accounts Committee, the Auditor General, and the Ombudsman. None of those five bodies is engaged in performance auditing functions at this time. They are not engaged in independent performance auditing which I believe is even more important than the performance auditing that is undertaken on a limited basis by some of the major Government authorities themselves. That performance auditing is an internal

function, and therefore, the motion before us is not relative to it.

Over recent years, most of the major States have conducted reviews of their respective Public Services. Victoria had the Bland board of inquiry in 1973-75. South Australia had the Corbett inquiry over the same years. Two committees have been set up in NSW—in 1974 a ministerial inquiry into the Public Service, and in 1977 the Wilenski review of Government expenditure. In the Federal sphere there has been a Royal Commission into Australian Government Administration chaired by Dr H. C. Coombes.

All these reports suggested a need for the performance auditing function to be undertaken in government today. It is high time that the State Government, while looking at programme budgeting, should look also at the setting up of a performance auditing function.

In conclusion, at this time the financial outlook of the State is most uncertain. Therefore, it is most important, as we have scarce resources, to be able to assure the people of the State that those resources are used to the best possible advantage. A Labor Government would have four principal objectives—accountability, responsiveness, efficiency, and effectiveness. We will set out to ensure we meet those objectives and also to see that the Public Service as a whole—and not just the Public Service as considered in the Budget—is a much more effective and vigorous operation when we take office in 1983.

MR BRIAN BURKE: I formally second the motion.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Treasurer) [1.51 a.m.]: I would be one of the first to agree that performance audits should be used wherever possible. The motion implies that this does not occur now in the Treasury or in the various departments.

Point of Order

Mr PEARCE: I apologise for interrupting the Treasurer, Mr Speaker, but I was not in my seat when the member for Kalgoorlie resumed his seat. Can I now ask for the tabling of the documents?

The SPEAKER: Yes, they will lie on the Table of the House for the balance of this day's sitting for the information of members.

The papers were tabled for the information of members.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr O'CONNOR: We must ensure proper operation, efficiency, and service, to the public. Per-

formance audits are no good unless other procedures are followed. We must ensure that our money is spent wisely.

I have no disagreement with the idea of performance audits. This can be carried out in many ways. It can be carried out through the departments, the Public Service Board, the Cabinet Expenditure Review Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, and the Ministers themselves.

Government policies have a great effect on the way money is expended. For instance, it is no good having the most efficient operation if the goods which are produced by that operation are not marketable. Members generally will agree that today it is fashionable to use new phrases such as "zero budgeting", "performance auditing", "management by objectives", and "planning programmes". These mean different things to different people.

Computers have enabled us to provide services more efficiently. The Lands and Surveys Department has been able to speed up the processing of titles by this means. A great deal of money has been saved in this way.

An unfortunate effect is that staff numbers are reduced. Good management is not simple, and modern management techniques have been introduced already in many areas of Government.

The Treasury officers are very efficient and they have done a great deal of work in this area. The public sector has two levels of effectiveness—firstly, results, and secondly policy performance. If the Government makes promises, the department must fit in with those promises. The Ministers' directives must apply, and this can effect the efficiency of a department.

Every three years the electors decide whether a Government has acted properly in this way. The Opposition also acts as a performance audit as it watches what the Government does. If the Government tries to show that it is setting out to improve the situation, the effectiveness of these measures can be observed. As the member for Kalgoorlie knows, it is most difficult to achieve effective operations in a department, yet alone in the total operations of the Government.

Very often it is the members of Parliament who decide what should happen in departments, and the departments then implement the decision. The Government has a profit and loss account as many businesses do. I believe what the Treasury does and what we are doing generally in this State is sufficient. Gross wastages are identified easily, but small wastages are not so easily identified. Collecting data by computers is vital, and this is making the operations of Government much more

effective. I believe what we are doing is sufficient, bearing in mind that we are trying to improve our performance all the time. Under the circumstances, the motion is not warranted and we oppose it.

Question put and negatived.

Motion defeated.

MEAT: BEEF

Kimberley: Motion

MR BRIDGE (Kimberley) [1.58 a.m.]: I move—

That this House calls upon the Government to explain reasons why those recommendations concerning the Kimberley Beef Industry which are contained in:

- (a) the Report of the Honorary Royal Commission into the Beef and Sheep Meats Industry (October, 1976);
- (b) the Present and Future Pastoral Industry of Western Australia report (April, 1979); and
- (c) the Study, the Problems and Future of the Kimberley Pastoral Industry (November, 1981)

upon which no action has been taken, have not been implemented.

Further, the House calls upon the Government to take all immediate actions within its powers to—

- (i) assist the viability of the Kimberley Beef Industry;
- (ii) rectify the adverse effects of absentee ownership of Kimberley cattle stations;
- (iii) assist with introduction of improved cattle husbandry and land management methods;
- (iv) alleviate existing transport problems where possible;
- (v) assist the industry in taking initiatives to develop and serve beef markets, other than those being supplied currently.

At the outset I would like to thank the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for arranging the business in such a way that I could speak to this motion tonight. There appeared to be considerable doubt about it until the last hour.

Several reports have been presented to the Government indicating a rather worrying situation in the pastoral industry in the Kimberley. For that reason it is important to canvass some of

these matters tonight, and I am sure the Minister will be happy to reply to the points I make.

Firstly, the Jennings report was made available to the Government some three years ago, and more recently, a report compiled by the Kimberley Regional Development Committee was along similar lines to the Jennings report. From the statistics which I have been able to obtain—although they may not be 100 per cent accurate—it appears that about 40 per cent, or nearly half, of the total cattle numbers are in the Kimberley. At the present time it is estimated that the industry is worth about \$25 million, so it is a very important industry.

When I put my motion on the notice paper quite some time ago I was more concerned about these matters than I am at present. I do acknowledge that a number of measures have been introduced into the Parliament by the Government over recent months which have been designed to restructure the industry. The Opposition has supported those moves and both the member for Warren and I indicated in our contributions that we did support the measures as we believed they were designed to improve and to restructure the industry in a number of ways. So at the moment some areas no longer are of great concern to me. Still, the pastoral industry in the Kimberley faces severe problems, and I shall mention some now.

One of the key problems in the area is the way the properties are being used. We now see a large number of properties controlled by absentee owners. Many of us in the industry question the value of this because we have seen a trend develop in the Kimberley where properties which were run effectively and profitably back in the late 1950s and early 1960s suddenly have been allowed to deteriorate to the point where, in many instances, no operations are being carried out.

A trend has developed of buyers taking up land only for economic and financial considerations without any regard for the preservation of the land and the application of traditional pastoral techniques. This has been a major factor in the decline of the pastoral industry in the Kimberley.

In the years when properties such as Mornington and Glenroy were operated by Gordon and Doug Blythe, the two properties would turnoff in the order of 1 500 to 2 000 head of "meatworkers" each year. They were good bullocks, not steers; they were genuine meatwork bullocks. Today those two properties are not even operating; they do not even have a caretaker. This is something to which the Government must pay due regard.

Properties which previously were very well run, with good turnoffs of perhaps 2 000 head of bullocks, are today not turning off any cattle; they are inoperative and without caretakers in some cases. This applies to a number of properties in the Kimberley. To a lesser extent we could include properties such as Silent Grove, Liveringa, Kimberley Downs, and Napier. These last mentioned were good properties in the days when the late Paddy Le Lievere worked in the area.

The pastoralists in those days mustered perhaps 5 000 to 10 000 calves a year. The properties nowadays are such that we would be hard put to find even that number of cattle, let alone to see them being branded. We are concerned that such properties have been allowed to deteriorate in this way and not have anywhere near the same turnoff.

On the other hand, properties owned by Emmanuel Bros. are being run very well and are maintaining a good ratio of turnoff. They are branding the normal number of cattle; their herd numbers are remaining static. I could mention a number of properties maintaining the normal ratio of stock numbers. However, when we look at the situation of the other properties to which I have referred and to many others I have not mentioned, we have reason to be concerned at what is happening in the area.

It gets back to the attitude of the present owners; this is a major contributing factor to the deteriorating situation on many stations. Many stations are owned by people who do not reside on the properties. We find stock handling techniques have changed considerably. In many cases the properties are owned by accountants sitting in offices in Sydney, Melbourne, and even overseas, who are dictating the requirements of these properties to managers on the spot. A financial and economic consideration is involved. Many of the properties have been bought at inflated prices with deflated stock numbers. They turn off large numbers of stock as quickly as possible and then sell the property as soon as they can. This trend has been developing over the last few years, and it is a serious problem, but it is one the Government has the capacity to do something about.

The Government is entitled to dictate the conditions applying to these properties. It should require incoming owners to act responsibly, to maintain their stock numbers, and to run the property as it ought to be run so that it meets its capacity. This situation has led to a great number of properties in the Kimberley being less than a quarter productive in terms of turnoff and stock numbers. If this situation is allowed to continue

the industry will face even bigger problems in the future.

While we may be getting reasonable stock numbers in the big operations, if we were to look at the kill statistics we would find that the type of cattle going to the meatworks is not what it used to be, and this is of concern to the meatworks in the north. No longer do we have the situation in the north where people would sell to the meatworks only the genuine animal, the "meatworker". Anything beyond four years was meatworks beef. However, nowadays the cattle are being turned off much earlier—what we term "calf meat". These are fairly young steers or heifers. The result is that lighter breeding stock and bullocks are being turned off before they have had a chance to mature and before they are of sufficient weight and size for what is considered to be the normal meatworks animal. This has had a devastating effect on the type of beef going to the meatworks today.

I believe the Government should provide assistance to the industry by establishing new markets. The Kimberley is locked into the American and Japanese markets because of the manufacturing type of meat they require, which we consider is the only type of meat available from the Kimberley herds, although I have always argued that a good quality Kimberley bullock will provide meat as good as any other bullock from anywhere.

Mr Old: That is one of the big problems.

Mr BRIDGE: The meatworks themselves are having great difficulty, as is the industry itself, in opening up new markets. As I said, this is where the Government could assist.

Mr Old: Marketing and management are the two big problems.

Mr BRIDGE: Yes. The Government can help on the management side by determining how the properties should be operated. The people should be made aware of the standards required. In many cases the properties are being run fairly indiscriminately now and this is having a bad effect on the industry generally. The other problem is that the beef market is diminishing. This problem is constantly being considered by the industry but it has been unable to find a solution.

One recommendation from the Jennings committee has been acted upon by the Government: it has allowed property sizes to be increased. I have mentioned this situation before and have indicated that I do not believe it is the answer to our problems. This situation is taken advantage of by absentee owners acquiring large properties, although in some cases the owners do reside on

the properties. But because of the size of some of the larger properties a lack of proper control results, and mustering techniques generally leave a lot to be desired. The larger properties have meant modern mustering techniques are employed. Helicopters and aeroplanes are being used to muster cattle rather than men on horseback, and this has created a number of major problems.

People must understand that cattle have only one speed at mustering time—very slow. The situation in the Kimberley has been that some people are trying to reverse the situation. By using aeroplanes and helicopters for mustering purposes, the cattle sold for market have been adversely affected.

Mr Laurance: The helicopter ringers.

Mr BRIDGE: They are very useful in areas inaccessible to normal horsemen. Of course, people have come to know about them when they were part of audiences listening to certain ballads!

My comments have been brief, but I have covered most of the concerns to people in the Kimberley. They are areas where the Government could assist. I have brought this matter before the Parliament because I am concerned and I trust the House will support my motion.

Mr JAMIESON: I second the motion.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne—Minister for Lands)[2.15 a.m.]: The member for Kimberley brought an important matter before the House when he raised this motion. It is important to the Kimberley electorate and to the State generally. The Government will not be supporting his motion, not because of the content of the motion and not because it is not important—

Mr Jamieson: Just because of the lateness of the hour.

Mr LAURANCE: —but purely because of the terms in which it is stated. It has been said that a number of these reports have not been acted upon, and that is not the case. I want to make it clear that this Government is committed to supporting the pastoral industry in this State and to maintaining a viable pastoral industry. Following the severe drought in the late 1970s the Jennings report, which the member referred to, was commissioned by this Government and it led to a number of legislative changes in 1981 and some were made this year. Those changes include the appointment of an executive officer to the pastoral board, the provision of new premises for that board to operate from, and the appointment of a Kimberley member to the pastoral board, to protect that part of the industry and to try to prevent difficulties. The member referred to the notice of the Government through the pastoral

board that we need to have a new attitude or philosophy in regard to pastoral lands in this State. Such an attitude would be of great benefit to the industry in the future. Legislation to extend compensation provisions available to pastoralists passed through this House quite recently and those measures will have a significant impact on the industry generally.

In relation to the Kimberley pastoral industry, the subject of this motion, there have been several reports such as that of the Honorary Royal Commission of this House, the Jennings report, and the report of the Kimberley regional development committee. The problems which are very wide-ranging and complex are understood and have been well researched. I mention in passing that the latest report of the regional development committee is excellent and it is a great credit to the committee which commissioned it and the people involved in its compilation.

The Government is aware of the wide-ranging problems within the industry in regard to rangeland management, livestock management and protection, marketing, and so on. Many changes in the industry have caused difficulties, and many Government agencies are involved. A tremendous amount of research is being conducted by the Department of Agriculture. Rangeland management is something in which the department is heavily involved and it is trying to find a solution together with those put forward in the various reports. The problems have been identified and the Government is heavily involved in finding solutions to them. I point out to the member and to the House that I have been in consultation with my ministerial colleagues, the Minister for Agriculture and the Minister for the North-West. We are co-ordinating Government agencies and private industry in that area to try to ensure that we work continually through the various solutions which have come out of these reports. A number of eventualities have flowed from these reports and if the member thinks about it, he will understand the Government cannot accept his motion because he says there are reports upon which action has not been taken and recommendations which have not been implemented. That is not the case. We acknowledge there is a long way to go and there is plenty to do, but it is being done. There will be continuing action to ensure that the Kimberley industry remains viable in the future.

It is an important industry for the State. I explained to the member who moved the motion that we are not saying it is not an important matter which he brought before the House, but the

Government is acting on these things and the member will see continuing action in the future.

I reject the motion.

Question put and negatived.

Motion defeated.

ELECTORAL: LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Election of Members: Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed from 16 November.

MR PARKER (Fremantle) [2.17 a.m.]: When we adjourned this debate some days ago, I was replying to the argument put forward by the Minister for Police and Prisons that somehow, because the Senate system existed with an undemocratic basis of election—that is, States with completely unequal populations electing equal numbers of senators—that did not mean the same thing should apply here in Western Australia. Indeed, if the Minister really wanted to take his argument to its logical conclusion, he ought to be saying that the proposition moved by the member for Stirling should be supported, and as I understand it, that was not his position; he was saying the proposition moved by the member for Stirling ought to be opposed. In so far as our amendment to the proposition put by the member for Stirling is concerned, the Minister's argument is not relevant because the State of Western Australia is not a Federal State in itself, it is a unilateral State, a sovereign State not made up of different regions and therefore one entity. To say different parts should be elected in the same way as different parts of a federation should be elected is a completely illogical argument.

The reasons put forward on behalf of the concept of having an election on a proportional representation basis have been argued many times before and I do not want to go through them all again. Suffice it to say, that the arguments in favour of proportional representation include the fact that it reflects accurately the political viewpoints of the electorate, it can be relied upon, and it is a truly democratic system in that minority representation can take place. Every vote counts in proportional representation. There are no wasted votes such as the Labor votes in Nedlands are wasted, or the Liberal votes in Fremantle are wasted. Every vote counts. It is calculated mathematically. Every politically active group of any size can rely on being able to achieve some support and, having sufficient support, of being able to achieve some representation. It provides greater freedom of choice for a voter and thereby raises the issue now before the House, it eliminates the evils of the gerrymander, which is all too prevalent in

Australia, or has been all too prevalent in Australia, and is now evident in its worst form or manifestation in the Legislative Council in Western Australia where there is a difference in voting of as much as 14: 1 in favour of certain regions as opposed to others.

In electing a member to the Legislative Council a voter in Lower North Province has 14 times the votes than has a voter in the North Metropolitan Province or any similar metropolitan province of the Legislative Council. That would be eliminated by the introduction of proportional representation. The ability of country people to be represented would not be eliminated because by not being confined to one particular electorate, but being right throughout the area, those country people would be able to support the National Country Party or the National Party if they wanted to do so; if they wanted to support the Labor or Liberal party, of course, they could do that.

The only argument is that the two major parties might start to ignore the country members or the country population if they were allowed to have a simple slate system of voting and the answer to that is that if the two major parties do ignore country people in putting up their slate or candidates it would not be very long before there would be country candidates standing and achieving a greater deal of support than they otherwise would get.

On that basis, I can see no reason that the amendment which is proposed should not be carried. If it is intended to have a referendum to determine the wishes of the people of the State in regard to electoral reform—and I think that is a very good idea—it is not sufficient that that referendum should contain only the two options which have been put forward by the member for Stirling; that is, the option of the system remaining as it is or the option of the system which has been proposed by the member for Stirling. We are prepared to second the motion, and we will vote for it, even in the situation of our amendment not being carried. Although it still provides for weighted votes—and weighted votes are not something which we can accept—it is better than the system of voting than that which currently prevails and it is a system which could result at least in changes in the power structure in the Legislative Council over a period of time.

As we all know, over the 92 years that this State has had responsible government, despite the fact that during that period of time—some 30 or 40 years—there have been Labor Governments in Western Australia with the majority of members in this House, never once has the ALP had a majority in the Legislative Council. Further, because

of the way in which the Legislative Council is currently structured, that will forever be the case.

If we had a system of proportional representation, by contrast, the will of the people would be reflected directly in the election of members to the Chamber. Although the member for Stirling's proposition is not what we desire, it is an option which he proposes to put before the electorate, and the result of his proposal, although it would still preserve unequal voting, would be that it would be possible for the balance of power in the Legislative Council to change. For example, were the Labor Party to become particularly popular over a period of time, it would be possible for the Labor Party to have control of the Legislative Council for the first time in the history of this State. That is certainly something which is possible under the motion moved by the member for Stirling even though it preserves unequal voting.

For that reason, we will be voting for the motion and the amendment which the member for Morley has moved, because we recognise that the proposition put forward by the member for Stirling is at least some minor advance of the system. If the Government proposes to defeat our amendment and the member for Stirling's motion, one is entitled to ask why it intends to do so because all we are seeking is a referendum of the people of Western Australia, and if what the Government is saying is that there should not be such a referendum, it is saying it wants to preserve the current undemocratic system and that it is frightened to put that system to the test of popular opinion in this State. Of course, the Government has every reason to be afraid of that because it has become quite clear that the system which prevails by means of gerrymanders in this House and more particularly in the Legislative Council, is something that is beyond belief in Western Australia and does not even have the support of the conservative media in this State; indeed, it has the total opposition of the conservative media in this State. *The West Australian* newspaper, for example, not an organ noted for its radical views, made the point that the Labor Party was entitled to take any measure short of violence to effect a change in the electoral system of this State.

It is our view that the best way of achieving that is to have a referendum to test the views of the people. If the Government is saying there should not be a referendum, effectively what it is saying is that it does not want to know the views of the people of Western Australia in this regard.

I commend the amendment to the House.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [2.29 p.m.]: In the absence of my colleague, the member for Stirling, I want to make it known to the House that we are opposed to the amendment moved by the member for Morley because it is not in accordance with National Party policy. However, that does not prevent this House from making a decision on what is placed in a referendum that will go before the people; that is for the House to determine. While we are opposed to it, it is still the right of the House to make a decision. As the member for Fremantle said, the matter is one of testing the water. We understand as well as anybody else that we cannot run the State by a referendum, but there are some issues which we think must be given some test by many people, and that is why we called for a referendum. We think in this case it is justified. While we oppose the amendment which has been moved, we support quite strongly the original motion.

Amendment put and negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Question put and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Point of Order

Mr BRIAN BURKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: I will leave it.

Mr SHALDERS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, would you please explain to the House so that we are not confused whether the motion just debated has been agreed to?

Mr Brian Burke: Standing Orders do not provide that once a decision has been committed in this House it can be changed and it does not provide for members to rise and ask the Speaker what has been done.

Mr Clarko: Does it not?

Mr Brian Burke: It is not very important, anyway.

Mr Clarko: I have asked you to have things clarified on occasions.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it has been agreed to.

CLOSE OF SESSION

Complimentary Remarks

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [2.31 a.m.]: We come to the close of another session of Parliament and this time we have an election in front of us. The members for Roe and Pilbara have made the decision to retire from Parliament and I would like to record my appreciation for the co-operation I have received from them during the year.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the *Hansard* staff, to the staff of the House, the Controller of the House, the policemen and the Press. With regard to the Press, sometimes we do and sometimes we do not get the result that we want from them. However, they are an essential part of the House and I thank them for their co-operation.

I thank the Deputy Premier for the support I have had from him and also the Ministers and members on this side of the House for their support.

I believe this session has been easier on members than has any other session and this has been due to the co-operation I have had from members of the Opposition, especially the member for Morley. I have received his fullest co-operation in organising the House in such a way that members could get away a little earlier than normal.

I say "Thank you" to you, Mr Speaker, for what you have done during the year. Yours is an onerous job in many ways and you have difficult decisions to make as you have had tonight. We appreciate what you have done.

I thank also my colleague, the Leader of the National Country Party, for the support I have received from him. I take this opportunity to wish those I have mentioned and all the members in this House a Merry Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [2.34 a.m.]: In the dying days of the Parliament some strange things happen and this Government is now committed to holding a referendum. I think we should take notice of the opinion of the House.

Mr Cowan: I think you should.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I was only making the point that strange things happen as a session comes to an end.

I firstly would like to thank the members who sit with me on this side of the House because they have been supportive of me in particular in the past year. I am very proud to have been chosen to lead them in this Parliament.

I would particularly like to thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his support and assistance in the difficult periods during the session. I also mention the member for Morley who has been appointed and acted as manager of the Opposition's business in this place through very trying times and he has done an excellent job on our behalf to get order in the way debates proceed in the Legislative Assembly.

I would like also to thank you, Mr Speaker, for your chairmanship of proceedings and to thank the Clerks in particular for their unstinting devotion to changing precedents and for their assistance during this session.

I thank also the *Hansard* staff and the policemen who sit in the Press Gallery. I thank also the members of the Press for their reporting of the proceedings. I must say that these days deadlines seem to be brought forward with disappointing regularity and sometimes the proceedings of Parliament are recorded a day or two after they actually occur and then sometimes in lesser detail than I would think appropriate, but I am the Leader of the Opposition so I suppose I have a jaundiced view. To members on the Government side of the House I wish good health. I do hope they understand that we are committed to their defeat, but I trust that they remain in good health and enjoy the festive season.

The next few months, as the Premier indicated, will be the months leading up to an election and we look forward to that with some relish and hope that when we do resume—although I would not have contested the seat of Scarborough against the Minister for Health—we will be joined on our side of the House, which we hope will be that side of the House, by many more Labor members of Parliament.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [2.39 a.m.]: At this time of the night I am sure I could refer members to the *Hansard* of last year because everything I say at this late stage could read the same.

Firstly I would like to say to the members for Roe and Pilbara that they are some of the privileged few in this place who have chosen when they will retire from Parliament. I wish them success in whatever ventures they are going to tackle in their new role. They will enjoy a degree of privacy that they have not experienced while in this place. We all came into this House in 1974 and I wish them well in whatever it is they choose to do.

May I join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing my thanks and the thanks of my colleague to the staff of this Parliament and also to the *Hansard* staff for the valuable work they do. I thank them also for the effort they make in being obliging whenever a request is made of them. We appreciate the service they give to us very much indeed.

There is always some mention made of the Press. I think being able to report the affairs of this Parliament is perhaps one of the many areas where the Press is able to demonstrate quite clearly their freedom. They can record anything they like and the only fear they have is the

ferocity of the editor's pencil. Quite often one does not recognise what appears in the newsprint on the same news item that one hears over the electronic media as a report of events that occurred here. Nevertheless, they do their best and put in long hours.

May I convey to you, Mr Speaker, and to all members of this House my best wishes for the coming festive season.

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I would like to thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the National Party, and all members of the House for the expressions they have made towards me.

I have enjoyed my term as Speaker, particularly during these last three years. I felt a lot more confident in the last three years than probably I did in the previous three years.

I want to sincerely thank members on both sides of the House for the friendship they have shown to me and the understanding they have exhibited.

I am sure members appreciate that this is a difficult office to fill. You cannot please everyone all the time and I have endeavoured to do what I have thought was fair and reasonable in the circumstances. I have no doubt there will be people who harbour doubts about some of the decisions I have made, but I have endeavoured to make them with the thought in mind of being fair to all in the House. If, in the minds of some members, I have failed, please accept my apologies. However, I assure you that my endeavour has been to do this job in the way I think it should be done.

I want to sincerely thank all members of the Legislative Assembly staff for the wonderful support they have given me, in particular Bruce Okely, our Clerk, and Lionel Farrell, his Clerk Assistant. Each year there is held a Presiding Officers Conference which is attended by the Clerk of each of the Houses. I am happy to report to you that our Clerk is held in the highest esteem among his colleagues of Australia and in those other Parliaments within the Australasian region.

The records we have in this Parliament are probably more comprehensive than those of any Parliament in this nation and region and it is due to the work of those who sit at this table and other officers of the House that this has been achieved; and I pay the highest tribute to them.

On your behalf I thank Miss Pick for the work she does. She does what is an impossible task, particularly as members become inquisitive, and they seem to get more inquisitive at the closing time of questions when she is working at the typewriter trying to get the questions out; I appeal

to members on her behalf to get their questions in earlier so she has the opportunity to do them in reasonable time.

I want to thank the *Hansard* staff for the job they have done during this session. They have probably never experienced such pressure as they have in fairly recent times. I think that has been brought about by a couple of factors. In the first place, members coming to this Parliament now are younger; I think they are more articulate; they certainly speak faster—the member for Fremantle and the member for Gosnells and one or two others, for example—and it must make the job of *Hansard* that much more difficult. I am happy to report to you that the President of the Legislative Council and I have written to the Minister for Works asking for an investigation to be implemented immediately with respect to the installation of some electronic equipment that will do a couple of things.

Firstly, it will increase the level of sound of those people who have a legitimate right to be speaking—not the interjectors—so that people in the Chamber can hear the debate more clearly. I have been conscious during this session of the difficulty faced by people in the back benches in hearing speeches, and correspondingly, the difficulty those of us who sit at the front of the Chamber have in hearing members speaking on the back benches. This is one of the things I hope will be rectified before the incoming Parliament meets. Another facility we have asked to be installed is a tape back-up. Members on both sides of the House have complained to me over a long period of time about inaccuracies that creep into *Hansard*.

I am convinced that if we have a tape back-up facility it will enable arguments to be settled fairly promptly, quickly, and effectively, and I think the job of *Hansard* will be made that much easier because they will be able to resort to a tape which they will be able to play back a couple of times if need be to hear that which was said by the member. We will not eliminate all the inaccuracies in the *Hansard* record. I do not think that will ever be possible, but it should be possible for it to be more comprehensive than perhaps it has been in the past. With all those difficulties, the *Hansard* staff have served us well.

People often criticise the system of reporting that we have in this place. Recently we received a submission from the people who report courts in this State suggesting that a substantial saving could be made if the system they employ for reporting courts were to be used here. There is a fundamental difference between the system of court reporting and that which occurs here. A

court report is a verbatim report; absolutely no editing at all takes place. In our situation the transcript we get can be, depending on who is making the speech, a very heavily edited version. *Hansard* never set out to be a verbatim report of what was said because I think members from both sides would recognise that if we were to be reported just as we spoke, some of the speeches would be a little hard to follow. *Hansard* was never intended to be a verbatim report, but a heavily edited version of what was said. It is not as simple as some people see to introduce a recording system which will turn out the *Hansard* of the type I think we want. I am sure it would be a downgrading of the facility we have had so far, and members would soon complain.

I would like also to thank the other sections of the institution that have served this Assembly. I am thinking in particular of the Parliamentary Library and the Joint House Department, Bernie Edmondson and Peter Hallett, and all those under them. I want to thank them sincerely. With respect to the Library, I want to say how pleasing it has been to have stability return to the Library as a result of the appointment of Roslynn Membrey. I would hope that the Library will become a more valuable or a more used facility in this institution. The Library has been through a destabilising time and I hope it gets back to full use because it is a fairly costly facility, and I am not too sure it is being used as extensively as it should be.

I have appreciated the support shown to me in this job by members on both sides and I want to reciprocate the expression of good wishes given to me.

I would like to thank one other group of people who are not here. We do not see them very often, but they do a tremendous amount of work in support of this parliamentary institution, and I refer to the Government Printing Office. I want to express my appreciation and I am sure that of all members to Bill Brown the Government Printer, Bill Benbow, one of his senior officers, and all those other members of the Government Printing Office who provide a very valuable service. When there was a glimmer of hope last night that this session might conclude, they readily agreed to have people on standby to call in and churn out a revamped Smoking and Tobacco Products Advertisements Bill at the suggested time of 3.00 a.m. or 4.00 a.m. We do not see much of them, but I want them to know how valued are their services.

In conclusion I say to all members of this House and to all of the staff who work in this institution, that I wish them a very merry Christmas and a happy and prosperous 1983.

I shall leave the Chair until the ringing of the Bells.

Sitting suspended from 2.52 to 3.40 a.m.

BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Smoking and Tobacco Products Advertisements Bill.

Bill returned from the Council without agreement.

2. Appropriation (Consolidated Revenue Fund) Bill.

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

BREAD BILL

Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying it had agreed to the amendments made by the Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [3.42 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising do adjourn until a date and hour to be fixed by Mr Speaker.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.43 a.m. (Friday)

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: COASTAL AREAS

Management Plans

2088. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Further to the Treasurer's statement (reported on 14 September 1982) that coastal management plans were nearing completion, would he state for 1982-83, with regard to implementing these plans, what amount of funds have been allocated for—

- (a) coastal engineering works;
- (b) soil conservation;
- (c) recreation reserves;
- (d) conservation reserves?

- (2) Of the total funds allocated what amount will each of the following bodies receive—

- (a) Government departments and/or authorities;

- (b) local government authorities;
- (c) community groups;
- (d) other?

(3) For each of the years—

- (a) 1983-84;
- (b) 1984-85;
- (c) 1985-86,

what is the estimated cost of implementing management plans for the coast?

(4) Will the Government ensure that funds are available to meet the costs of implementing coastal management plans?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (3) Coastal management plans as announced on 13 September 1982, will aim to identify key coastal resources and co-ordinate such aspects as coastal engineering works, soil conservation, recreation, access to the coast, and protection of important natural features. Co-ordination will be through the co-ordinating committee of senior Government officers and by extensive liaison with all of those agencies involved with coastal management, particularly local government authorities. Initially, the plans will be advisory and will be implemented as appropriate through existing mechanisms, such as town planning procedures and State and local government development approval processes.

Funds have been provided in the Department of Conservation and Environment's 1982-83 budget for preparation of the plans noted in the Press statement of 13 September 1982. Implementation will be a staged process depending on the particular situation, and specific costs for coastal engineering works, soil conservation, recreation reserves and conservation reserves cannot be identified at this stage. The co-ordinating committee will ensure that the Government receives the best advice on the most effective method of implementing coastal management plans as they are prepared, including the allocation of funds where these are necessary.

(4) It must be emphasised that many aspects of implementing coastal management plans will not require funding. Where funds are necessary, the Government will consider the need along with other demands at the time. There is already a high level of funding for coastal works and improvement programmes and this is expected to continue.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Air-conditioners

2089. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) Who holds the contract for—

- (a) installation;
- (b) maintenance;

of air-conditioners for TAB premises?

(2) Were the contracts put to tender?

(3) If not, why not?

Mr HASSELL replied:

The TAB advises—

- (1) (a) currently nobody; contractors vary according to tender;
- (b) ACES Airconditioning Pty. Ltd. and Roleystone Air Conditioning.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Answered by (2).

TECHNOLOGY PARK

Land

2090. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

- (1) Further to question 2031 of 12 November 1982, will the area to be used by the new technology park be sold to the WA Institute of Technology or some other controlling centre, or will it be made available free of charge?
- (2) If sold, what is the estimated selling price?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The technology park will not be sold to WAIT or some other controlling centre. The land will be vested in the Industrial Lands Development Authority for development and sales to organisations meeting establishment criteria on advice from a board of management yet to be created.

- (2) No estimate of selling price has been determined as development costs of the park are not yet known.

ROAD

Empire Avenue: Priority

2091. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did he receive a letter from the City of Stirling dated 24 August 1982 complaining that it was not receiving its fair share of road funds?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) why was Empire Avenue (carrying less than 10 000 vehicles per day) given priority for improvement to dual carriageway standard over Wanneroo Road (Tuart Hill) which carries over 30 000 vehicles per day;
 - (b) will he supply me with a detailed assessment of how priorities were assessed for the group "B" planning area and the City of Perth;
 - (c) has he given the City of Stirling an assurance that the short-fall in funds received by that city for urban road grants in the 1982-83 year will be taken into account when the 1983-84 grants are assessed?
- (3) If "No", why?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (3) The member has indicated that the question is based on a letter from the Stirling City Council dated 24 August, 1982. This is a detailed three page submission to which I replied in equal fashion on 20 September.

I believe it would be appropriate therefore to let the member have a copy of my reply and I will ensure that this is done.

On the question of fairness, I would however point out that Stirling City Council's share of the inner council's road fund has increased by 54 per cent over the last six years compared with a 39 per cent increase in this fund.

TOWN PLANNING

Urban Lands Council

2092. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) When is the Urban Lands Council required to commence repayments to the

Federal Government for moneys advanced?

- (2) What is the repayment programme?
- (3) What funds are on hand to meet repayments?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) 15 June 1985.
- (2) Equal annual instalments over 20 years.
- (3) As at 30 October 1982 the funds were \$11 766 million. This figure does not include interest from 1 July 1982 to 30 October 1982.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Youth Programme

837. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

I remind the Treasurer of his Budget announcement of a \$450 000 programme directed at youth unemployment. As it is now seven weeks since the Budget was brought down and five and a half months since the beginning of this financial year, can he explain why the programme has not yet started, and can he tell the House when he expects it to begin?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The last I heard of this matter was a few days ago. As the Leader of the Opposition knows, it is necessary for us to make an approach to the Commonwealth Government to obtain its support for the scheme. The indication we have had is that the support will be forthcoming, although at this stage that support is not confirmed. A further indication is that the arrangement could be in force in December this year, or January next year.

ABORIGINES

Land Rights

838. Mr COYNE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Premier read a report headed "A.L.P. vows to give blacks land rights" which appeared in *The Western Mail* on 24 October last?

- (2) Did he see an article in this morning's edition of *The West Australian* featuring an article by Norman Aisbett, Jnr., titled "ABORIGINES WIN LAND PLEDGE", a report stemming from Mr Brian Burke's address to a large delegation of central reserve desert dwellers at the Claremont Showgrounds yesterday?
- (3) Was the Premier surprised at the awesome commitment made by Mr Burke, the Leader of the Opposition, if his party becomes the Government in 1983 after the next elections?

Mr Davies: A good Dorothy Dixier again.

Mr O'Connor: It certainly didn't come from me. I assure you of that.

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) I was astounded that Mr Burke could so strongly assert adherence to such a divisive and racial policy. The land rights policy in respect of Aborigines in both South Australia and the Northern Territory has brought massive complications, to the extent that mining developments are being jeopardised on an unprecedented scale. Although it may not be palatable to the ALP, the reality is: The present Aboriginal reserves system which obtains in Western Australia gives the Aboriginal communities greater protection and greater control over their land than the freehold title would, bearing in mind that freehold title is subject to intrusions by mining companies by virtue of the Mining Act.

EDUCATION: TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Conversion to Community Colleges

839. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Government considering converting any more of the State's technical colleges into community colleges, such as the Eastern Goldfields college.
- (2) Can he give a guarantee that the Bunbury Technical College will not be converted into a community college of this type in the next year or two if, of course, he is still the Minister for Education in that period?

Mr CLARKO replied:

I do not support the use of the term "community college". I have advised

people with whom I am connected that it is appropriate to call such colleges "autonomous" colleges. The answer to the question is—

- (1) No.
- (2) At present, negotiations are continuing to take place in regard to the situation at Bunbury. As the member would be aware, he made some comments on this matter in Bunbury several days ago. He made a comment to the effect that tertiary institutions would be instructed by a Labor Government on what should happen. I think the member would agree the matter at Bunbury is complicated. I certainly am aware of the ambitions of people in Bunbury to acquire for themselves a post secondary institution. As the member would be aware also, we have allocated considerable sums of money in recent times to the Bunbury Technical College. I know my colleague, the member for Bunbury, has had a great deal to do with that college.

At present everybody is aware of the problem, and we are addressing ourselves to it. We are in the process of taking certain steps, as the member would be aware, such as ensuring that certain courses can be taken in Bunbury using the college as an outlying establishment in conjunction with the tertiary institutions of Perth. At present no decision has been made to convert the Bunbury Technical College into an autonomous college, but all matters are being considered.

HEALTH: MENTAL

Institutions: Facilities

840. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

Can he inform the House what action he has taken, or proposes to take, in view of the comments of the Director of Mental Health Services in his annual report to the effect that facilities at Graylands, Heathcote, and other institutions, are inadequate, overcrowded, understaffed, and barely able to cope with the work load imposed upon them?

Mr YOUNG replied:

The member for Melville would realise that the report to which he refers is for 1981-82.

Mr Barnett: The director said the same things the year before.

Mr YOUNG: In fact, he did, and some remarks he made were quite justified. I have never hidden from that point. Over the last two or three years the situation of patients of Mental Health Services has improved at a steady and rapid rate. Since the time period of the report to which the member for Melville refers, the percentage of my Budget allocation for health services has been made larger than for any other sector.

The Campbell report will be released shortly and will further show what will be done to get people out of the establishments of concern and into better facilities. I would say that the 1982-83 report of the director may even give the Minister a pat on the back.

LAND

Mindarie

841. Mr NANOVICH, to the Premier:

Referring to an item in *The West Australian* of Monday, 15 November, on page 13 under the heading "Questions over \$4m Land Buy", was a reply made to a letter from the Wanneroo Shire Council, and addressed to Mr J. D. Reidy-Crofts, and forwarded to the shire, dated 22 August 1980, which advised his office that the Valuer General had valued the land at Mindarie at \$2.4 million?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Subsequent to the Valuer General's advice of 23 June 1980 to the Shire of Wanneroo that the Mindarie land had been valued at \$2.4 million, he received a letter signed by Mr Reidy-Crofts for the shire clerk, seeking further comments and observation.

On 22 August 1980 the Valuer General addressed a letter to the shire clerk giving additional information and confirming the earlier advice.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

High Voltage Fuse Loss

842. Mr GORDON HILL, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has the State Energy Commission recently received a complaint from the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations on behalf of Mr W. Robinson of Maida Vale regarding the SEC failure to compensate Mr Robinson for damages to household electrical appliances as a result of a high voltage fuse loss?
- (2) Will the SEC compensate Mr Robinson for this damage?
- (3) If "No" to (2), why not?
- (4) Does the SEC have any evidence that the loss of the high voltage fuse was caused by external interference?
- (5) If "No" to (4), how can the SEC refuse compensation on the grounds that the loss of the fuse was caused by external sources and that the SEC is therefore not responsible?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (5) Yes. I am advised that an investigation revealed no negligence on the part of the State Energy Commission. As the damage was subsequently found to have resulted from vandalism, no compensation is payable by the State Energy Commission.

ABORIGINES

Land Rights

843. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

I refer to his answer to the question asked by the member for Murchison-Eyre and, in particular, his statement in that answer regarding the proposals outlined by me in respect of Aboriginal land claims giving Aboriginal people less control over the central desert area that they seek to control than the Government's present Aboriginal reserves policy. If our proposals would give less control to the Aboriginal people, how can the Premier accuse us of trying to set up a separate black State, or trying to carve up this State?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Again the Leader of the Opposition conveniently leaves out some of the words I use. My remarks related to freehold

land. I said that the present system gives Aboriginal communities greater protection than they would have with freehold title. This related to freehold land where those people want land, which would not be in accord with normal freehold land.

ANIMALS: KANGAROOS

Killing Ban

844. Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of an ABC news item yesterday advising that the banning of commercial killing of kangaroos will take effect in Victoria from the end of this year?
- (2) Could the Minister advise the House what prompted this action which will obviously bring about widespread disruption to the pet meat industry.
- (3) Would he expect that a similar situation could develop in Western Australia?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) to (3) I am aware of the announcement made yesterday—

Point of Order

Mr HODGE: The first part of that question would seem to be out of order. How can our Minister be responsible for actions instigated by the Victorian Government?

Mr Old: He never said anything about my being responsible.

The SPEAKER: The member for Melville is quite accurate. The first part of the question relates to an administrative action taken by the Victorian Government and clearly the Minister has no authority over those matters, or is involved in them. The later part of the question brought the question into conformity with the Standing Orders, and the responsibility of the Minister. I should imagine the Minister will answer the question in terms of his responsibility to this House so far as this State is concerned.

Mr OLD: Further to this point, the first part of the question asked whether I was aware of a news item.

Mr Hodge: He has already ruled that to be out of order.

Mr OLD: I am asking the Speaker to rule, not the member for Melville.

The SPEAKER: I recollect that there were three parts to the question. The first

asked whether the Minister was aware of a news item. That was a reasonable question to ask. However, that same question sought some reaction from the Minister in respect of what had happened in Victoria. I cannot recall the substance of that, but in the later part of the question the Minister was asked what impact the Victorian situation would have on the pet meat industry of this State. This situation is one of those where part of the question is out of order, but the major part of the question is in order.

In the spirit of co-operation that always has been shown from the Chair—at least while I have been in it—I will allow the Minister to answer.

Questions (without notice) Resumed

Mr OLD: If I transgress, I have no doubt you, Sir, will advise me accordingly. I am aware of the news item. It was quite interesting. Pressure is coming from quite a number of organisations to stop the farming and harvesting of kangaroos. The part of the news item that disturbed me was the reference to the Minister for Conservation in Victoria stating that the ban had been imposed as a result of pressure from conservation and animal liberation groups.

This I feel is very pertinent to the situation in Western Australia at present. We are receiving quite a deal of pressure, not only from groups, but from the Federal Government also with its sales tax. It is disturbing to the pastoral industry and the agricultural industry in this State. I assure members that while we are in Government—and I trust that will continue for many years—we will not be subjected to pressure. Any future Government prone to pressure from conservationists and lobbyists—as some parties in this State are, and admit they are—would bring nothing but disaster to the pastoral industry and in turn that would filter through to the agricultural area.

TOWN PLANNING

Urban Lands Council

845. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning.

Further to the Minister's answer to question 2092 today which related to repayments to be made by the Urban

Lands Council to the Federal Government which was equal annual instalments over 20 years, can she answer by telling me what the instalments are likely to be, because that information did not make sense?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

I regret I cannot tell the member for Victoria Park that at the moment because this matter is under negotiation between me and the Commonwealth Minister and no determination has been made.

LAND: NATIONAL PARKS

Beaches: Access

846. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) I asked in question 1970 whether it was possible for professional fishermen to have access to beaches through national parks. In his reply the Minister indicated the cost of permits to allow this access was \$10 for each park per year. As at least one fisherman is being charged \$50 per year for his permit for access through the Walpole-Nornalup National Park and still others have indicated to me they pay \$20, can the Minister have steps taken to normalise the permits.
- (2) Is it possible for fishermen to be granted access on the same basis as the general public, that is, without the need for a fee to be paid?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) The permit fee of \$10 referred to in question 1970 clearly relates to professional fishermen operating through the three Esperance coast national parks.
Over the years one traditional beach fisherman has received special approval to establish a seasonal camp and to fish for salmon at the mouth of the Nornalup Inlet in the Walpole-Nornalup National Park.

The authority, to allay the concern of park visitors about this activity, has printed an information pamphlet on the salmon fishing operation. However, the authority believes that from January 1983 so as to be consistent with the Esperance region, it will consider modifying the fee to \$10.

The authority is not aware of any professional fishermen paying a fee in excess of \$10 per park per year.

On a different basis, two fishermen in the Esperance region, who have semi-permanent camp structures under lease, pay \$50 each per year for their leases.

- (2) and (3) No. Because there is a management cost on their operations with the need to maintain standards which the public expects in a national park.

HEALTH: POISONS

Act: Offence

847. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) With reference to his answer to part (2) of question 1980 of 10 November 1982 concerning the sale of poison in an allegedly improperly labelled container, is there any danger of the difficulty being experienced in identification of the company involved resulting in section 51 of the Justices Act precluding the prosecution proceeding?
- (2) Why is difficulty being experienced in identifying the company involved?
- (3) Is there any reluctance or hesitation on the part of officers in his department about proceeding to prosecution and, if so, why?
- (4) What steps are being taken to identify the company involved and is the work receiving high priority?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The company was registered in New South Wales, but it has now been identified.
- (3) No, and I am at a loss to understand why the member should believe otherwise.
- (4) For the information of the member, the complaints papers have now been received from the Crown Law Department and are being processed.

RAILWAYS: FREIGHT

Joint Venture: Salmon Gums

848. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Transport:

In answer to my question of Thursday 11 November, concerning the discontinuance of Total West's services to Salmon Gums and points south to Esperance, the Minister answered that Total West had indicated to the commissioner where it thinks the freight available does not warrant a regular service by it. I now ask—

Could the Minister please indicate where those areas are, whether Total West will discontinue services, and what arrangements the Government will make to ensure a freight service to the area?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Dealing with the part of the member's question relating to those areas where Total West proposes to withdraw services due to insufficient freight, it is not the function of Government to provide this information in respect of any commercial transport organisation. No doubt the company concerned would advise the member if he was to make his request direct.

As regards transport services to Salmon Gums and points south to Esperance, in accordance with the announced commitment of the Government, the Commissioner of Transport, who is responsible for monitoring the Government's land freight transport policy, has advised me that when the existing service provided by Total West ceases on approximately 25 November, he does not anticipate any difficulty in introducing other transport operators to service the area. Steps will be taken to ensure that people in the towns concerned are advised of the alternative transport arrangements.

As has been said in this place previously, the Government stands by the assurance that no area will be left without an adequate transport service.

HOUSING

Maintenance

849. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

I refer the Minister to the information he gave in his answer to my question

2003 in which he said that it was not the case that the State Housing Commission was now requiring tenants to carry out or pay for some maintenance items themselves.

Further to that, I refer to an answer received from the General Manager of the SHC who received a request for maintenance on behalf of a constituent. The general manager states—

Due to the lack of maintenance funds the commission is now requesting tenants to carry out minor items of maintenance considered non-essential as is the current practice in the private rental sector.

In view of the apparent anomaly between the answers given in these two cases, can the Minister tell me definitely what is the policy of the SHC with respect to the onus placed on tenants for the payment and responsibility of maintenance items?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

I would have thought that it would be perfectly clear to the member that with items of maintenance which are considered necessary, it is the policy of the commission that the expense of that maintenance be met by the commission.

At times, items of maintenance might be desirable, but not necessary. A limited amount of funds is allocated each year for maintenance purposes and, in cases where the maintenance is not deemed to be necessary, obviously the tenants who wish to go ahead with such maintenance will be required to expend finance to have that maintenance done.

Mr Brian Burke: What is an example of that sort of maintenance?

Mr SHALDERS: I would have thought that if the tenant believed that the interior of a room required painting, and if the tenant wished to have that done rather than wait until the commission deemed it was necessary, the tenant would be required to pay for it.

TOWN PLANNING

Urban Lands Council

850. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

(1) This question is further to the question I recently raised with the Minister. As she

told me in written answer that the money to be paid back by the Urban Lands Council will be in 20 equal annual instalments, and then she informed me the matter is still under consideration, am I correct in assuming that the only matter under discussion is the total amount?

- (2) If that is so, does that mean not all the money we have received from the Commonwealth has to be paid back?
- (3) Alternatively, can she tell me what the amount under discussion is?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) In reply to the member for Victoria Park, the equal annual instalments over 20 years are part of the original agreement and that is a part I have not yet had any discussions about.
- (2) Do I believe it will not be necessary to repay all the moneys owed? Quite clearly that is part of the discussions that are taking place. The member would know that South Australia was forgiven a large part of the debt it owed, NSW and Victoria similarly. In WA we have had discussions at officer level. In fact, had I not been in this House now, I would be in Canberra. I had an appointment to meet with the Minister tomorrow.
- (3) From memory, the total moneys we are talking about that will need to be repaid, if the first agreement remains, is \$20.8 million.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE: NURSES

Work Bans

851. Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a group of nurses wishes to present him with a petition on the steps of Parliament House tonight?

Mr Davies: Half his luck!

Mr COYNE: To continue—

- (2) If "Yes", has he spoken to their representative?
- (3) If "Yes", will he receive the petition?
- (4) What is the current situation in respect of the nurses' work bans?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) I have consistently made it a practice not to receive petitions on the steps of Parliament House in such circumstances as are usually designed to gain publicity as distinct from getting to the root of the problem. I spoke to the representative of certain nurses on the telephone today and I told her I would be very happy to meet with her in my office next week together with any other delegates she wanted to bring along, not only so that could the petition be received, but also the facts of the matter could be talked about between them and me; and the decision as to whether she takes that step or the alternative step, I left entirely with her.
- (4) I understand that although the Royal Australian Nursing Federation has refused to take part in the working party that I suggested would consist of representatives of the Department of Hospital and Allied Services, the teaching hospitals, the RANF, the Government Industrial Relations Service, and the Hospital Employees' Union, it apparently has indicated its preparedness to meet with hospital industrial officers, so that is at least a step in the right direction.

The situation arose out of a claim lodged by the RANF before the Industrial Commission on 7 October. On 27 October the RANF had its annual general meeting, prior to the due time for response to that claim, and passed resolutions in terms of work bans in regard to the rostering system.

On 28 October the RANF officially announced the imposition of work bans unless the Government agreed to the roster situation. To that claim, my response on behalf of the Government was the setting up of the working party because I wanted to point out to them that unless they were prepared to sit down in a party consisting of all the people who had to make nursing rosters work it was not much sense—

Mr Hodge: But you know negotiations have been going on for about 18 months. I told you that last night.

Mr YOUNG: I will get to that point later. That rejection was confirmed by an RANF council on 15 November. The RANF imposed the work bans and still

refused to meet with the working party. In addition to that, it should be noted by everyone here that the RANF has made no attempt to have the matter arbitrated.

Mr Hodge: Neither have you.

Mr YOUNG: For me to ask for it to be arbitrated would mean having to go to the Industrial Commission with a request that the work bans be lifted; that is, their imposition of work bans to support their original claim. It seems to me if they are serious as originators of the claim, they would want the matter arbitrated.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I suggest the Minister ignores the interjections.

Mr YOUNG: The member for Melville said that this matter has been under negotiation for a period of over 18 months. In answer to that, I suggest the RANF lists the negotiations and approaches other than internal discussions that have been made over that period of time in an en-

deavour to have discussions in regard to the rosters.

I said I would investigate the matter and note the progress or lack of it which has brought about this situation. One meeting of note I can remember was with the RANF and the Commissioner of the Hospital and Allied Services in May. The commissioner pointed out that the Grants Commission finding could determine that there would not be enough money if in fact the new roster system resulted in greater costs and the RANF would have to be careful the moves did not cost jobs. I was of the opinion that the RANF took note of that.

Finally, I indicate that the RANF has two options; it can either go before the Industrial Commission and have the matter arbitrated, or it can sit down with the working party and come to an agreement. I agree completely that it is a stupid system whereby a nurse can knock off work at 11.00 p.m. and be rostered for duty the following day at 7.00 a.m.
