

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 11 August 1982

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

SITTING OF THE HOUSE: WEDNESDAY, 11 AUGUST

Personal Explanations

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [2.17 p.m.]: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr O'CONNOR: In view of the problem with electricity services in this State and that after approximately five o'clock this evening we will be using electricity that others could well use, it is my intention to allow private members' business to be proceeded with first, then questions be taken at 4.30 p.m., to finish at approximately 5.00 p.m.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [2.18 p.m.]: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Premier mentioned to me the conditions associated with what he sees may be the lack of power supplies in Western Australia as this afternoon goes into evening.

I have indicated to the Premier that the Opposition will co-operate in any way he thinks desirable to make sure that we as a Parliament do not constitute a drain on essential supplies.

TRANSPORT: PERTH AIRPORT

Extension: Grievance

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [2.19 p.m.]: It is important that the Government take issue with my grievance immediately. It relates to the options available for the improvements and reconstruction of Perth Airport.

Recently, a Federal Government committee on this matter took some evidence in this State and I was surprised to learn that the departmental officers from this State advocated option number two, which would result in the enlargement of the east-west runway, one of the most dangerous runways so far as the population of this State is concerned.

If that runway were approached from a westerly direction and were used more often, it would result in more planes passing over Victoria Park, Rivervale, and adjoining areas than has

been the case in the past. It will affect the lives of more people and if there were no other option, I would not be on my feet complaining today.

The Government has been shown to be lacking in its attention to this matter. The Government has made provisions for air travellers to be serviced along the Beechboro-Gosnells Highway, but so far as aircraft movement is concerned, it has not shown much interest. If the State Government is not interested in aircraft movement, who can be expected to be interested? Other than Mr Beazley and Mr Shack, who have their electorates in proximity to the airport, Federal members of Parliament do not seem to be interested in this matter.

Of course they all know the present situation. The entire suburb of Newburn was bought by the Commonwealth Government some years ago for the purpose of constructing a parallel runway. The intention was to construct this runway so that the noise would be taken away from the residential areas of the metropolitan area. Why did the Commonwealth Government buy this area? It comprises a number of square kilometres which are of no use to man or beast.

At the present time the area looks as though it is part of the moon! When it was made known that the Commonwealth Government was to buy the land most of the people who owned a block were able to sell the land off it. They then sold the land to the Commonwealth Government which has subleased some of it at a nominal charge to people who breed greyhounds. Other than that the entire area has lost its viability.

When I became a member for the area, the land was occupied by many Italians who undertook market garden operations. I know that with the passage of time the market gardeners would have left the area because the city would have been developed around them. However, when the Commonwealth decided to purchase the land the market gardeners had to move out and establish themselves further afield in the Wanneroo area or south of the city, depending on where they could find suitable land to carry out their occupation.

It appears that the Government of this State is prepared to allow the situation to continue. The land in Newburn, which is within 10 kilometres of this building and closer to the centre of the city, will remain in a state of shock and disuse if the Commonwealth is not forced to use it for the purpose for which it was intended.

The area is an encumbrance upon the local authority concerned. There are roads through the area and little remuneration is provided from the

rates where the properties are subleased. The normal procedure is for the Commonwealth Government to pay an amount of money in lieu of rates. The ratability of this land has ceased to exist. It is not reasonable for us to allow it to continue on this basis.

If the Commonwealth Government buys large tracts of land within the precincts of our city we must make sure that it makes proper use of it and that it does not disrupt the advancement of our city and suburbs. This would not occur if the Government would sponsor the fourth option which has been recommended. While the State Government is more interested in making a decision regarding an alternative terminal, such a decision will be of no use if it causes more disruption in the suburbs. I could understand if no other alternatives were available. In that case one would have to say, "We have an airport and have to put up with it". However, an alternative exists and that is the construction of a parallel runway which would allow for the provision of in and out flights over more industrialised areas and not over residential areas which include schools.

I pointed out to the committee, when I gave evidence, that the Queens Park School which is a long way from the runway, is about the same distance from the airport as is the area in which a plane recently crashed in the United States. At the present time the flight path incorporates many schools.

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: There could not be any more schools than there currently are in the flight path and this has not received attention by the Government. I would hate a tragedy to occur when it could have been avoided. The proposition is that the main take-off runway would be in a north-south position and the aircraft would fly over the Bickley Valley where there is a smaller concentrated number of people who would be in danger at the time of take-off.

The new terminal would have to last for a long time. We have not had any major accidents at the existing airport and we do not want them in the future. When planning these things, the Commonwealth Government should endeavour to minimise the chance of this type of tragedy. If the Government did not specify this to its representatives who gave evidence at the inquiry it would surprise me. It should have investigated it more thoroughly with the local authorities who have put forward their preference for option four. It would be more expensive ultimately, but if the Commonwealth Government carries on with option two, it will be worse off. If this option is

adopted the east-west runway will be extended and the flight path will be over Victoria Park, Rivervale, and Cloverdale, which areas get shaken enough now. I know, because I have experienced it. I have lived in the flight path area and I appreciate the difficulties experienced by those residents. I wish the Government would take time out to properly consider this matter. It should say to the Commonwealth Government, "If you are going to keep the airport where it is you must use the land you bought and be reasonable about it".

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): I ask members to keep the noise in the Chamber to a minimum. It is difficult for *Hansard*, and for those members who are listening, to hear.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [2.29 p.m.]: With reference to the grievance concerning the international terminal and the construction of a second runway, all I can say is that it is something like "Johnny-come-lately". The Government heard nothing from the members of the Opposition—going back to the time of the Tonkin Government—when the proposal for the airport was in its planning stages.

Mr Jamieson: Yes, you did. In 1970 they promised a second runway.

Mr Bryce: They promised a second runway you goose!

Mr RUSHTON: I know I am on a sensitive nerve. The Opposition has said nothing about the proposals for the airport until the last few months.

Mr Jamieson: Nonsense! I will show you my file.

Mr RUSHTON: This has been worked on for a long period. Indeed, as far as I was concerned, the committee took too long to deliberate upon the actual forward planning of the airport. Under pressure, the committee came down with a commitment and a recommendation and, from that time, this Government has moved forward positively. We are not unmindful of the issues raised by the member for Welshpool. I have represented them constantly to the Federal Minister; indeed, I was in the Eastern States only recently, and raised the matter once again. The member for Ascot has adopted a responsible attitude in recognising the part this Government has played.

I am concerned for all those who live adjacent to the airport. After tremendous deliberation, a decision was made to site the airport at Guildford. If the member for Welshpool had come forward at that time and suggested an alternative, that would be another matter.

Mr Jamieson: We did. When we could not get the one we wanted, we thought we should come up with the best alternative.

Mr RUSHTON: Which alternative did the honourable member suggest?

Mr Jamieson: We said it should be placed at Pearce, but you would not move the military out. I have expressed that view in this House on many occasions.

Mr RUSHTON: Some very knowledgeable people, such as Sir Cyril Kleinig, were in favour of siting it somewhere on the northern side of the city; however, once again, Pearce was in the way.

Mr Jamieson: Get rid of Pearce.

Mr Pearce: I object to this line of conversation!

Mr RUSHTON: I assure the member for Gosnells that is not our current objective; that will occur at the next election.

Land planning surrounding the airport has been with us for a long time, and this Government has an obligation not to disregard that planning. At the Commonwealth's request, we have made provision for a second runway. However, we are putting our case to ensure the Commonwealth does not walk away from the issue.

I cannot accept the charge that we have been neglectful of the interests of the people, because we have been conscious of those interests at all times. I have held this portfolio for about four years, and, since I took office, I have been putting Western Australia's case for the Guildford proposal, and will continue to do so until the situation is resolved satisfactorily. The Government has been totally supportive of my recommendations. We have rejected option number one because we believe options numbers two and four allow for all the things we would prefer to take place.

Mr Jamieson: No; option number two includes the east-west runway.

Mr RUSHTON: It allows for the international airport in the centre of the strip; it allows for the installation of navigational aids and of a second runway. Basically, that is what the member for Welshpool has been advocating.

Mr Jamieson: No, it is not; you do not understand the situation.

Mr RUSHTON: I have been out there; I have spoken about the matter; and, I have had it represented to me. Basically, our long-term objectives are the same.

The reality of the situation is that the Commonwealth needs to start in the right direction; that is the basis of the case we are

making to the Commonwealth on behalf of the State, and local authorities, and that is how we will continue to represent the issue.

Mr Bryce: Would you agree we do not want the existing runways extended in the way envisaged by options numbers one and two?

Mr RUSHTON: An extension already is taking place under option number two which will cater for today's needs. We also realise that future technology can vary things quite dramatically. For example, the aircraft of the future may operate with quite a reduced impact upon the surrounding area. That is what we are hoping. However, we must be realists and stick to our guns. There is not a great deal of difference between the long-term objectives of the member for Welshpool and those of the Government. However, I will not accept his claim that only Labor Federal members have made representations on this matter.

Mr Jamieson: I did not say that; I mentioned both Shack and Beazley.

Mr RUSHTON: This matter has been going on for a long time, well before they spoke on the matter. Indeed, the Tonkin Government had three years in which it could have done something, but it did not.

Mr Jamieson: Yes, it did.

Mr RUSHTON: This Government has acted positively and we are actively pursuing options numbers two and four. Mr Acting Speaker, I can hardly hear myself speak.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! Before the Minister commenced speaking, I drew attention to the level of audible conversation in the Chamber. Rather than its being reduced, I think it has become worse. I ask members to come to order, and to observe the request I have made.

Mr RUSHTON: I do not disagree with the member for Welshpool in his endeavours on behalf of his constituents. I am supportive of local councils in their efforts to obtain the maximum benefits for the people living in those areas. We are realists and know we must pursue things logically. However, at the same time, we must deny the Commonwealth the easy answer. We must ensure option number one is not adopted. We are positive about options numbers two and four which will lead us to an end similar to that sought by the member for Welshpool.

EDUCATION: "THE WESTERN TEACHER"

Peace Movement: Grievance

MR HERZFELD (Mundaring) [2.36 p.m.]: Fundamental to the established system of public

education in this State is the principle that children should gather knowledge in schools, free from any political, religious, or moral bias. Primarily, the Minister for Education is the ultimate guardian of that fundamental principle. The Minister will be aware we live in times in which people with extremist and radical views increasingly are prepared to sacrifice ethical responsibilities and loyalties to employers in blindly pursuing their objectives. No institution or organisation seems to be free of such people today.

It is a matter of concern to me that these sorts of people already may be active in the classrooms of the public schools of Western Australia. It is a fact that the State School Teachers' Union of WA (Inc.), particularly its executive—which, after all, speaks for the union—over the last few years progressively has become more radical in its approach to various issues.

The latest issue of the union's publication *The Western Teacher* draws together a couple of announcements which create some concern in my mind. In the latest issue, on the one hand, we have the announcement that the union has become affiliated with an umbrella movement which, in broad terms, is called the "peace movement". The word "peace" is somewhat of a misnomer in this context because it can mean many different things.

Mr Pearce: Mostly, it means being opposed to war.

MR HERZFELD: If it were as simple as that, I would be quite happy, because no-one in his right mind would support war. However, I think the word means much more than that.

In this issue of *The Western Teacher*, an executive member of the union states that teachers must advocate peace in the classroom. The issue also contains a centrefold, to which I will refer in some detail in a moment. It sets out the resource material required in the classrooms to meet the objectives previously outlined.

In a very cruel and distorted way, the article uses emotive words and pictures to misrepresent completely the whole situation.

Mr Pearce: What situation? It tries to make peace.

Mr HERZFELD: It associates starvation with defence. It states that starvation, poverty, and disease are caused by defence expenditure.

Mr Parker: That has been said by the United Nations.

Mr HERZFELD: It promotes the concept that we in Australia should trade defence preparedness

for more homes, better schools, and better care for the aged.

Mr Parker: The arms race is the cause of those things. Check with your leader.

Mr HERZFELD: This is cruel exploitation of young and innocent minds. History has shown that the lack of defence preparedness leads to war. Defence preparedness is the reason for the relative peace in the world over the last 36 years.

Mr Parker: Might I suggest that you read the statement of Malcolm Fraser?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! The House will come to order! I have made repeated calls for order and two Opposition members continue to interject incessantly. I ask that the member be allowed to make his grievance as time is limited.

Mr HERZFELD: I want to remind the House not to forget the tens of thousands of people from different countries who gave their lives in the last war to defend this country, to defend its freedom; and to protect its future. Let us not defile their memories by allowing radicals with unknown motives to undermine the sense of responsibility and the sense of right of our future citizens. Idealism is all very well, but it must be moderated by realism; without realism we will become the prey of opportunists.

Mr Tonkin: You are the opportunist.

Mr HERZFELD: I remind members of what has happened on the world scene since the last war. Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, and other countries have been taken over by the USSR for its own political purposes. We do not want to see more such acts in the future. The only way to ensure that does not happen is to be prepared.

Mr Parker: Why don't you read the speech Malcolm Fraser made to the United Nations? He disagreed with you.

Mr HERZFELD: I now want to refer to this so-called resource material which appears in the centrefold of the Teachers' Union newspaper. As I said earlier, I do not find any argument with any of the factual material presented, except that it is one-sided.

Mr Pearce: That is incredible.

Mr HERZFELD: They are factual statements.

Mr Pearce: People like you should not be allowed near schools.

Mr HERZFELD: The article provides no information as to the reason that most subscribe to defence preparedness. No reasons are given for influencing young minds—

Mr Pearce: Living in peace is a good thing.

Mr HERZFELD:—to accept that there should be no preparedness for the eventuality of an aggressor taking over this country or other nations.

Several members interjected.

Mr HERZFELD: It is wrong to suggest to innocent young minds that if the expenditure on defence were reduced to nothing, we could solve all the world's problems. That is a quite fallacious concept. It is a matter of regret to me that the Teachers' Union should be promoting—

Mr Carr: Peace

Mr HERZFELD:—this type of thing in the way it is. It is the business of the Teachers' Union if it chooses to do so to the community at large, but not in the classroom.

Mr Pearce: Not yours.

Mr Carr: What are you making a fuss about then?

Mr HERZFELD: I would be most unhappy if the Teachers' Union were using its privileged position to introduce this type of material into the classroom.

Mr Parker: Material with which you can find no argument!

Mr HERZFELD: Most teachers and parents, and indeed the majority of the people in the community, expect the Minister for Education to ensure that classrooms are not used to indoctrinate our children with concepts and philosophies which are foreign to the accepted social and moral standards of this community.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr HERZFELD: The community expects the Minister to ensure that the classrooms are not used by radicals and extremists—

Mr Bateman: You are the most right-wing radical this Parliament has had.

Mr HERZFELD:—to introduce principles which are unacceptable to the community at large.

The purpose of my grievance is to alert the Minister about what is going on so that he will be on his guard against the promotion of these types of philosophies in the classroom.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup—Minister for Education) [2.46 p.m.]: I have just looked at *The Western Teacher* of 16 July and it appears that the material to which the honourable member referred was taken from a statement made by a Teachers' Union executive. I would like to read from this article because it brings together the main thrust of the matter which the member

discussed. Referring to the executive member it says—

... he felt deeply that teachers must not only advocate peace in the classroom but should also be seen to do something actively for peace in the community.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr CLARKO: One would think that at least in regard to the subject of peace, everyone would be in agreement and that it could be dealt with in a highly positive way. Unfortunately that is not the case because while people applaud peace unanimously—

Mr Parker: Everyone except the member for Mundaring, of course.

Mr CLARKO: As the member for Mundaring said, every country which is of any significance in the world has a substantial deterrent in the way of various military forces designed to protect them against an aggressor. Some countries establish forces as part of their territorial ambitions, and so on. Over the long period since World War II the peace movement has become tainted by various groups.

Mr Parker: This is not a monolithic organisation—it is a number of different organisations.

Mr CLARKO: Over the past 30 or 40 years, the peace movement has been corrupted by socialists, Communists, and people of the extreme left wing. The greatest alleged supporter of peace today in terms of its utterances would be the Soviet Union but, of course, it poses the greatest threat to world peace. It has probably the best defence force of any nation in the world, and in many ways it has returned to the Czarist policies of the past. The Soviet Union has pushed on aggressively into Afghanistan, as members know. It is not unreasonable for countries in this particular area to want to arm themselves.

It does not surprise me that the Chinese Government goes out of its way to ensure that it has a very positive military force on its borders with the Soviet Union.

The teachers who believe in peace must be very careful of the manner in which such a belief is presented in the classroom. A large majority of the people who advocate peace, in fact, practise war.

I am surprised that the United Nations article which is included, as the member for Mundaring so charmingly describes it, in the centrefold of *The Western Teacher*, should contain the following—

This teaching picture shows how weapons have changed through the ages. Early man used weapons to hunt for food. Later, weapons were used for greed and conquest.

That is a biased statement, because weapons have been used not only for greed and conquest, but also on numerous occasions to protect free people who wanted to remain free. Against Germany we have fought two major wars in which we have used weapons; but it would be incorrect for anyone to make the simple statement that those weapons were used for greed and conquest. The article continues—

Today, in the era of nuclear weapons, war can no longer be used to settle differences, because in a nuclear war there can be no winners—all would be losers.

We all know that in the war against Japan the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima played a major part in saving lives as well as taking lives. All military experts say that the dropping of the nuclear bombs actually saved lives.

Mr Carr: Do you believe in the concept of a winnable war?

Several members interjected.

Mr CLARKO: Just button your mouth for a minute. We are supposed to be able to have our say.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr CLARKO: I am just trying to make my point. The member for Fremantle has spent half the time interjecting; and other members want to have their say. The member for Geraldton should be quiet for a minute. I am trying to say that when the United Nations puts out documents—

Opposition members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Despite my repeated calls for order, members of the Opposition persistently have interjected. It seems that they are endeavouring to prevent the Minister from giving his speech. The situation is intolerable and it will not be allowed to continue. If members persist, I shall have to take action against the offenders.

Mr CLARKO: In the case of Japan, a nuclear weapon was used; and almost everybody who has any knowledge of the subject believes that that led to a net saving of lives. In addition, Labor spokesmen have said repeatedly over the last decade at least that they would spend more money on defence. The Labor Party spokesmen on defence repeatedly have criticised the Australian Liberal-National Country Party Governments for not spending enough money on defence; so it is sheer hypocrisy for members

opposite to suggest that we should cease spending money on defence and turn it over to matters of health and education. That is nonsense. Every country needs a defence force; and the only argument is as to how big it should be. It is ridiculous to suggest that money should not be spent on defence in Australia.

Let us take the case of the United Kingdom today. As far as I know, it has not a single territorial ambition, yet it has just been involved in a significant war over the Falklands—

Points of Order

Mr PEARCE: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, we are listening to this and finding it increasingly difficult to exercise restraint. I wonder whether you would care to cast your attention towards the relevance of this diatribe? After all, it is not competent for the Minister to answer any question outside his portfolio, and all he is being asked to comment on is whether some historical material in *The Western Teacher* should be used in schools. He only has to say whether it is material that the Education Department believes should be used in the classroom. Surely he cannot be allowed to carry on with this sort of generalised diatribe about the history of the world.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): There is no point of order. As I understand it, the question of peace in the Teachers' Union publication covers a wide range of defence matters. Obviously I do not have a copy of it in front of me. However, the member for Mundaring described some of the matters portrayed in that "centrefold", as he described it. It seems perfectly relevant for the Minister to comment in the fashion that he has.

Mr PEARCE: On a further point of order, the Speaker previously has ruled out of order a grievance by the member for Morley on the ground that the grievance related to a Federal matter and did not come within the competence of the Minister to whom the grievance was addressed. I suggest that unless there have been changes to the responsibilities of the Minister for Education, this grievance does not fall within his portfolio.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Classroom conduct does.

Debate Resumed

Mr CLARKO: I hope some consideration will be given to giving me an extra three minutes of time.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The time was stopped while the point was taken.

Mr CLARKO: I have never heard more nonsense than that which has been uttered by the member for Gosnells. Let me say that is a very difficult thing for me to say.

Opposition members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): The Minister will direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr CLARKO: The relevance of my remarks is witnessed to by the fact that the Teachers' Union in this State has agreed recently to affiliate itself with the campaign for nuclear disarmament. It has been talking about peace; it has been talking about nuclear energy; it has been talking about disarmament. It is an indication of the atrophied brain of the member for Gosnells that he cannot understand that.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr CLARKO: The union apparently has affiliated itself with the campaign for nuclear disarmament. I have been talking about nuclear energy. Why the member for Gosnells became upset was because I pointed out correctly that the Labor spokesmen on defence have been urging continually that more money be spent on defence; and he did not like it.

Controversial subjects are part and parcel of every teacher's life. Most of the teachers I know are aware of controversial topics. During my teaching career, I was not aware of examples of teachers virtually going out of their way to foster a blatant, party-political cause. I think my two former colleagues on the Opposition side who were teachers would agree that that is the position. That is the sort of situation we want to prevent.

My reaction to the question is that if a person did, for a particular reason, push a partisan political point of view in a "party" way for a strong personal reason, obviously someone would consider it and discuss it with him. I do not imagine such a practice would be continued.

As I have pointed out, peace has been tainted because various groups in Western Australia today, and around the world, are part of the movement in which people in the community are calling to stop certain things. It is not surprising that that will have an effect on the Teachers' Union. Such a matter has been floating around the western world as part of a concerted campaign.

I have confidence that the majority of our teachers would not involve themselves in something relating to political partisanship. It is important to take notice of what the member for Mundaring said. If such a thing did take place, it

would not be appropriate because we do not wish to have controversial subjects dealt with in our classrooms and through our young children.

Peace is a wholesome subject if it is dealt with properly; but many people today have subverted the use of the word "peace". The people involved in the peace movements are generally those who are regarded as being the "lefties" of our community. They are the members of a movement which I do not believe we should support.

STOCK: CATTLE

Lake Gregory: Grievance

MR BRIDGE (Kimberley) [2.58 p.m.]: I direct my grievance to the Premier. It relates to the matter of the 700 head of cattle currently marooned on an island in Lake Gregory. I rise to speak on this matter because of my concern for livestock based on my long experience in the industry, and the sensitivity that I have for animals.

I have been disappointed at the very lighthearted approach in this State to this matter. When the matter was first raised with me, I immediately contacted the Premier, and he dealt with it almost immediately. I acknowledge that, as far as I am concerned, he acted with a great deal of good sense and responsibility; and he dealt with the matter as soon as I raised it with him.

The departmental officers and those responsible within the Government have since concerned themselves with the likely precedents that might develop from this situation. They appear to have taken into account what situations of this type could lead to in future Government considerations of the type of funding involved here.

The matter to which I have referred is a totally one-off situation. Most people who have lived in the Kimberley for a lifetime cannot recall a wet season comparable with that which the Kimberley experienced this year. It has been an unusual year with a very high rainfall. As a result, a lake such as Lake Gregory measures approximately 40 miles by 35 miles. I am sure members would be able to appreciate the unusual situation in which the Kimberley is placed at present.

The call which the community made on the Government, through my approach to the Premier, was clearly justified taking into account the precarious position of the livestock involved. Therefore, the Government should examine the possibility of extending the contribution it has made to date in relation to this matter.

So far the Government has expended \$500 to freight a boat from Kununurra to Lake Gregory in order that the community there can ferry fodder from the mainland to the cattle on the island. However, that contribution by the Government is insufficient.

We frequently hear of the need for the Government to assist when disasters occur and many of those requests for assistance are dealt with immediately. I am sure the community at large applauds the Government for that sort of action and most people wish the Government to assist when problems or disasters arise.

I would class the matter which I have just raised as falling into the "disaster" category, because it is a one-off situation. This community has not gone cap in hand to the Government asking for assistance without first endeavouring to solve the problem itself. Initially the people in the area spent \$10 000 of their own funds to try to ferry the stock from the island to the mainland, a distance of nearly one mile.

Members who have any conception of the problems inherent in moving stock across swollen rivers would realise that this is a rather major exercise, although it is not impossible. The people involved tried to move the stock with the assistance of a helicopter, but that attempt was unsuccessful, because the cattle turned back when they were half way across and returned to the island.

Since that first attempt to move the stock, \$10 000 has been spent on their upkeep. Fodder is obtained from Kununurra and transported to Lake Gregory and, with the support and encouragement of the Federal member for Kalgoorlie, hay is being cut on site, baled, and ferried across from the mainland to the island. It can be seen much is being done locally to alleviate the difficulties and to save the stock.

The total number of stock involved is approximately 700 and we should look further than simply at the economics of saving them. Humane considerations should be taken into account also. It may be said that the value of the stock is X number of dollars, but if we, as members of Parliament, worry so much about economics that we abandon our responsibility to try to save these cattle, we should give the game away.

The crux of the matter is that 700 head of cattle may die if appropriate action is not taken to save them. All members who have any appreciation of stock will look at it in that context. Approximately 700 head of cattle may die if we do not do something positive to save

them. Therefore, the Government should allocate additional funds to assist in this area particularly bearing in mind that it is a one-off situation.

Disaster relief funding is awarded when the livelihood of people is threatened. If the 700 head of cattle to which I referred are lost, the livelihood of the people at Lake Gregory will be threatened, because cattle form a major part of their economic viability. The Government must take a responsible stand, because sadly enough that seems to be lacking in the community generally.

People say to me jokingly, "How are you going with your 700 head of cattle in the north? Can you save them?" I will not describe in this House what I would like to do with people who make such remarks. It makes me angry when people speak jokingly about the likely loss of stock, because, as a cattle man, I treat this matter very seriously, and I am sure other people who know anything about cattle do also.

In the first instance, the Premier acted very responsibly in this matter, but the position has now got out of hand and he may not be aware of what has occurred. The Government should increase its contribution in this area, because it is not enough simply to supply a boat for the people to use to assist the cattle.

I emphasise this is a one-off situation and I would not be urging the Government so insistently if you, Sir, could convince me it would be an ongoing matter. It is possible another 100 years will elapse before a similar wet season occurs in the Kimberley, because the rainfall this year has been unusually high. As it is a one-off situation, it can quite justifiably be classified as a disaster, bearing in mind that people's livelihoods are threatened, a matter which disaster relief funding takes into account.

This is a serious and justifiable call on the Government and it has been made only after a great deal of effort on the part of the community. I would not be pursuing the matter if the people of Lake Gregory were saying, "We cannot do anything. Why does not the Government help us?" They have not done that. They have used all the funds at their disposal and they now need additional Government funds to ensure the continued survival of the stock.

I hope the Premier will view favourably the request I have placed before him today.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [3.08 p.m.]: I assure members opposite we care very much about the welfare of stock in this State. However, a valid analogy cannot be drawn between the loss of stock as a result of floods in

the south-west and the present situation in the Kimberley, because in the former case people are compensated to the extent that loans are made to enable them to replenish their herds to a certain level.

I became aware of this problem for the first time about 10 days ago when the member for Kimberley drew it to my attention. Prior to that time I was unaware the stock had been in that position for approximately three months.

The proposition put to me was that we should attempt to fatten the stock for about three weeks and then try to swim them to the mainland. However, if, as I was informed, the stock had been there for three months, it is difficult to understand why it was not possible for them to be swum to the mainland previously and, if that was not possible, one wonders why we would be able to do so now.

We have been in touch with the South Australian company involved in the matter. As soon as the member for Kimberley contacted me about this stock I asked the State Emergency Service to take action and report back to me. All the assistance requested by the company has been given and the Government has provided the necessary back-up in the supply of fodder to the cattle. The information I have been given is to the effect that approximately 700 head of cattle worth about \$65 000 are stranded on the island.

Mr Bridge: About \$60 000 to \$100 000. Perhaps \$100 a head.

Mr O'CONNOR: Probably at the moment they are not worth that bearing in mind the conditions under which they have been living. The information given to me by the member for Kimberley is that it might be a year before the floodwaters recede to the extent the cattle could be walked out. It is a difficult position and the people involved must take some responsibility. I say that because if the stock have been there for three months as I am advised, they should have been swum out when they were fit and well rather than expect them to do so after a fortnight of new feed.

The Government wants to ensure the right thing is done. I have been advised that at this time all the requests have been met and that through the SES we still are having discussions with the people involved. If there is a need for further assistance it may be necessary for the company itself to make a commitment to repay any help in due course. We are anxious to get the stock out, but the same situation applies here as to a farmer who loses his stock in floods. He does not get total

reimbursement; he gets a loan which he repays over a period.

We are not unsympathetic to this situation and we want to help. Our people are in touch with those in the north and this will continue to happen. We will provide the assistance which we deem necessary in the long term. The Deputy Premier has indicated that the Government, in discussions which have taken place, agreed to give the company what it requested by way of back-up assistance.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

Redbank Power Station: Grievance

MR SIBSON (Bunbury) [3.12 p.m.] My grievance is directed to the Premier and concerns an article in tonight's edition of the *Daily News* with the heading, "Perth faces blackouts". I ask him: How long are we to put up with strikes of this nature which disrupt the State and inconvenience most of its people, especially those who produce goods?

I understand that the strike resulted from the sacking of Mr Geoffrey Duke who supposedly gave permission to a fitter to use an SEC vehicle when this was not authorised in the proper manner following a dispute. Irrespective of the reason machinery exists within our society to handle these matters, I am sure they provide the right of appeal and so on to deal with them. It seems to me to be an imposition on the people of this State that they must face an almost total blackout.

As I understand the situation, if no other stations but Muja, Kwinana, and Bunbury go out, we will have 750 mW available to provide a potential market of 1 000 mW. Already we have a very real shortage and a need will exist for some desperate cuts to be made. Further, if the strike goes beyond tonight, the whole of our industrial and commercial enterprises could well close down.

Another disturbing fact which I have not had a chance to verify is that members of the Bunbury power station twice decided not to go on strike originally. They have now gone on strike in a fashion similar to that of the Newton Moore High School strike of last year which was brought on by teachers at that school following central union pressure. The power workers have been pressurised by the central union movement to go on strike.

I find it detestable that this should occur because members will be aware that Bunbury and the south-west in general always have had a very good industrial relations record, and that applies to the Bunbury power station, the SEC and other

Government instrumentalities, the mines, and other private companies in the area.

In recent times I have been most perturbed by the central union pressure applied to people in the south-west to have unionists take part in strikes involving workers in other parts of the State in disputes which have no base with the south-west workers. To bring out the three south-west power stations to solve a dispute in the north-west is diabolical and something to be frowned upon and resisted in every way possible.

I ask the Premier: How long can we as a Government and representing the people of the State continue to be confronted with strikes of this nature? I am totally opposed to strikes under any circumstance, but I could perhaps be a little tolerant of a strike that had a meaning and a purpose. However, to pull out a whole system and to upset production and export at this very crucial time in our history is wrong. On a number of occasions recently we have heard the Leader of the Opposition taking this Government to task on Western Australia's and Australia's economic position, yet here we have an issue that should never have involved this arena taking out the power necessary to keep the State rolling. Ships will be tied up, trains will not run, factories will not be able to operate, and retail outlets will not be able to get supplies. I understand emergency services will be looked after, which is to the credit of those involved. Nevertheless, it is not good enough to have such a strike in our present economic situation.

I am airing my grievance on the basis that we have absolutely had enough of this sort of performance. I want to make the point that these strikes are not being called by the workers; they are being agitated for by the union executives and the union advocates. These people are going down to the south-west areas in order to coerce workers there to go on strike. We had a situation recently in the south-west involving BLF members who, in the final analysis, were told by the men on one site to clear out and leave them alone. That is how bad it got. The men did not want to be involved in the dispute.

I would accept that at any time should members of a union in any factory, shop, or power station call the executives of their union in to assist with their problems, the executives should follow the men's instructions. However, I cannot agree with the situation we have now where the Bunbury power station workers obviously resisted this action initially and the union executives chose to see the men of their own volition and put them in a situation where it was very difficult for the men not to co-operate. The men are in a difficult

position when union executives coerce them into striking on the basis that other workers have gone on strike elsewhere. I wonder what is happening to the rest of the power workers who will be producing what power we will have. I wonder what their position is and why they still will be working.

I place my grievance firmly on the Premier's shoulders as the Leader of this Government and ask him to tell us how we are to front up to the problems we have in our community today with these sorts of strikes, overall strikes called because of isolated incidents involving an employee who has obviously done the wrong thing. No-one would deny that the action taken at Port Hedland and Marble Bar was totally wrong and outside the agreement covering employer and employee relations. The whole State looks like being blacked out tonight and, more importantly, industry and commerce face a shutdown tomorrow.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [3.20 p.m.]: Mr Speaker—

Mr Pearce: The Parliament will have to close, too. It is hardly open these days.

MR O'CONNOR: It is not like the member's mouth.

Mr Pearce: At least I'm here doing my job.

MR O'CONNOR: Mr Speaker—

Mr Pearce: That's not like you.

MR O'CONNOR: This member continually interjects to try to stop Government members having their say.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Why are you here if you can't take it?

MR O'CONNOR: He never stops.

Mr Pearce: You react in such a childish way.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You can't take it.

MR O'CONNOR: If I were to continue to interject on the member for Kalgoorlie, which I would not do, he would feel he had just cause to complain.

The grievance raised by the member for Bunbury has justification. It is a great pity people who normally are decent citizens as individuals—

Mr Grill: It was just a Dorothy Dix.

MR O'CONNOR: —are bullied by union officials to do things they would not normally do which disadvantage the majority of people in the community. Individual unionists have been bullied into breaking the law and abusing the industrial arbitration system. Governments and companies do and are expected to abide by the arbitration

court decisions, but the unions decide they will not because they are above the law.

Mr Grill: Your Government has failed in the industrial relations area, and that is a fact. You are getting worse at it.

Mr O'CONNOR: On the other side of this House we have the bed mates of some of these union bosses, bed mates who talk about their policies for freedom of choice and speak about International Labour Organisation conventions yet do not say one word in support of people who stand up for their individual rights. How hypocritical are these members on the other side?

Mr Grill: Most employers acknowledge what we stand for, and with respect to your policies they believe they are causing more problems than anything else.

Mr O'CONNOR: Why does not the Opposition stand up for its policies instead of kowtowing to union bosses?

Mr Grill: You name an employer who agrees with your policies in this area.

Mr Davies: You should let decisions of the court stand.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is a great pity unions which request the services of the arbitration system abuse that system by not abiding by the conditions laid down by the Industrial Commission. Some of these unions take no notice at all of the law, and that applies in the case we are discussing. It is a great pity more members of this House have not taken greater notice of the problems created in the economy by the present industrial action, and the effect those problems have on the public; in particular, on pensioners and other such people. These problems have been caused by the union movement's not abiding by the law or accepting the recommendations of the Industrial Commission.

Mr Blaikie: Hear, hear!

Mr O'CONNOR: A typical example was brought forward by the member for Bunbury. He referred to the people who were considerate of the needs of the community and acted responsibly, but who, upon returning to work, were beaten into submission by the union heavies. It is a great pity such things happen in this country. We on this side certainly will not go along with such action. The circumstances explained by the member for Bunbury are ones which cause great concern in the minds of the people of this country.

Mr Bryce: Why do you stir up trouble?

Mr O'CONNOR: Most union members are hard working and decent individuals who merely want to get on with their jobs. If we let their

union bosses push them around and bully them into doing what the unions want, it will be no time at all before no freedom exists in this country. It is time members spoke out in stronger numbers to indicate how they feel about this situation.

Mr Grill: That is the limit of your knowledge on this matter. The problem with you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Grill: —is that you don't know the difference between preferential and compulsory unionism.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Yilgarn-Dundas will cease interjecting.

Mr O'CONNOR: This Government has stood up for the rights of the people of this State; it has stood up for union members generally, people who do not want to be subjected to pushover tactics or protection racketeers. We will stand up for these individual union members as much as we can.

Mr Davies: What do you mean by "protection racketeers"?

Mr Grill: Was that supposed to be a speech in response to the member for Bunbury?

The SPEAKER: Grievances noted.

INCOME TAX

Reduction: Motion

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [3.26 p.m.]: I move—

That this House urges the Federal Government to introduce reductions in personal income tax in the 1982-83 Federal Budget.

I wonder how members in this place view the Premier's comments when he talks as he just did about industrial relations; about how he terms the standover tactics of unions and unionists as robbing pensioners, and about how he measures that against his soft attitude towards tax avoidance. It is absolutely appalling the Premier takes that sort of attitude in public in respect of industrial relations, and then by his public statements urges the Federal Government not to implement measures designed to retrieve for the public, for those same pensioners and working men and women and their families, the thousands of millions of dollars avoided and evaded in the payment of tax by a number of dubious schemes. It was during the past week that the Premier of this State was the only State leader to criticise the Federal Government's intention to introduce legislation aimed at retrospectively retrieving the money avoided by people involving themselves in the murky, bottom-of-the-harbour, tax avoidance

schemes. What sort of hypocritical attitude is it on the part of any Government to be on the one hand crying crocodile tears about the way in which pensioners are deprived of income as a result of industrial action and problems in that field, yet on the other saying to the Federal Government, "You are doing the wrong thing in pursuing tax avoiders"?

Mr Bryce: It sounds like a protection racket.

Mr O'Connor: This is another statement by the Leader of the Opposition which I will rectify shortly.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We have heard the Premier say many times, "I'll answer you in due course." I ask members to cast their minds back to the point I made the other night about the Premier's comparing like with unlike in regard to increasing wages and productivity. Everybody heard the Premier say three or four times, "I'll answer you when I get to my feet," but he did not answer the question in any way whatsoever. He simply says, "I'll answer the question", and in due course conveniently forgets to do so.

I will repeat my point, because it is so important in respect of this motion. This Premier is the only State leader to have publicly urged the Commonwealth Government not to implement its proposed measures aimed at retrieving tax avoided by bottom-of-the-harbour schemes, and he stated that the Commonwealth should not introduce retrospective legislation to regain that money.

Mr Bryce: Who is the protection racketeer now? Who is providing the protection now?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is one law for those people who are friends of Liberal Governments and another law for those people the bashing of whom this Government sees as being to its political advantage.

It is absolutely deplorable that this State Government through its Premier would say that people who avoided almost half a billion dollars in tax should not be pursued. Even the Federal Government—through Mr Howard, its Treasurer, and Mr Fraser, our Prime Minister—has said that these tax avoiders should pay their proper tax; that they should not escape their obligations. Yet this Premier says, "Go easy on them; retrospective legislation isn't advisable."

On behalf of the Opposition I say that any measure designed to ensure precisely that tax avoided or evaded, either legally or by way of immoral and unacceptable schemes such as bottom-of-the-harbour schemes to which the Federal Government has taken exception, is a measure which every decent Australian should

welcome. I would hate to think that because this Premier took the opposite stance—

Mr O'Connor: I did not.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —the Federal Government desisted. I do not know how often it must be said, but I will say it again: The public comment of this Premier was that the retrospective legislation planned by the Federal Government was inappropriate.

Mr O'Connor: That is correct, but you should go back to all that I said and all that you said. Probably you don't remember what you said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Premier seems to be very thin skinned. I will repeat exactly what I have said: The Premier has said publicly that retrospective legislation—

Mr Shalders: You complained about the member for Vasse doing this the other day.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —to cover people involved in bottom-of-the-harbour tax avoidance schemes should not be pursued by the Federal Government. That is exactly what I have said, and the Premier knows that it is what he said. His remarks were published in the Press, and he has not denied them. By way of his last interjection it would appear he is not now denying those remarks. We say that if that is the Premier's attitude, it is not the Opposition's. Retrospective legislation that leads to the apprehension of tax avoiders is legislation every decent Australian should welcome.

Mr Young: How about dropping the level of your voice a bit?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am amazed that this Premier—

Mr Young: That's better.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —should deviate in such a marked fashion, from what appears to be his public stance, because no other conclusion can be drawn apart from the fact that the Premier does not believe the law should be changed to recover this unpaid tax. If the Premier is concerned about pensioners, working men and women, and families who are being adversely affected as a result of industrial disputation, why is he not concerned about the increasing tax burden being placed on families as a result of the sort of thought that he expresses such as, "Let us not apprehend these tax avoiders with retrospective legislation." I say we should.

As far as I am concerned, the Premier should be standing with us on this issue to support the Federal Liberal Government. It is not a Labor Government which is proposing this legislation; it is a Liberal Government. He has let the State

down badly by telling his Federal colleagues, "Desist from retrospective legislation."

Tax cuts in the order of \$17 a week will be required if we are to do two things. The first is to maintain the proportionate share of tax contributed by pay-as-you-earn taxpayers and taxpayers who receive their income from other sources; and the second is to achieve a restoration of the situation in which wage and salary earners are protected from being pushed by inflation into higher tax brackets. That is the amount of the tax cut that is needed if we are to do those two things.

I will repeat them: Firstly, a tax cut of \$17, simply to maintain the proportion of tax paid by income earners of different sorts at the level that it was in 1975-76; and secondly, avoidance of wage and salary earners being pushed into tax brackets simply as a result of inflation and not as a result of increased real wages.

The inequitable tax system in this country makes certain that there is no tax equity or justice in Australia; that personal income tax rates bear down heavily upon those same families of which the Premier wishes so often to say that he is the protector, and are killing initiative, strangling small businesses, dampening down economic growth, and generally providing a massive disincentive to people to create wealth in this community.

During the past seven years of the Federal Liberal Government supported by State Governments of the ilk of the one we are now confronting in this Parliament, the most massive redistribution of wealth has occurred within Australia. It may be of interest to people like the member for Bunbury, who pretend to champion small business and the family, to know the following figures: In 1975-76 an average wage earner with no dependants paid \$2 420 in tax. In 1981-82 the same wage earner with no dependants paid \$3 778, an increase of \$1 358 or \$26.12 a week. That has been the course of the progress by that single taxpayer without dependants during the time of the Fraser Government and of Governments in this place.

By a taxpayer with a dependent spouse and two dependent children, in 1975-76 the tax paid was \$1 670; in 1981-82 the tax paid by the same small taxpayer was \$2 300, an increase in the case of a taxpayer with a dependent spouse and two dependent children of \$630 or \$12.12 per week.

Where is the justification? Where is the stand taken by this State Government in opposition to that brutal increase in the taxation burden thrust upon the shoulders of working men and women of families in this country?

Accompanying that increased burden is the promise that in 1982-83, unless there is a realistic reassessment of what this Commonwealth Government is about, taxes will rise still further. Taking into account the fact that the indexation provision of 3.8 per cent was abandoned in 1981, in 1982-83 the first taxpayer of whom I spoke, the single taxpayer without dependants, will pay an extra \$654 or \$12.60 per week in tax. The second taxpayer, the wage earner with a dependent spouse and two dependent children, will pay an extra \$644 or \$12.40 per week.

What action is this State Government taking to contradict the plans of the Fraser Government? We already have seen that the Premier is soft on tax avoidance. We have a situation in which in the last seven years taxes on average wage and salary earners have escalated dramatically, and in the next financial year wage and salary earners in the two categories I have spoken about, will pay \$12.60 and \$12.40 respectively a week more in tax. Where is this Government's competent and intelligent response to that situation?

Mr Herzfeld: How much has Government action to do with wage demands? Why don't you be fair when you make these allegations?

Mr Davies: How much has it gone up through rises in interest rates?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I hesitate to dally with the member for Mundaring, but perhaps he is sincere this time and he will understand the explanation I give him.

Mr Herzfeld: That will be a change.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The disproportionate change in the burden of the taxation take by the Commonwealth has absolutely nothing to do with the amount that it raised in total. It has nothing to do with the cost of government. It has nothing to do with wage demands or with the demands of—

Mr Herzfeld: That is a really stupid sort of statement to make.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —producers of different goods and services. I will try to explain it once more for the benefit of the member for Mundaring. Even if he does not understand, perhaps other members will.

If the total tax take remains constant throughout five or six years, and if that constant take is shared differently, it is entirely legitimate to talk about the burdens being thrust upon certain sections of the community. We are not talking about great increases in taxation raised in total, but about the way in which the burden has

changed in those instances. If the member cannot understand that, I am sorry for him.

Let me make it clear by reference to some statistics. In 1975-76 wage and salary taxpayers contributed 76.1 per cent of total income tax receipts. In 1981-82 the same group of taxpayers contributed 82.7 per cent.

Mr Herzfeld: You realise of course that the Federal Government tried to alter that situation last year and had the Budget provisions knocked back in the Senate.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I cannot believe that this man is serious. It beggars belief that he cannot follow this simple logic: If a constant number of dollars are being collected and being paid by different groups of people there can be an argument centering around why the emphasis changes; There cannot be an agreement about why we should reduce sales tax by less than the total amount of income tax paid. It has absolutely nothing to do with it.

Mr Herzfeld: Will you agree that by introducing sales tax you do alter the incidence of direct taxation.

Mr Wilson: Your Government opposed it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That may be true, but in the absence of any change in the collection of income tax why is it that one part of the income tax paying public now pays a greater proportion? I think he understands eventually.

As the wage and salary earners have paid a greater proportion of the total tax take collected by the Commonwealth, income earners who receive their income from other sources have paid less. The proportion that is paid in total tax by income earners who receive their income from sources other than wages and salaries has fallen from 23.9 per cent to 17.3 per cent of the total taxation take. Where is the justice? Where is the equity? Where is the evidence or substance that supports this Premier's contention that we should not bring down retrospective legislation on tax avoiders?

The leading taxation expert (Professor Mathews) says that whether or not the top five per cent of income earners in this country pay tax is entirely a voluntary decision on their part. That is the situation we have reached. I do not blame the Premier for attacking retrospective legislation because I suspect he really did not understand what Mr Howard was talking about.

Had the Premier understood exactly what was at stake, I am sure he could have done nothing other than support the Federal Liberal

Government's initiative in respect of bottom-of-the-harbour schemes.

Why should people in this State who sold companies two or three years ago, and who evaded or avoided tax on the sale, not now be asked to pay that tax? No-one is talking about doing it with a shotgun; and aiming imprecisely to hit whoever stands in the way.

We are talking about a measure specifically designed to say to those people who avoid or evade taxes, "You have had the money for two or three years. It should be in the Commonwealth coffers, to help the pensioners about whom people speak so often". We are now asking those people to pay it.

So that no-one is under any misapprehension as to the drain on this economy as a result of tax avoidance, members should consider that it is reliably estimated that, the tax avoidance industry now confiscates \$7 000 million each year from the people of this country, the rewards of which are to be gained by those who are wealthy enough or who—despite their not being wealthy—are in a position to employ tax avoidance schemes.

The tax avoidance industry is a multi-million dollar one. It has consultants who do nothing but earn a living by advising people how to participate in schemes such as the bottom-of-the-harbour scheme.

Mr Herzfeld: You don't give any credit to the Federal Government for fighting it.

Mr Carr: No we do not.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I give credit to the Federal Government for scrambling to the trough eventually. How much credit can one give to one's Premier who opposes what the Federal Government does?

Mr Herzfeld: What did you do about tax avoidance when you were in Government?

Mr Grill: What did your State council do on this issue? It was reported in *The Australian Financial Review* yesterday.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Mundaring must be a constant embarrassment to the Premier.

Mr O'Connor: Not at all.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Mundaring accuses him of not supporting the Federal Government's initiatives. It has been the Premier who has refused to support the retrospective legislation.

Mr Grill: What did your State council do on this issue? I would like to see it. I hope we will hear about it.

Mr Wilson: He won't mention that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There is an obligation on the Government in Western Australia not to hinder the Federal Government, but to assist it wherever possible in the pursuit of tax avoiders and evaders.

What we have established to date is, firstly, that the Premier stands opposed to the Federal Government's retrospective legislation to catch those bottom-of-the-harbour merchants who have taken a minimum of \$500 million from the purse of the Commonwealth Commissioner of Taxation and thus from the purse of the people of this country; and, secondly, that during the period of the Fraser Government, aided and abetted by Liberal Governments, like this State Government, across the country, income tax on pay-as-you-earn wage and salary earners has escalated dramatically for income earners with or without dependants.

We have established that tax has escalated and the total tax being paid by wage and salary earners has increased from 75 per cent to 81 per cent. At the same time, we have established that approximately \$7 000 million in taxes is being lost as a result of tax avoidance and evasion procedures in a multi-million dollar industry.

Mr Herzfeld: Do you think that the pay-as-you-earn proportion might have something to do with the greater improved wages and conditions in that particular sector of the economy over the last few years? Is that a possibility?

Mr Parker: There has been a real improvement only in the last year.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is difficult to imagine how the member for Mundaring can talk about oranges when everyone is talking about apples. That is what he is doing.

In Government, the Labor Party in Western Australia will set the lead in retrospective recovery of tax avoided and in countering tax avoidance schemes, in the name of the public interest. We are not satisfied that this Government has done all that it can do to assist the Federal Government. We will be looking to this Government to lift its game in assisting the Federal Government—whether it is a Liberal Government or a Labor Government in Canberra—to pursue and apprehend these tax cheats. If that means retrospective legislation, directing that legislating precisely to the area of delinquency, we will support it. If it means, for example, an investigation on a State basis by a State Government's establishing a tribunal into tax avoidance in Western Australia, we will

establish that tribunal, and if it means complementary legislation on a State basis to facilitate, for example, investigations interstate by the Commissioner of Taxation, we will introduce and pass that complementary legislation.

In this case the Opposition's commitment is uncompromising in its opposition to tax avoidance as it is uncompromising in its support of the need for tax cuts in the coming Federal Budget. We have not heard one word from the Premier in respect of tax cuts. It is almost as though he does not understand that the dampening down of demand, the reduction of real disposable income, and the strangling of incentives and initiatives are all part of the whole malaise. I suppose it is too much to expect of this Government that it understand that sort of thing when today we learn that the SEC is paying 130 per cent of its surplus in interest payments. In fact, the SEC is borrowing money to raise loans to pay the interest on loans it already owes. If that sort of—

Mr Bryce: Wizardry.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —wizardry, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition says, is the order of the day, the Government is incompetent. How can we expect it to understand there needs to be tax justice and equity in this country?

Mr Parker: This Government supports tax avoidance.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Who knows who they will sack—it should be the commissioner. We had the shambles with the water board and it is now the SEC. How often are we told to live within our means? But the SEC is raising charges to pay interest on money previously raised. In America a man tried to do the same thing. He tried to get rich quick by investment. All he did was to try to extend loan raisings so each subsequent loan paid the interest off the previous one. After two years he was put in gaol.

The Opposition believes the Government in this State needs to look to the SEC and its financial operations. Perhaps, as a first step, it should be framing some sensible and intelligent response to this present problem. We believe that the House should take the opportunity presented today to say resoundingly to the Fraser Government that it is time it introduced tax cuts and that it is time it understood that tax cuts of the magnitude of \$17 a week are necessary to restore the proportional burdens borne by different classes of taxpayers, as they exceed 75 per cent, and to prevent taxpayers being driven into higher tax brackets as a result of inflation.

The Government does not show an awareness of the problem and it does not show the willingness

to frame a sensible and intelligent response to the difficulty. The Premier's statement that he does not support restrictive legislation to combat the bottom-of-the-harbour tax avoidance scheme is of great regret to this State.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.54 p.m.]: I second the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition and in so doing I wish to emphasise at the outset that reductions in Commonwealth income tax should be implemented immediately for several very good reasons.

The first and best reason that I can recall and suggest to members is that the Fraser Government has promised on the hustings on no fewer than four separate occasions over the last seven to eight years to reduce the level of income tax. The people of Australia are still waiting for the level of income tax to be reduced. For the last seven years the people of Australia have been fed one line of excuses after another—that it cannot be done just yet.

In this motion today the Opposition argues that the Premier, the Leader of the Government in this part of Australia, has a responsibility to keep Fraser honest.

If we are to believe what so many of the Government back-benchers and front-benchers have had to say in recent weeks about the nation's economic ills being caused by wage and salary earners—to whom they refer as "the greedy"—and if there is any substance in what they say, might I suggest that they prevail upon their own colleagues in Canberra to reduce the level of income tax. This may in some way have an indirect effect upon the level of future wage demands. Cannot they see that it is a logical consequence?

If people's income tax obligations are to continue to rise, their expectations for wage increases will continue to rise. There is no question but that the present situation in regard to the income tax obligations on the shoulders of wage and salary earners feeds wage inflation in this nation.

Another very sound reason for our calling upon this Government to prevail upon its counterpart in Canberra to take action in this way is that by doing so it may help to rectify the massive shift in wealth that has occurred in this community over the last seven years.

Since Fraser has been at the helm of this nation's economic destiny a very deliberate and significant shift in wealth has occurred from low and middle income earners to the top 10 per cent of income earners in this community and, of

course, it has been no accident. It has been a result of a very deliberate set of economic policies and order of economic priorities.

Let me demonstrate what I mean by giving members a few figures: In Australia today one per cent of the population owns 20 per cent of the nation's wealth. The top 10 per cent of income earners in this nation own 60 per cent of the nation's wealth. It is not ironic in the least to realise that that 10 per cent of the population that owns 60 per cent of the nation's wealth spends a good deal of its time, as the Leader of the Opposition has just indicated, employing consultants to evade and avoid the payment of tax. They resent paying tax and so many people in this community who are in that particular category regard themselves as experts on avoiding income tax commitments. In fact, I have heard them discuss these questions in detail and they refer to any of their contemporaries who does, in fact, pay income tax at that level as an economic dill.

We have seen members of the Government back benches in recent days—ranging from the member for Bunbury, and the member for Nedlands, to the member for East Melville—launch a fairly bitter attack on wage and salary earners in this community; they seek to lay the blame for the nation's economic ills at the feet of people who rely on wages and salaries to survive.

Mr Davies: What have they said about interest rates?

Mr BRYCE: What have they said about tax evasion and the dishonest people at the top level of the income range who avoid their economic and moral responsibility to contribute \$7 billion a year to the Commonwealth Consolidated Revenue? They have said nothing.

I will outline the philosophy—the dichotomy—involving the top 10 per cent. So often when people in that top 10 per cent of income earners receive an increase in income, members of that ilk defend the increase on the grounds that it is an incentive to investment. It is described as very worthy indeed. It is an incentive for investment when the top 10 per cent of the population receive income increases, but when the 90 per cent of the nation's income earners who receive less than \$70 000 a year get an increase in their income, the same economic "dries"—the Friedmanite exponents in this place and the National Parliament—describe it as needless greed.

It is needless greed when the 90 per cent of the community who own only 40 per cent of the

nation's wealth receive a pay increase. But it is described by those people to whom I have referred as incentives to investment when the top 10 per cent of the income earning scale receive their fairly significant income increases—often as a result of an income increase, but more often as a result of the avoidance of income tax payments.

The Leader of the Opposition has emphasised that we on this side of the House are more than a little disappointed that the Premier of Western Australia stood alone among the State leaders in disagreeing with the action of the Federal Government which was dragged ever so reluctantly to the point of having to take action to introduce legislation to recover retrospectively a great deal of the tax which is being avoided. Liberal Governments around the country have aided and abetted their faceless friends. They went to the nth degree to protect them.

Mr Fraser and Mr Howard put off the day as long as they possibly could, and if it had not been for the election of the Cain Labor Government in Victoria, it is quite conceivable that the Fraser Government would not have been embarrassed sufficiently to bring in legislation to do something about it. The Premier of this State stands shoulder to shoulder with the element in the Liberal Party across the country that has been so determined to protect its faceless friends. The loopholes in the taxation system have been exploited in a most extraordinary fashion in the last five to seven years. It has reached the point where the tax evasion industry has become a massive industry in its own right. If we examine the path of this nation's economic development since 1974-75, we might fairly reasonably come to the conclusion that the only growth industry in that period of time has been the tax evasion industry.

Mr MacKinnon: Rubbish!

Mr BRYCE: It is the only industry to have grown in leaps and bounds.

Mr MacKinnon: Haven't you heard of the tourist industry?

Mr BRYCE: The Minister should try comparing the degree of growth of the Australian tourist industry and the growth in the tax evasion industry in the last seven years. He would be embarrassed by the reality. Most of the economists or tax experts who have worked on this subject estimate that between \$5 billion and \$7 billion each year is not paid into the national Treasury as a result of tax avoidance and evasion schemes. Let us consider that figure in the context of the size of last year's national Budget. The Federal Government introduced a Budget last

year which involved expenditure estimates of \$42 billion. But \$7 billion is not being paid into the national Treasury in the form of taxation that should be paid by people who certainly can afford to do so. About 1/6th of the national Government's income is being avoided in that way. Let us consider the implications of the most conservative of those two figures—\$5 billion a year—and relate it to a two-year period. Let us relate that figure of \$10 billion to the projects which we are told we simply cannot afford in this community. I refer to the imaginative programmes which we are told cannot go ahead because there is not sufficient money—we cannot afford them. Let us relate them to the question of Western Australia's defence. We have the most naked section of coastline in the world. We have had a succession of national Liberal Governments—

Mr O'Connor: It has a fair bit to do with the reduction of taxation and personal tax!

Mr BRYCE: It has a great deal to do with that indeed. The Premier cannot see the connection at this stage. The Premier should consider what \$10 billion over two years might have done for the defence of this State. I am not suggesting that the whole of the \$10 billion would come to Western Australia.

Mr Clarko: You were not here earlier today when I made that point.

Mr BRYCE: It would not all come to Western Australia, but let us consider the magnitude of that amount of money. For 20 years and for seven or eight Federal elections, the national conservatives have promised Western Australia a defence umbrella of one sort or another. We have been told at the end of each three-year period in office that the nation really could not afford the promises that successive defence Ministers and Prime Ministers made about providing that defence umbrella. Six or seven fully-equipped aircraft carriers with a generous complement of jet aircraft could be bought for \$10 billion.

Mr Coyne: Nonsense. How many aircraft carriers did you say?

Mr BRYCE: I said six or seven. It costs approximately \$1 billion to buy an aircraft carrier, and when a carrier is equipped generously with jet aircraft, it may be \$1.3 billion. The cost varies enormously. I am not going to estimate it in more detail.

Mr Coyne: What about their base facilities?

Mr BRYCE: The member can subtract from that actual number if he wishes. I am making the point in terms of hardware alone.

Mr Clarko: Do you think we should spend more then?

Mr BRYCE: I certainly think we should be spending more if the Minister can arrange to collect the money from his friends who are avoiding the taxation they should be paying. For generations members of the Liberal Party have been saying, "We cannot afford it. Where is the money coming from?" The answer is quite simple—it would come from the people who contribute quite generously to the Liberal Party and who make it possible for the Liberal Party to go to the hustings. Perhaps members opposite may not be satisfied with aircraft carriers; they may like to consider something else. The amount of money which should be paid by these tax evaders would provide 40 submarines to defend the Western Australian coastline. In the case of this year alone, the promises of 22 years could have been met. For 22 years the people sitting opposite us have promised us a defence umbrella and at the end of each three-year term we have been told that this umbrella cannot be afforded.

Mr O'Connor: Are you saying that personal tax should be reduced?

Mr BRYCE: There is a very good basis for such an action and if the Premier cannot see the connection, we feel very sorry for him. We have not been able to afford a proper defence system because the faceless friends of members opposite have been avoiding their responsibilities.

Mr O'Connor: This motion relates to the reduction of personal income tax.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier's friends in Canberra have not been able to reduce income tax for precisely the same reason; that is, certain select sections of the community have been able to avoid meeting their responsibilities.

Mr Young: The people to whom you are referring do not happen to be friends of ours.

Mr Parker: What about Dennis Horgan, the chairman of the Liberal Party finance committee?

Mr Young: You ought to read the motion—you are so far away from it it is not funny.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order! I ask the member for Ascot to resume his seat. When I call for order I expect everyone to take notice. The member for Ascot is endeavouring to pursue a certain line in his speech, and I will not tolerate cross-Chamber interjections which are in complete defiance of my request.

Mr BRYCE: I am a little surprised that the Premier cannot see the logical connection between these two very important factors relating to the

nation's taxation system. Firstly, we have heard an endless string of promises from the Premier and from his colleagues in Canberra that the level of income tax would be reduced. Those promises have not been kept. Secondly, there is the obvious need to put an end to tax evasion in this country. If the Premier cannot see the connection between these two important factors, he is not entitled to occupy the position of Treasurer of this State and Leader of the Government. There is an umbilical connection between them.

On many occasions the Federal Government has said that it cannot afford the tax cuts it has promised because of the people in this community who do not accept their responsibilities and pay the taxation they should be paying. It was a practical, legitimate, and logical exercise on my part to remind the Premier about something in this community which is just as important as taxation. The promises made in regard to defence have not been kept.

Mr Clarko: Are you supporting guns rather than butter?

Mr BRYCE: If the Minister is of the opinion that the end of taxation evasion will mean that his friends who have been avoiding tax will have to go without butter, I inform him that a short period without butter for some of these people might be acceptable.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the work of Professor Russell Mathews, one of the most respected and highly regarded experts in this nation.

Mr I. F. Taylor: He is described by the Prime Minister as a brilliant tax analyst.

Mr BRYCE: Professor Mathews tendered his professional advice to Governments, both Liberal and Labor, at national level. Certainly he has given a great deal of advice to the Fraser Government, and in a recent article entitled "The structure of taxation in Australia", Professor Russell Mathews made the observation that the top five per cent of Australian income earners are today paying taxation as a matter of choice. Whether or not they pay taxation depends upon their consciences. As I have indicated already, the individual who does decide to pay tax because his conscience compels him to accept his moral obligation is regarded as an economic or financial dill by his peer group. It is a fairly extraordinary state of affairs.

Mr Young: When was that written? I do not mean when it was published.

Mr BRYCE: To the best of my knowledge, within the last couple of years.

Mr Young: That is right, and do you know that all those loopholes have been closed by Howard?

Mr BRYCE: That is not true.

Mr Young: That is absolutely true. Every loophole that existed has been closed. Name one that is still in existence.

Mr Brian Burke: There is \$900 million still owing.

Mr I. F. Taylor: The Commissioner of Taxation says that \$900 million has not been paid.

Mr Young: They have all been closed.

Mr BRYCE: As a former tax accountant, is the Minister seriously alleging that all the loopholes have been closed? I concede that work has been done to close some of them.

Mr Young: Not just that work has been done—every one has been closed.

Mr BRYCE: The Minister is the first individual in this nation to make that assertion.

Mr Young: Name one.

Mr BRYCE: The Minister knows very well that variations of the bottom-of-the-harbour schemes are emerging already before the legislation to close them off has been passed.

Mr Young: I want to point out to the House that you are fabricating the story. Howard has done more than anyone else to close spurious and specious loopholes in the taxation laws.

Mr BRYCE: Perhaps I may be allowed to quote Professor Mathews' comments.

Mr Young: Find out the date he wrote it.

Mr BRYCE: It was certainly within the last two years, although I do not have a note of the exact date. I believe it was written within the last 12 months.

In the article, Professor Mathews makes the point in fairly basic language. On pages 30 and 31, he says the following about the taxation system—

... the system gave preference to foreign taxpayers over Australian residents redistributed income from the poor to the rich, consciously discriminated against wage and salary earners and provided a major stimulus to wage inflation and industrial conflict.

That does not come from somebody who could be described as a biased, political, partisan individual. Those words were written by the man described by Prime Minister Fraser as "a brilliant tax analyst". He has laid it on the line in that way.

Professor Mathews made the point also that in this day and age the top five per cent of the nation's income earners pay their income tax as a matter of choice.

Mr Young: In that day and age, not in this day and age.

Mr BRYCE: It is interesting to discover one political individual in this nation who is so naive that he believes all the tax loopholes have been plugged. He would be the only person—

Mr Mensaros: He did not say "all". He said "all known ones".

Mr BRYCE: He said all of them.

Mr Young: I said all of the known ones.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Oh, that is different. Now you are back tracking.

Mr Young: I said "all" four times. You can check *Hansard*.

Mr BRYCE: What is of concern in that observation by Professor Russell Mathews is that he made the point that the top five per cent of the nation pay income tax as a matter of choice, when the pensioners of this country no longer have a choice. We have reached the position where, because the top 10 per cent of the nation's income tax earners are shirking their responsibility, an ever-increasing number of pensioners in the community are, for the first time in the nation's history, having to pay income tax because their levels of income have reached the old basic "commence to pay income tax" scale level. We now have 200 000 pensioners in the nation who pay income tax, while the top five per cent of earners pay income tax as a matter of choice.

Mr Young: That includes Lang Hancock—people who are over 71 are entitled to a pension.

Mr BRYCE: What a red herring that is! Are there really 200 000 Lang Hancocks in Western Australia, or Australia for that matter?

The point is that as a result of the Liberal Party's negligence on the one hand, and its deliberate manipulation of the taxation system on the other, we have reached the point at which we have seen a massive transfer of wealth from people on the very lowest and most modest incomes, who are forced to pay taxation and who have no means of avoiding that taxation, to the very wealthiest section of the community. Of course, it is possible that the Liberal Party of Australia may have gotten away with that for a long time, had the economic circumstances of the 1960s continued well into the 1980s.

What is bringing the Liberal Party undone? What is causing the people across the nation to

question the ethics of how that taxation system has been administered? The answer is, basically, the realisation that we have fallen upon economic hard times. In economic hard times, it is almost a natural human inclination for people to look askance at "bludgers"—people who are not carrying their fair share of the burden. That is precisely what has happened.

In this motion, we are, in fact, calling upon the Premier to bring some pressure to bear on his colleagues in Canberra to relieve the burden on the 90 per cent of Australians who earn less than \$70 000 a year, and to reduce the level of income tax by providing for the tax cuts which on no fewer than four separate occasions over the last seven years have been promised on the hustings by the Prime Minister.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [4.25 p.m.]: When speaking initially on this motion, the Leader of the Opposition was both inaccurate and misleading in the comments he made regarding myself. While his oratory was all right, his substance and sincerity were totally lacking. I want to bring forward the facts in connection with this point.

I have never said that the people breaking the law ought not be brought to task. As a matter of fact, I believe they ought to be brought to task. If people are breaking the law and avoiding taxation, we should do whatever we can to make sure that the position is rectified.

What does worry me is the problem of the people who have abided by the law and who could be affected should the legislation be made retrospective. I am referring to the innocent people. I have made it clear at all times that if there are loopholes in the law, we should plug those holes. We should make it impossible for people to evade tax. However, many people have avoided tax and operated according to the law, and have invested the money they have retained in industry and in employing people. If we made the law retrospective, people would become upset and say that a small industry has gone bankrupt because we made the legislation retrospective, to make lawful what somebody did lawfully some two, three, or five years ago.

Mr Parker: So you are supporting tax avoidance in Australia, because that is precisely what they are doing.

Mr O'CONNOR: What about the employees? The innocent employees working for the companies could lose their jobs because of retrospective legislation.

Mr Brian Burke: Don't you realise that these companies were sold? We are not talking about companies that persisted. They were sold.

Mr O'CONNOR: Would the Leader of the Opposition deny that in some cases the people who are affected would be innocent people?

Mr I. F. Taylor: The companies were sold on 27 June.

Mr Brian Burke: The first point is that you are not talking about employees because Tremog, for example, was sold; then it was sold on to people who did not exist. The second point is that it may be possible to say that people were unaware of the situation. I do not know; but what is true is that they did not pay tax that they should have paid. Even if they were unaware of the facts, I am saying simply that they should pay what they were due to pay.

Mr O'CONNOR: In every case, if a person should pay a tax, the law has tried to see that he does.

Mr Brian Burke: I agree with you. The point we make is that you should go back and retrospectively take the tax off them.

Mr O'CONNOR: And bring in innocent people, in some cases, who have obeyed the law. That is the point with which I disagree.

Mr Brian Burke: I am not saying they break the law. What I am saying is that they paid no tax, when they should have.

Mr O'CONNOR: What I said before, and what I say again—and I hope that the Opposition agrees with me at this stage—is that if there are loopholes in the law, they should be plugged. I will do whatever I can to assist in that regard. However, I do have concern for the innocent people who may have acted according to the law, and the people who are working for them who could find themselves without a job. I am quite sure that members of the Opposition are as concerned about that aspect as I.

Mr Parker: What about a guy like Dennis Horgan?

Mr O'CONNOR: That is why I have said very clearly that I will support, in any way I can, the plugging of the loopholes in the law; but in connection with retrospectivity, I have grave doubts. In many ways it can affect people who are innocent. It can affect the jobs of a number of people who otherwise would have jobs.

Mr Parker: Would Dennis Horgan be innocent? He has certainly been shown to be a tax avoider. The McCabe-Lafranchi report shows him to be a tax avoider.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have no wish to sit the Premier down, but we do have an arrangement that questions will be taken at 4.30 p.m.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr O'CONNOR: Fair enough.

Leave to Continue Speech

Mr O'CONNOR: I seek leave to continue my speech at a later stage of this sitting.

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS*Extension*

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Premier) [5.00 p.m.]: In view of the reduced time available today for private members' business, I have made arrangements for private members' business to take precedence over Government business until lunchtime tomorrow.

House adjourned at 5.01 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**LAND: CROWN***Auction*

951. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Further to question 892 of 1982 on what basis does the Government continue to maintain the legal requirement that residential blocks of Crown land made available at auction, but remaining unsold 12 months after the date of the auction, are withdrawn from the market?
- (2) Is the Government considering an amendment to the Land Act in order to overcome the requirements of section 41A?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (3) The purpose of the provisions of section 41A of the Land Act is to make it necessary to review release conditions

and pricing from time to time and to provide an opportunity to meet any demand from Government or semi-Government Authorities.

However, it is my current view that there should be an ability to withdraw land from sale and make such reviews at any appropriate time, or leave the land on the market if its price and conditions of sale remain suitable.

Section 41A is being examined as part of a total review of the Land Act.

HEALTH: MINERS*Silicotic: Lump Sum*

1000. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) With respect to the widows of silicotic miners, are those widows who have a lump sum invested on their behalf by the Public Trustee able to claim that lump sum in full to be used or invested in accordance with their own needs?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) While the lump sum is held by the Public Trustee, is a widow able to include in her will her wishes as to the dispersal of that lump sum on her death?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) Is the Minister aware that widows are liable to pay income tax on the interest earned by the Public Trustee on the lump sum but have no say or influence on the investment of such funds?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Yes. The widow is at liberty to apply for all or part of the trust funds invested on her behalf and funds may be released with the approval of the manager of the commission.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) Yes.

EDUCATION*School of the Air*

1001. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that year four School of the Air students are unable to obtain urgently needed English set books past set 10?

(2) If "Yes"—

- (a) why is the Education Department unable to obtain and despatch the books;
- (b) when will the books be available to the students?

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (1) and (2) Sets 11 and 12 of the year four English lesson books have been despatched this week to School of the Air students.

1002. *This question was postponed.*

FUEL AND ENERGY

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd. and Western Collieries Ltd.

1003. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Further to question 925 of 1982 relevant to the contract signed on 21 December 1978 with the Griffin Coal Mining Company, did the contract actually relate to itself or the contract for the supply of coal to the State Energy Commission?
- (2) With respect to his answer to parts (3) and (4) of question 925 relevant to the supply of coal by Western Collieries to the State Energy Commission, if no agreement is reached later this year, is he aware of the situation that will occur at Collie in connection with the opening of a new underground mine to replace Western No. 2?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) The purport of the question is not known or understood. If the member will please clarify the information he is seeking, I will provide details.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Station: Kwinana

1004. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) In reference to question 923 of 1982 relevant to the temporary use of gas at Kwinana power station and his stated

inability to give costs of same, has not the State Energy Commission already partly costed the relative usage of coal and gas?

- (2) If "Yes", would he please so inform the Parliament?
- (3) If "No" to (1), why then did the State Energy Commission not obtain this information prior to taking a decision to temporarily burn gas at Kwinana power station?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The total relative cost of gas and coal used at Kwinana power station is a complex matter involving evaluation of the relative capital, fuel and operating costs using the alternative fuels, taking into account committed capital works and the prospective capital works programmes for varying levels of use of each fuel in the commission's generating system. Use of gas provides the opportunity for reduced capital expenditure by deferring new power plant works as the full capacity of the existing power plant at Kwinana can be used without the present penalty of high cost for fuel oil. Taken overall, use of some gas at Kwinana will effect savings in power generation cost during the second half of this decade.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Dampier-Wagerup

1005. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Subject to final negotiations, who are expected to be the prime contractors for the construction of the Dampier to Wagerup natural gas pipeline?
- (2) Are Western Australian, or Australian, subcontractors to be involved in operations associated with its construction?
- (3) If so, what estimated proportion will be the supply of equipment and services from Western Australian, or Australian, companies?
- (4) What procedures are followed by which all of the various tenderers, both prime contractors and subcontractors, are assessed?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) As announced, negotiations for the construction works are proceeding between Saipem Australia Pty. Ltd. and ICC Construction Co. Ltd.

Saipem Australia Pty. Ltd., a subsidiary of the leading international pipeline contractors, Saipem SPA of Milan, successfully completed in Australia the Dongara to Perth natural gas pipeline, Moomba to Adelaide natural gas pipeline, and a large section of the Moomba to Sydney natural gas pipeline, during the past 15 years. Saipem Australia Pty. Ltd. is the recommended tenderer for the northern section of the pipeline, and this section would be assigned to the joint venture if the Government approves the arrangements being negotiated.

ICC Construction Co. Ltd., a subsidiary of the Kukje Group of South Korea, has 20 years of major construction experience in domestic and overseas projects, and ICC Construction Co. Ltd. is currently working on gas and oil pipeline projects in the Middle East. ICC Construction Co. Ltd. has also recently signed a preliminary agreement with the Western Australian Government for the carrying out of feasibility studies for a major coal power station at Bunbury, and the installation of a new gas turbine plant to supply electricity for a proposed aluminium smelter in the south-west of the State, in which it is negotiating a significant equity interest.

- (2) No detailed subcontracting arrangements have been made at this time for other than the northern section of the pipeline construction, but extensive use of Western Australian subcontractors is anticipated by the joint venture, in line with the Government's policy of promoting the use of local goods, services and labour to the maximum possible extent. Other Australian firms may participate in the subcontracted work where the particular skills or services required so dictate. All subcontractors are subject to approval by the State Energy Commission and the Western Australian Government.

- (3) For the northern section of the pipeline construction, Saipem Australia Pty. Ltd., and now the joint venture, have indicated that they would propose to subcontract 81 per cent of the value of the contract to Western Australian subcontractors and suppliers for the provision of materials, equipment and services, a further 10 per cent of the value of the contract to Australian—other than Western Australian—subcontractors and suppliers, with the proviso that the prices at which the goods and services are offered be competitive.

It may reasonably be expected that similar percentages will apply to the remainder of the pipeline construction.

Elements of the pipeline construction for which Western Australian organisations are expected to provide most, if not all, the goods and services required are—

- civil works (some 40 per cent of contract value)
- transport (some five per cent of contract value)
- catering
- accommodation
- aircraft charter
- cathodic protection
- consumables (e.g. welding electrodes and gas)
- vehicles and heavy equipment (purchase or rental).

- (4) For the northern section of the pipeline construction, the work was tendered in line with the State Energy Commission's normal practice.

Tender evaluations were performed in great detail by the commission and their principal consultants—Fluor/Maunsell, giving full attention to the technical, contractual and financial aspects. Details of each tenderer's construction plant proposal were assessed against details of the construction plan developed by Fluor/Maunsell and approved by the commission. Interviews were held with tenderers to clarify all aspects of their tenders.

Fluor/Maunsell, through their worldwide organisation, checked on critical information contained in the tenders to verify tenderers' claims.

Western Australian and Australian subcontractors named in the tenders were investigated on the basis of the commission's and the principal consultants' knowledge of the organisations.

All areas of cost exposure were investigated by the commission's principal consultants, and detailed assessments of their probable and possible effects were made, with a view to achieving maximum control of the final cost of pipeline construction.

Finally, the commission, in close consultation with its principal consultants, made a determination of the facts before it as to which tenderer was most likely to successfully complete the work on schedule.

1006. *This question was postponed.*

FERTILISER: SUPERPHOSPHATE

Transport

1007. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Are farmers who reside in the West Pemberton area able to cart superphosphate from the Picton Junction works by road in their own trucks?
- (2) Are these same farmers able to employ carriers to transport superphosphate by road from the Picton Junction works to the West Pemberton area?
- (3) What is the reason for any difference in the policy which applies to each of the above situations?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes, provided that the superphosphate is for use on his own farm.
- (2) No.
- (3) Exemption from licensing Nos. 31 and 31A under the Transport Act, which allows a primary producer to transport in his own vehicle his own produce and supplies in respect of his own farming operations was introduced to give due recognition to the fact that a primary producer, by the nature of his occupation, must be in possession of a farm vehicle.

As such, in addition to the use of such a vehicle for "feeding" rail, there would be those occasions on which a producer would need to go to his nearest regional centre or Perth and in order to gain maximum utilisation of the vehicle, the exemption from licensing under the Act was introduced.

As a primary producer is restricted to transporting his own requirements, and as such is under limitations as to the quantity of goods he is able to transport, there is a clear distinction here between a primary producer and a commercial carrier who transports goods for anybody who required his services.

The Government is committed to the progressive implementation of a competitive transport policy to give users more freedom to choose the system they want. We have recently introduced the third stage of our land freight policy which deregulates the transport of general goods from 1 July 1982 and also grants farmers an exemption from licensing for transport of their own wool, mohair and chaff in their own vehicles. These initiatives are a significant forward step for the new freight policy.

As implementation proceeds the temptation which must be resisted is the desire for even faster and greater deregulation before the States transport has adapted to the freedoms which have been introduced. As low transport costs are the Government's objective, the deregulation process cannot be permitted to prompt a wholesale rejection of railways as the main provider of so much of primary industry's needs.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Camballin Project: ALCO

1008. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development.

- (1) Is the Camballin Farms project ALCO on a care and management basis at the present time?
- (2) Is the project in the hands of a receiver?
- (3) Is it intended that unsecured small creditors will receive payment, and, if so, within what period of time?

- (4) (a) If the receivers do not intend to meet the unsecured accounts of small creditors, does the Government intend to assist these creditors; and

(b) if so, in what way and to what extent?

- (5) If the receivers and the Government do not propose to meet the accounts of small assured creditors, what redress to recover such debts are available to these people?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The term used by the receiver is "care and maintenance".

(2) Yes.

- (3) All amounts outstanding to wages personnel have been paid. Others are being considered.

(4) and (5) See (3) above.

1009 and 1010. *These questions were postponed.*

HOUSING

Funds: Federal and other Sources

1011. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What was the level of funding received by the Western Australian Government for housing from the Federal Government in each of the past five years?

- (2) What amount of funds from other sources has been received by the Western Australian Government in each of the past five years?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) The following funds were made available by the Federal Government to the State Housing Commission for purposes of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, the Aboriginal Housing Scheme, and the Armed Services Housing Agreement—

	(\$'000s)
1977-78	41.319
1978-79	35.600
1979-80	31.107
1980-81	31.693
1981-82	27.944

- (2) Considerable research is required to answer this question and I will write to the member when the information is to hand.

HOSPITAL AND NURSING POST

Northcliffe

1012. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Following the erection of a new hospital building/nursing post at Northcliffe, is it proposed to dispose of the existing hospital building?

(2) If "Yes"—

(a) how will it be disposed of;

(b) when is it proposed to take action to dispose of it?

- (3) Will the Manjimup Shire Council be given favourable priority consideration in acquiring this building for community use?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) Yes.

- (2) (a) The building will pass to the Public Works Department for assessment as how best it may be disposed of.

(b) After the new facility is commissioned towards the end of September 1982.

- (3) The member may be assured that due consideration will be given by the Government to a request by the Manjimup Shire Council to acquire the old building.

1013. *This question was postponed.*

TOURISM

Manjimup

1014. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) What was the value of tourism to the Manjimup region in each of the past two years?

- (2) Precisely how is the value of tourism to a region calculated?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Estimated tourist expenditure for the Shire of Manjimup—

1980	1981
\$3.5m	\$3.9m.

- (2) Tourist expenditure estimates are calculated by the Department of Tourism from information supplied by—

Australian Bureau of Statistics
Tourist Accommodation Survey;

The Domestic Tourism Monitor (a joint project undertaken by all State and Territory Departments of Tourism);

Western Australian Department of Tourism surveys.

GRAIN

Charges and Tolls

1015. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the charge per tonne made by Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., for the handling and storage of grain in Western Australia?
- (2) What tolls are levied by Co-operative Bulk Handling against farmers in Western Australia?
- (3) What are the charges made by the other grain handling authorities in Australia for similar services?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) and (3)

HANDLING CHARGES

1981-82 SEASON

\$ per tonne

	W.A.	N.S.W.	Victoria	Q'ld	S.A.
Wheat	11.67	14.40	10.35	16.00	11.35
Barley	14.01	14.40	11.00	12.50	10.25
					(plus wharfage and belt charge of \$2 per tonne approx.)
Oats	14.01	14.40	11.00	—	11.35
					(plus wharfage and belt charge of \$2 per tonne approx.)

(2)

CBH TOLLS

1981-82 SEASON

\$ PER TONNE

	Foundation Toll	Port Equipment Toll
Wheat	1.11	0.73
Barley	1.33	0.88
Oats	1.66	1.10

TIMBER

Royalty Rates

1016. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What is the current royalty rate charged by the Forests Department for—
 - (a) karri sawlogs;
 - (b) jarrah sawlogs;
 - (c) woodchip logs;
 - (d) pine thinnings?

(2) What royalty rates for timber are charged by the Governments of South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland for—

- (a) saw logs;
- (b) woodchip material?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) (a) The net royalty rate for karri sawlogs varies with locality and ranges from \$9.58 to \$11.18 per cubic metre.
- (b) The net royalty rate for jarrah sawlogs varies with locality and ranges from \$9.08 to \$14.78 per cubic metre.
- (c) The net royalty rate for marri chiplogs is \$3.15 per cubic metre.
- (d) The royalty rates charged for pine thinnings vary with class of logs, location and species. Representative rates per cubic metre for particle-board logs are \$4.13 to \$4.96, for case logs \$6.46 and for mill logs \$20.09 to \$21.52.
- (2) Direct comparison of royalty values with other States is difficult. However, hardwood sawlog royalty rates in Western Australia are generally comparable to those in New South Wales and Victoria and somewhat higher than those in Queensland and Tasmania. Softwood sawlog royalty rates in Western Australia are similar to those in South Australia.

CO-OPERATIVE BULK HANDLING LTD.

Shares

1017. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the total number of shares which Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. initially had to issue to growers?
- (2) How many growers hold shares at the present time?
- (3) How many shares has Co-operative Bulk Handling purchased back from ex-growers, and holds at this time?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) In 1943 when CBH was transferred to growers, 7 501 shares were issued; i.e. one share per grower.
- (2) 11 749
- (3) 3 760.

LIQUOR: LICENSING COURT

Quiz Nights

1018. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Has the Licensing Court issued any recent "tightening up" instructions regarding fund raising quiz nights being held on licensed premises?
- (2) If so, what motivated such action?
- (3) Would the Chief Secretary table a copy of such instructions?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.

1019. *This question was postponed.*

SLIPWAY

Maylands

1020. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Who owns the slipyards in Hardy Road, Maylands?
- (2) Is she aware of the continuous noise from grinding steel and sand blasting as well as the fumes and smoke from burning metal and rubbish which are causing much distress to residents of the street?
- (3) Is it a fact that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is concerned about the operation of the slipyards and has, as a consequence, applied the following conditions—
 - (a) All buildings on site not essential for the continued operation of the slipyards to be demolished, those buildings remaining to be made safe and to be renovated. Any new structures or buildings required to conform to an approved building code;
 - (b) All parking areas and accessways to be properly marked out and suitably constructed;
 - (c) The site to be suitably screened and/or fenced around the land perimeter;

- (d) A landscape plan for the whole site to be prepared and approved. Such a landscape plan should attempt to soften built structures, screening, etc., attempt to improve the view of the site from the river and integrate the slipyard with adjacent landscape;
- (e) All derelict boats, unused materials and equipment to be removed;
- (f) An adequate amenities block, or similar facility, to be provided;
- (g) Compliance with all health and noise requirements in respect of sandblasting and all other activities?

- (4) Is she aware of the distress being caused to a resident in the area, who is dying, and to that resident's husband?
- (5) Has Mr J. Glover of the City of Stirling written to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority a letter dated 18 June 1982, and to which no reply has been received?
- (6) If so, why has no reply been forthcoming?
- (7) Is it a fact that there have been a number of breaches of the indenture entered into dated 1 May 1981?
- (8) If "Yes" to (2) to (7), what urgent action will the Government take to remedy this state of affairs?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.
- (2) I understand that there have been some complaints from residents in the area.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No.
- (5) Reply posted on 10 August 1982.
- (6) See (5).
- (7) Yes.
- (8) The present tenant is seriously ill and the MRPA is now negotiating for the premises to be re-leased.

INCOME TAX

Avoidance and Evasion

1021. Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Is it his intention to extend the new neighbourhood watch scheme principle by inviting employees and others to inform the appropriate authorities of taxation avoidance and evasion practices which come to their knowledge?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The concept of the neighbourhood watch pilot scheme to be introduced in Bunbury is to assist police in their fight against crime in suburban areas. It can be expected also to lead to greater public vigilance towards all crime, and encourage co-operation which will benefit all citizens and assist the police to more effectively carry out their duties.

Taxation avoidance is a Commonwealth issue and the Federal Treasurer is constantly on the alert for any taxation avoidance schemes.

REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Consumer Affairs and Labour and Industry Statistics

1022. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

- (1) Is there a standard basis for the collection and analysis of statistics on labour and industry and consumer affairs matters in regional administration offices throughout the State?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1), could he provide a detailed comparison of such statistics for each of the regional administration offices in—

- (a) Albany;
- (b) Bunbury;
- (c) Geraldton;
- (d) Karratha; and
- (e) Kalgoorlie,

over each of the past three years?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Formal records were not considered necessary under the previous departmental administration.
- (3) Not applicable.

TRANSPORT: BUS

Westfield Shopping Town

1023. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Transport:

What action has been taken to provide a bus service for Westfield shopping town following my presentation in this 1982

session of a petition containing 1 000 signatures calling for such a service?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

I am advised consideration has been given by the MTT to extending the existing route to the Westfield Shopping Town but that at present the existing route is adequate for the population it serves. However, I have asked the MTT to continue to monitor the situation.

GAMBLING: CASINOS

Illegal: Police Raids

1024. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

- (1) In what years did gambling at each of the following establishments first come to the notice of the police—
 - (a) Il Trovatore;
 - (b) Club 27;
 - (c) Gingers;
 - (d) The Roma Club;
 - (e) The Patris Club;
 - (f) The International Club?
- (2) In what years were each of the establishments first raided by the police?
- (3) How many times have each of the establishments been raided by the police and what were the dates of the raids?
- (4) Who are the registered owners of each of the premises in question?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) From records held, it has been established that the undermentioned clubs were first deemed to be common gaming houses by police court conviction in the years set out below:

(a) Il Trovatore	1967
(b) Club 27	1973
(c) Gingers Club	1973
(d) The Roma Club	1971
(e) The Patris Club	1974
(f) The International Club	1968
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Different proprietors.
- (4) Dates of execution of warrants on Perth Clubs prosecuted under section 86 of the Police Act—keeping gaming house—

GINGERS CLUB

240 William Street, Perth.

9-07-73
11-06-74
10-09-74

27-10-74
 14-06-75
 28-02-76
 4-07-76
 28-10-76
 24-01-77
 30-04-77
 8-08-77
 20-11-77
 22-02-78
 29-07-78
 5-09-78
 10-12-78
 31-03-79
 3-07-79
 17-10-79
 13-01-80
 24-04-80
 1-08-80
 1-11-80
 12-02-81
 8-05-81
 16-08-81
 4-12-81
 12-02-82
 7-05-82
 31-07-82 TOTAL 30
PATRIS CLUB
 71 James Street, Perth.
 28-09-74
 9-08-75
 2-05-76
 15-10-77
 10-09-78
 9-05-79
 29-11-79
 3-04-80
 18-09-80
 6-02-81
 23-07-81
 26-11-81
 9-03-82
 26-05-82 TOTAL 14
CLUB 27
 Cnr. Lake & James Streets, Perth.
 7-05-73
 2-10-73
 27-07-75
 3-04-76
 15-10-76
 10-12-76
 8-01-77
 10-08-77
 19-11-77
 11-03-78
 12-08-78
 19-11-78

11-03-78
 26-07-79
 31-10-79
 12-02-80
 13-05-80
 15-12-80
 14-03-81
 28-06-81
 24-09-81
 9-12-81
 13-01-82
 6-05-82
 21-07-82 TOTAL 25

IL TROVATORE CLUB
 174 James Street, Perth.
 11-04-57
 28-07-58
 1-07-59
 21-01-69
 3-02-70
 5-05-70
 27-07-70
 27-10-70
 12-12-70
 15-03-71
 18-05-71
 28-08-71
 4-08-73
 20-10-73
 19-02-74
 10-06-74
 17-03-75
 5-10-75
 25-03-76
 3-07-76
 20-10-76
 14-07-77
 27-10-77
 6-01-78
 29-04-78
 6-08-78
 30-10-78
 21-01-79
 26-05-79
 21-09-79
 11-11-80
 17-04-80
 24-07-80
 28-11-80
 7-03-81
 16-08-81
 15-09-81
 23-11-81
 29-01-82
 7-04-82
 12-07-82 TOTAL 41

INTERNATIONAL CLUB

91 James Street, Perth.

3-06-68
 27-10-69
 18-05-70
 10-10-70
 6-03-71
 3-09-73
 10-12-73
 9-12-74
 24-01-76
 30-06-77
 25-05-78
 27-01-79
 18-08-79
 17-01-80
 21-05-80
 7-10-80
 17-02-81
 4-06-81
 26-10-81
 25-02-82
 2-06-82 TOTAL 21

ROMA CLUB

155 James Street, Perth.

20-12-71
 22-09-73
 6-08-75
 10-09-76
 16-01-77
 8-05-77
 9-11-77
 21-04-78
 10-09-78
 6-02-79
 9-09-79
 23-01-80
 2-03-80
 18-08-80
 6-01-81
 10-04-81
 18-07-81
 19-11-81
 8-02-82
 5-06-82 TOTAL 20

RECREATION
Grants: Greenough

1025. Mr COWAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Recreation:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that details of the Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation grants for sporting clubs in shires within the Greenough electorate were published in *The Geraldton Guardian* on 22 July 1982?

- (2) Is it a fact that the information on the grants was supplied to *The Geraldton Guardian* by a Liberal Party candidate?
 (3) How was the information conveyed to the candidate?
 (4) Was it conveyed to any members of Parliament representing the area?
 (5) Were any members of Parliament representing the area given the information in preference to others?
 (6) If so, why?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) According to the statement in the newspaper.
 (3) Mr Peter Browne, the Liberal Party candidate for Upper West Province, requested details of any funds supplied by the Western Australian Government in the area of interest to him, and these were forwarded to him on 14 July 1982.
 (4) Yes, on 16 May 1982 and Press releases were published in *The Geraldton Guardian* on 20 May 1982.
 (5) The information was supplied to the Hon. M. McAleer, M.L.C. and Mr R. Tubby M.L.A.
 (6) These two members had approached the Minister for Recreation for assistance for the various sports and youth organisations within their electorates.

1026. *This question was postponed.*

HEALTH: HEARING CONSERVATION
Regulations

1027. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Health:

Referring to question 829 of 1982 regarding regulations relating to hearing conservation, can he give the present position regarding promulgation please?

Mr YOUNG replied:

There has been considerable progress. A second draft of the regulations from the Crown Law Department is receiving special consideration by the Noise and Vibration Control Council.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Mrs Catherine Veronica Finlay

1028. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Can he confirm that his department is involved in any way in court action

against Mrs Catherine Veronica Finlay from Victoria who is currently on a visit to Perth with her son Brendan?

- (2) Why have officers of his department been involved in apparent harassment of Mrs Finlay when she has full custody rights to her son?
- (3) Is he aware that her son's placement at Bridgewater has prevented Mrs Finlay from returning to her home in Melbourne and forces her to pay for accommodation in Perth for an extended period out of her widow's pension?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) to (3) I am only prepared at this time, if authorised in writing by Mrs Finlay personally, to write to the member directly regarding the circumstances of this family.

HEALTH

Mrs Catherine Veronica Finlay

1029. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Can he confirm whether or not any officer of the Mental Health Services was involved in issuing an order for Mrs Catherine Veronica Finlay to be confined in Graylands Hospital on 7 July 1982?
- (2) On what grounds was Mrs Finlay confined in Graylands Hospital, and who was responsible for certifying that she be so confined?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) and (2) I am surprised that the member for Dianella is prepared to canvass the private details of a mental health patient in a public forum.
I have no intention of providing this personal information in public.
If Mrs Finlay authorises me, in writing, to provide the information to the member for Dianella, I will write him a letter forthwith explaining the circumstances of Mrs Finlay's case.

POLICE

Mrs Catherine Veronica Finlay

1030. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

- (1) Can he confirm that police officers were involved in the apprehension of Mrs

Catherine Veronica Finlay at the Town Lodge motel, South Perth, on 7 July 1982?

- (2) If "Yes", can he also confirm that the same police officers took Mrs Finlay to police headquarters and from there to Graylands Hospital?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), on what authority was Mrs Finlay apprehended and taken to Graylands Hospital?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) to (3) I am not inclined to give particulars of the circumstances of Mrs Finlay's case in a public forum.
If the member for Dianella contacts me I am prepared to discuss the matter with him on a confidential basis.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MINISTER OF THE CROWN: MINISTER FOR RECREATION

Newspaper Advertisements: Overspending, and Incorrect Information

368. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it his intention to take some action to inquire into or to restrict the activities of the Chief Secretary, Minister for Cultural Affairs, and Minister for Recreation who, I understand, has vastly overspent his department's advertising budget, has advertised wrong information in many of the advertisements he has had inserted in the Press, and has directed his department to insert his photograph in advertisements, and in some cases in the wrong advertisements?
- (2) Does he think it appropriate in times of financial stringency to ask the Minister to stay within his budget and to give the correct information to people?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) If the Leader of the Opposition has any information in connection with incorrect information in advertisements, I would be happy to receive it. My understanding is that the Minister's total budget for that department is not overspent at all, although it may be in certain sections.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Preference to Unionists

369. Mr NANOVIICH, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Premier seen the article on page 6 of this evening's edition of the *Daily News* in which the Leader of the Opposition is reported to have said that the stage had been set for confrontation when the Government abolished the preference clauses?
- (2) Was this the Government's reason for abolishing those clauses?
- (3) If not, will he give details?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) I have seen the article referred to and I make it very clear that we are not set for confrontation with the unions in any way at all. We would like the unions, industry, and everyone else to abide by the law. What we are trying to do is to make sure we protect individuals in the way they ought to be protected from any organisation, operation, or union boss. We are not anxious to have confrontation. We want to get on and get things done in this country. If we can receive co-operation from these organisations and get back to work and on with the job, it will be great for the economy of this State.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Interest Payments

370. Mr GRILL, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is he aware that the SEC is paying before-interest charges of 130 per cent on its net operating surplus?
- (2) Is he further aware that no other power utility in the nation is living beyond its means in the way the SEC apparently is?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

TRAFFIC

Rossmoyne

371. Mr WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that residents of Rossmoyne wishing to enter Leach

Highway and travel west, in particular to connect with the Kwinana Freeway, have no controlled access to the freeway?

- (2) Following the installation of traffic lights at the Karel Avenue-Leach Highway intersection, does the Main Roads Department propose extending this intersection across Leach Highway into Rossmoyne?
- (3) If so, when?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What provision is being made by the Main Roads Department to provide controlled access to Leach Highway for residents of Rossmoyne?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

It is assumed the member is referring to access via an intersection under traffic control signals when he uses the term "controlled access" in his question. My answer is as follows—

- (1) Yes, but traffic wishing to make a right turn into Leach Highway is able to do so under traffic control signals at Leach Highway-Barbican Street West, Shelley.
- (2) This option was offered to the Canning City Council as part of the overall proposal for traffic control signals at Leach Highway-Karel Avenue, but subsequently was not accepted by council.
- (3) to (5) I understand some difference of opinion exists in the local community in regard to the extension of Karel Avenue on the northern side of Leach Highway, Rossmoyne. However, in view of the member's representation I will ask the Main Roads Department to further investigate the matter with the council with the aim of resolving the situation.

RAILWAYS: FREIGHT

Joint Venture: Robb Jetty Facility

372. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that after five weeks of operation, the Total West joint venture has determined to close its operations at the Robb Jetty former smalls terminal of Westrail?

- (2) Is he aware that Total West has advised the 15 employees at the Robb Jetty terminal that if they wish to continue work they will have to transfer to Kewdale and that there will be no facility for Fremantle people to use the Total West joint venture or Westrail facility at Robb Jetty?
- (3) Is he aware no travel allowance will be available for the men who are forced to work at Kewdale instead of Fremantle?
- (4) Will he ask Westrail, as a partner in the joint venture, to review this decision with a view to allowing the continued operation of such a facility in the Fremantle area?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (4) I am not aware of changes taking place at Robb Jetty because this is an independent decision made by the company. If the member wants me to obtain the information relevant to his question, I will do so.

Mr Parker: I do.

MINERAL SANDS

Capel Primary School

373. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Health:

The Minister was given some notice of this question, which is as follows—

- (1) Has the Minister's attention been drawn to the photograph in the *Daily News* of 1 April regarding mineral tailings in the playgrounds of the Capel Primary School?
- (2) Can he now comment on that photograph?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) and (2) I thank the member for Vasse for the opportunity to advise the House of the situation involving that photograph. At the outset I make it very clear to the Opposition, the Parliament,

the Press, and indeed everyone that I have absolutely no objection to the way the *Daily News* has reported the Capel situation in that the paper believes the comments it is making on radioactivity in the area are correct. The paper has a perfect right to ask me all the questions it has and to make any comment it wishes to make. What I want to bring to the attention of this House and the public is the photograph to which the member for Vasse has referred and which came to my notice not so long ago. It represents one of the most blatant pieces of false reporting I have ever seen.

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: When I was a journalist you didn't complain about me like that.

Mr YOUNG: The photograph purports to show a child inside a roped off area in the playground at the Capel Primary School. In fact, beneath the photograph a caption reads—

A Capel primary school pupil retrieves a ball from inside the roped-off area in the school playground.

The rope is shown and is drawn in behind the girl's back. The actual photograph quite clearly places the girl outside the roped off area. Notwithstanding the funny comments of the former journalist on the other side of the House, I seek permission to table these documents. Had the Leader of the Opposition been aware of a photograph being doctored in such a way when he was a journalist, he would have been one of the first to yell. Further, had the Government faked a photograph like the *Daily News* faked that photograph to try to put the girl outside the area had she been inside the area, members of the Opposition and the Press would have crucified the Government for ever and a day, and quite rightly so.

Mr Brian Burke: There is an ethics committee. Have you complained to that?

Mr YOUNG: I understand complaints have been made, although I have not personally lodged a complaint. This matter has been brought to my notice only recently.

Mr Pearce: We don't support doctored photographs. Don't imply that we do.

Mr YOUNG: I am not implying that the Opposition does and I am glad members opposite are rushing to get on our side on this one. The day after this was shown—and members will have seen the size of the photograph, which occupied almost the entire second page of the paper I have asked to be tabled—an article appeared which I have marked in yellow, and which is just one inch high. It reads as follows—

Pupil in safe area

Because of a misunderstanding, a pupil of Capel Primary School was shown in the *Daily News* yesterday to be inside a roped-off area of monazite radiation when in fact she was outside it.

The girl was pictured on Page 2 with stories of monazite radiation. Artwork was carried out on the picture incorrectly.

Mr Pearce: So that was on 2 April, the *Daily News* says?

Mr YOUNG: The article continues—

The Daily News apologises for any concern caused to the pupil or the girl's parents.

As far as I am concerned, it is appropriate for the sort of journalism to which the *Daily News* stooped at that time to be read in conjunction with all the articles that are being run by the *Daily News* in respect of this matter. The newspaper has referred to me in writing a number of serious questions of a scientific nature which I am having examined by some of the world's leading authorities on radiation, but when it tries to justify its stories like that, I think it ought to be brought to the attention of this House and the public of this State.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

The documents were tabled (see paper No. 340).

EDUCATION: TERTIARY

Fees

374. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it not a fact that the reference in the Press this morning or yesterday to the proposition that no decision had been made at the Cabinet meeting with regard to further Government action on student fees at tertiary institutions is incorrect; that is to say, is it not a fact that that report is wrong?

(2) Given that, will the Minister agree to explain to the House what decision was made at the Cabinet meeting?

Mr CLARKO replied:

(1) and (2) Mr Speaker, I would have thought you would rule that question out of order. It does not seem to me to be appropriate.

Mr Davies: You are reflecting on the Speaker.

Mr Bryce: You are a Minister now, not a Chairman of Committees.

Mr CLARKO: I have been asked a question about a Cabinet decision and I would have thought that someone with even the member for Gosnells's limited knowledge of politics and Parliament would know such questions never receive a positive or negative answer.

Mr Pearce: An embarrassing area, of course.

Mr Brian Burke: He is a statesman!

APPRENTICES

Government Projects: Policy

375. Mr SIBSON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

I have given the Minister some notice of this question, which is as follows—

Could the Minister outline his policy relating to the employment of apprentices on Government projects?

Mr Brian Burke: No.

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question, the answer to which is as follows—

Tenderers who do not employ the specified number of Western Australian registered apprentices or apprentices from an approved

apprentice pool at the date of closing of tenders will be permitted to tender, provided they take on the required number of apprentices within 28 days of being awarded the contract.

Tenderers whose principal fixed establishment in Western Australia is situated outside a radius of 100km from the GPO Perth or outside a radius of 15km from the official post office in the towns of Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton or Kalgoorlie shall be exempted from the apprentice requirements.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

"Hansard" and Statutes: Delay

376. Mr PARKER, to the Treasurer:

I ask the following question of the Treasurer in his capacity as the Minister in charge of the State Government Printing Office—

- (1) I draw the Treasurer's attention to the fact that abnormally both the bound volumes of last year's *Hansard* and the bound volumes of last year's Statutes have not been provided to members. The Statutes did come on one occasion, but were wrong and had to be sent back, I understand, for reprinting, which must have cost a great deal. What is the reason for this delay in regard to the 1981 *Hansard* and Statutes?
- (2) The parliamentary debates from last week were received later this week than they normally are and I ask: Is there some problem with the management of the State Government Printing Office?
- (3) As the responsible Minister, will he take action to have the situation remedied?

The SPEAKER replied: Order! The matter of the printing of parliamentary papers is one for a committee of this House. I inform the member that I will examine the question that he has asked, put it before the appropriate committee, and give him a reply.

WATER RESOURCES: ACCOUNTS

Late Payment

377. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Water Resources:

My question relates to the payment of accounts for excess water as distinct from rates—

- (1) Is it a fact that a penalty is imposed on late payments for excess water?
- (2) Can he tell us what is the penalty?
- (3) From when did this penalty apply?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) to (3) If excess water accounts are not paid after the receipt of the account—it could be any time during the year because meter readings are graduated throughout the metropolitan area—they are reinvoiced by way of a debit against the main rates accounts which go out at the beginning of July. On the main rates account it states the present arrangement of paying in full in one amount, which commands a rebate. When paying in two amounts, no rebate or penalty is applicable as long as the arrears which include the excess water are being paid at the same time. Other than this, of course, there is a due date, which I think, is 30 days. The normal process applies with that. Apart from legal proceedings to recoup the debt, the usual restriction could apply to the service if the bill is not paid.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: PROJECTS

"Locally sourced" and Statistics

378. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

In response to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday the Minister stated he was confident that the statistics relating to resource development work which the Government claims is completed in Western Australia in fact are correct. If that is so, I ask—

- (1) How does the Government monitor the performance of local companies in regard to resource contracts and what action is taken to verify the figures being provided by the development companies?

- (2) Is it correct that an overseas or interstate owned company having an office in WA and doing more than half its work in Western Australia is regarded as a local company for the purposes of the statistics compiled by the Government?
- (3) The Premier of New South Wales has recently announced that it will require at least 30 per cent Australian content in contracts going to overseas companies. How does that compare with Western Australia's record?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Generally by obtaining monthly reports from the major developers. We have, in charge of this task, a senior officer who is a qualified engineer and who is skilled in these matters. He checks those reports and if any doubts exist, they are verified with the company to permit the correct allocation of that statistical information.
- (2) No, that is not the case. In fact, the company could well have an office in St. George's Terrace, Perth, to which the Leader of the Opposition often likes to refer, and that company could then subcontract the work in three different places—for example, Western Australia, the Eastern States or overseas. We would then make an allocation for each of those areas, whether local, interstate or overseas. It is not true to say that a company can just set up an office in St. George's Terrace and that it will then be treated as a local company. That is the way the Government allocations go and the way the statistics are maintained.
- (3) I think that would be unworkable in the first instance because sometimes, the New South Wales Government would find that the contract would not be able to be completed in New South Wales or for that matter, in Australia.

Some very technical pieces of equipment cannot be manufactured in Australia and obviously they will need to be sought from outside.

The clause we have in our agreement seems to be far more effective because all the contracts currently existing in this State average 65 per cent of the work being completed in Western Australia.

RAILWAYS: FREIGHT

Joint Venture: Railway Truck Hire

379. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does Westrail hire railway trucks to Total West for the purpose of carrying goods by rail?
- (2) (a) Is the charge made by Westrail to Total West the same as the charge made to members of the public or other bodies;
- (b) if "No" to (a), how much less is Total West charged by Westrail?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) My understanding is that Total West pays the same freight rate for a wagon as anyone else. The objective is to treat everyone equally. In fact, Westrail has to compete with Total West in the sense that it wins wagonloads where it can in competition with Total West and any other company.
- (2) (a) and (b) Answered above.

BRICK MANUFACTURERS: COUNTRY

Government Policy

380. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Works:

Could the Minister clarify the Government's policy with respect to the use of bricks and blocks produced by country manufacturers?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Departmental specifications require that material or goods manufactured and services available in the general locality of the works shall be used wherever they are available and conform to the specification. Also, their cost must not exceed by 10 per cent the cost of the equivalent materials or goods and services available from within a 100km radius of the GPO, Perth, excluding areas within an 8km radius of the official post office in the towns of Mandurah, Northam, Pinjarra, Toodyay and York.

At the design feasibility stage, project officers have been instructed to establish all available local goods and materials, including bricks and blocks.

It is the responsibility of project officers to ensure that, where these local goods and materials are of suitable quality,

available in sufficient quantity and reasonably economical, they are to be specified by name in the documents.

MINING: DIAMONDS

Marketing: Government Study, and Arrangements

381. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Has the Government undertaken its own independent diamond industry marketing study?
- (2) Has the Government received Ashton Joint Venture's final proposals for the marketing of Western Australian diamonds?
- (3) Can the Minister provide an assurance that any new proposal from overseas for the marketing of Ashton diamonds received before the end of September will be seriously considered?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) If, in fact, the member is suggesting there is a report or something of that nature, the answer is "No". A considerable amount of detailed information has been gained from meetings held here and in various countries; for example, I recently had two officers gathering information in South Africa and India and I have visited countries in Europe. Much information has been gained from discussions held on marketing procedures between myself and officers from my department.
- (2) I have not received the final proposals at this stage.
- (3) As I understand it at the moment, we have only one marketing proposal. While the organisation concerned has reached some understanding as to the kind of thing it wishes finally to put to the Government, it has not yet been received.

Mr Bryce: Are you advising overseas organisations which are interested in marketing diamonds to submit their proposal to Ashton and not the Government?

Mr P. V. JONES: The Government is not in the business of advising anyone and it is not in the business of selling diamonds. The Government depends on what Ashton Joint Venture tells it. No-one

has discussed the matter with the Government in a positive way. In most cases the organisations concerned have held discussions with Ashton Joint Venture.

Mr Bryce: You advise them to go to Ashton first?

Mr P. V. JONES: As well as to the Government.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Interest Payments

382. Mr GRILL, to the Treasurer:

I asked the Treasurer a previous question regarding the SEC interest payment. He endeavoured to further ignore the serious claims made by a conservative firm of Melbourne stockbrokers in relation to the findings of a Senate standing committee. I ask—

Is the Treasurer embarrassed by the nature of the allegations and for that reason does not want to comment on the matter, or is he able to comment?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

If there was a fault in my earlier reply it was because the question was not framed adequately. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas asked if I was aware that the SEC was over-committed by something like 130 per cent. I said "No" then and I say "No" now because I am unaware of the position.

SHOPPING: CENTRES

Lease Agreements

383. Mr SIBSON, to the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development:

In the light of the report in this morning's *The West Australian* that the State Government may consider controlling shopping centre lease agreements, I ask—

- (1) What action is the Government taking on this matter in view of concern expressed by many small business proprietors?

- (2) What advice does he suggest to concerned shopkeepers, like the WA Shopping Centre Retailers' Association, over their lease agreements?
- (3) Is he aware of the Queensland report which was critical of certain widely used clauses in lease agreements?
- (4) Will he give examples of what he regards as "unacceptable clauses"?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (1) I would point out that the State Government, through the Small Business Advisory Service Ltd., for the past 12 months has been closely involved in discussions by various elements of the industry in the whole question of lease agreements. We are very pleased at the level of co-operation achieved by all the interested groups acting in concert as a committee.
- This committee decided that the first requirement was to educate shopkeepers and intending shopkeepers in what to look for in lease agreements and as a result the brochure "Shop Leases—What the Tenant Should Know" was published. Some 8 000 copies of this brochure have been published.

The next step, which is where we are at right now, is to work out solutions to some of the difficulties arising from lease agreements with the aim of achieving a model lease agreement.

We do not see that agreement on a model lease will be difficult. The real estate industry for example for some time has had in operation an agreement on general conditions on the sale of land which is acceptable to all parties.

- (2) My advice to all shopkeepers concerned about their leases is to make contact with this lease committee, through the Small Business Advisory Service, to add weight to the committee's efforts.
- (3) I am aware of the Queensland report and while aspects of it do not necessarily apply in Western Australia it is a useful document which is being examined by the committee to determine whether common problems exist between the two States.
- (4) The sort of clauses which I find unacceptable are—
 - (a) high percentage payments for goodwill; and
 - (b) percentage rents which do not move with inflation, thus cutting retailer income.