

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural - Leader of the House) [10.00 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Bromell, Mr Ross - Adjournment Debate

HON BARRY HOUSE (South West) [10.00 pm]: I raise an important issue that arises from a couple of questions I asked in the House last week. Last Tuesday, 19 March, I asked this question of the Leader of the House representing the Premier -

Why is the Government using Mr Ross Bromell, the defeated Labor candidate for Vasse at the 2001 election, who is not an elected official and holds no public office, to officially communicate with the Busselton Shire Council on matters such as government funding and cheque presentations?

The answer I received was -

The Government is not using Mr Ross Bromell to communicate with the Busselton Shire Council on matters such as government funding and cheque presentations.

The following day I asked a similar question of the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development, Hon Tom Stephens -

Why does the minister use Mr Ross Bromell, who does not hold an electoral or public office, to officially communicate with the Busselton Shire Council?

In his answer, Hon Tom Stephens said -

I do not believe that I use Mr Ross Bromell to officially communicate with the Busselton Shire Council.

After a few interjections, he said -

As far as I know, I conduct my communications directly with the Busselton Shire Council. If the member has a bee in his bonnet, I suggest he come out with it, and we will see what we can do.

I have a bee in my bonnet and I am coming out with it. I have information that clearly indicates a couple of things. First, in late January, Mr Bromell telephoned a shire officer and informed that shire officer and the Busselton Shire Council that a government Treasury cheque for \$40 000 was available for presentation. He requested the shire to put on a function for the presentation of that cheque by a minister. It turned out that the cheque was later presented by Hon Adele Farina, and that cheque presentation function was attended by Mr Bromell. Many shire councillors and staff commented on and wondered about what he was doing there, because he had no official role.

In February - I am not sure of the date - another shire officer, who happened to be the chief executive officer's assistant, was telephoned by Mr Bromell with a request for speech notes for Minister Stephens on a billboard project at the entrance to Busselton, which was to attract people into Busselton rather than going along the bypass road. This prompted a written response, by fax, from the shire's CEO, Michael Swift, to Mr Ross Bromell. The fax number is given, and the fax is dated 13 March. The subject is "Billboard - Tom Stephens". It states -

Ross,

We are in the dark about the Minister's involvement in this project. The Shire President has asked that I ensure compliance with usual protocols - which usually means receiving notice etc and interacting with the Minister's office direct. Under these arrangements we are happy to coordinate everything. Please let me know exactly the arrangements/commitments to date.

Brief details of the Billboard project are:

- . It is first stage of the Busselton Entry Statement Project
- . Total Project cost \$70K - Billboard component \$20K
- . Funded By Council and CBD businesses (not the Chamber itself nor the State Govt)
- . Graphics by Glasshouse/CNTA -

That is the Cape Naturaliste Tourism Association -

- . Designed to promote Busselton as a destination and to offset the effects of the Bypass on particularly the retail sector - a proactive approach

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Barry House; President; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Robin Chapple

That sounds pretty much like an official communication from Mr Bromell, on behalf of the State Government. It indicates a couple of things: first, the Premier, through the Leader of the House, gave an incorrect answer to a question I asked; and, secondly, Minister Stephens does not seem to have a very good idea of what is happening in his ministerial office, let alone in his portfolio. The clear fact is that the Government has been using Mr Bromell to officially communicate with the Busselton Shire Council. This breaches protocol and displays great discourtesy to elected officials and a local government body. Mr Bromell has no official or elected position to carry out any such work on behalf of the State Government. To my knowledge, the only position he occupies is promotions officer - I think that is his role - with the Busselton jetty management committee; and he does that very well, by the way. However, that role has absolutely nothing to do with liaison between the Government and the shire.

I have no particular beef with Mr Bromell. I raise this issue only to expose the Government's dishonesty and lack of organisation and adherence to basic protocols.

Hon Kim Chance: Where is the dishonesty alleged, I am sorry?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The Leader of the House dishonestly answered the question I put to him.

Hon Kim Chance: Hang on. How is the Premier supposed to have known about any of this?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The Premier is in charge of the Government, is he not? He gave a dishonest answer.

Hon Kim Chance: But the Premier does not know who got the cane at the Warragunna school yesterday. If he were asked whether someone got the cane, he would probably say no.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: He gave a very deliberate, unequivocal answer -

The Government is not using Mr Ross Bromell to communicate with the Busselton Shire Council . . .

Hon Kim Chance: You have alleged that he made a telephone call to the shire.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I know he made two telephone calls to the shire.

Hon Kim Chance: No, it is an allegation, and now you are saying that as a result of that alleged telephone call -

The PRESIDENT: Order, members! Hon Barry House has the call.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I could have accused the Leader of the House of misleading the House and referred the matter to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges.

Hon Kim Chance: You would have got as far as you did last time on that.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Just take it seriously. I am trying to make a point in a reasoned -

Hon Kim Chance: You just called the Premier dishonest - that is all - and I am not real keen on that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Get used to it, because it seems as though he thrives on it.

Hon Kim Chance: You have not given a shred of evidence that that is the case.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I want to say a couple of other things. It illustrates a lack of basic manners and adherence to basic, ordinary, normal protocols. I put it to Mr Bromell that he is being used by the State Government. I do not believe that he is doing anything maliciously. He is probably naive in this whole process, because he is over-keen to please his colleagues in the Labor Party. I quite like Ross Bromell. He is a very decent bloke. He was the candidate for Vasse in the 2001 election.

Hon Kim Chance: That is the problem, is it?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: No.

Hon Kim Chance: I wondered what you had against the poor guy.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: It is not a problem. I believe he stood to become the Labor Party candidate for Forrest at the federal election but missed out. He would have made a better candidate than the one the Labor Party had, by the way. I cannot understand why Mr Bromell has teamed up with the Labor Party, because all he does and stands for seems to me to be the antithesis of what the Labor Party represents. He is a self-made man. He is semi-retired at an early age, and is very involved in the local community. He went to Busselton about four years ago and quickly got involved as president of the parents and citizens association. He is promotions officer with the jetty management committee, and carries out his duties enthusiastically. He is vocal on a range of issues. He knows how to use the media well, and is a frequent commentator on many issues in Busselton, especially jetty issues, to the extent that sometimes people think he has done the whole lot himself. I do not necessarily knock

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Barry House; President; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Robin Chapple

him for that, because he is obviously a very capable person who has brought a degree of professionalism to that organisation, which has been important in the development of an important tourist facility, the underwater observatory. It is going out to tender at the moment. He sometimes puts forward provocative, innovative ideas about the Busselton foreshore, and I applaud him for lots of those things, but I caution him not to overreach himself because he is being used in this case - probably innocently - by the Labor Government. He is desperately keen to become a member of Parliament, and he is obviously working towards that, almost to the extent that he is masquerading as one now, but I remind the Government that he has no elected position or public office. The major message to the Government is clear: it needs to lift its game and observe normal decencies and protocol when dealing with local authorities and elected organisations.

Ministers, Coordination of Presence in Chamber - Adjournment Debate

HON NORMAN MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [10.11 pm]: I refer to the prior adjournment debate when I somewhat tongue-in-cheek suggested to the Government that it not adjourn but allow the Leader of the House to move a special adjournment until 9 April. The reason for doing that was to allow the Government time to get its act together on its legislative program. The Leader of the House accused me of being naughty or something like that.

Hon Kim Chance: Mischievous.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: That contained an element of tongue-in-cheek, but I was also making the point that at that time there seemed to be a lack of coordination among government ministers about what was happening in the House. Be that as it may, the House adjourned and we came back today to receive at 10.10 am a note from the office of the Leader of the House advising that the pairs for this week would be, for Tuesday, 26 March, Hon Tom Stephens; and for Wednesday, 27 March, Hon Michelle Roberts. That was followed at 10.44 am by another note saying that the pairs would be, for Tuesday, 26 March, Hon Tom Stephens and Hon Nick Griffiths; and for Wednesday, 27 March, Hon Michelle Roberts, Hon Tom Stephens and Hon Nick Griffiths. When I received that note I was a bit annoyed, because it meant two ministers out of three from this House were to disappear for the two sitting days this week.

Hon Kim Chance: I do not know whether that is correct any more.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I know it is not. I am about to tell the Leader of the House what happened next. I raised this issue in the House today and advised the Leader of the House that I felt that having two ministers away when the House is sitting is not acceptable. However, some time this afternoon we received a note indicating that Hon Tom Stephens will not be paired tomorrow - I am not sure that is a good thing - but Hon Kim Chance will be paired on 27 March 2002. We are getting Hon Tom Stephens back but we are losing the Leader of the House tomorrow.

Hon Kim Chance: It is a surprise to me. I am going to Geraldton in the morning but I should be back in time for Parliament.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: If there is another note somewhere in the fax system I would like to know what it is. If it transpires that Hon Kim Chance is paired tomorrow, I will want to know why he told us that today - if the reason for the pairing was that he was opening an office in Geraldton. I would have thought he would know about that before today, but he now tells us by way of interjection that he will be here.

Will the Leader of the House do us a favour and let us know what on earth is going on, so we have a rough idea which ministers will be here and which ministers will not be here? We cannot ask questions of ministers who are paired and we need to know in advance who will be paired if it is at all possible.

Hon Kim Chance: I take your point.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Three sheets of paper have been received in one day, all telling me different things, and the Leader of the House now tells me there is a fourth on the way. Let us hope there is not a fifth. If the Leader of the House could organise a fifth one, perhaps Hon Tom Stephens ought to stay where he is, because his contribution to this place is minimal, to say the least. We ought to have at least one minister here, Mr President, and if it is going to be Hon Tom Stephens the Government has picked the wrong one.

Southern Cross, Dogs and Skeleton Weed - Adjournment Debate

HON MURRAY CRIDDLE (Agricultural) [10.14 pm]: I want to bring to the notice of the House a meeting I attended today at Southern Cross at which some 80-odd people indicated their concern about a couple of issues in their area, one being dogs and the other being the expansion of skeleton weed and the organisation dealing with the expansion of that weed.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Barry House; President; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Robin Chapple

A deal of emotion was on display at the meeting and there was some concern that the minister was not present. I have spoken to the minister about that and I am sure he will explain the reason for his absence to the people at Southern Cross. However, the minister was well represented by the people from the Department of Agriculture, who did the best to defend the position that arose.

Dogs have become a real problem in that area. A request was made for an additional dogger. I understand the Government said it would make an amount of \$30 000 available if that were matched by the local shires. Ten shires were asked to submit \$3 000 each, and five shires have agreed, so the matching funds of some \$15 000 falls short of the required amount for a dogger. The shires that have agreed to make funding available are Kulin, Mukinbudin, Westonia, Yilgarn and Narembeen. They are very keen to see another dogger in place. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that those councils are the first line of defence, if I can put it that way, against the dogs.

Land under the control of the Department of Land Administration adjoins those councils and it would seem there is a responsibility on DOLA to contribute towards doing something about these dogs. I will explain the damage they are doing in a moment. The Department of Conservation and Land Management also has a couple of nature reserves in the area, Jilbadji and Walyahmoning, and it is claiming that chuditch are an endangered species. I would have thought that the dogs and the foxes in those areas are a greater danger to the chuditch than is the poison, although poisoning is a necessity in those reserves.

I will give members an idea of what damage is being done in that area based on the accounts of four people. The first person did a survey in his immediate vicinity and said that last year 997 sheep had been identified as being killed by these animals and that nine dogs had been caught by the one person. That is something like a loss of \$60 000 worth of sheep if we are looking at fat lambs or mated ewes. Another person said that he had had 900 mulesed lambs and only 350 survived following dog attacks. In another area 300 sheep had been lost in three months and two dogs had been caught. In another area 600 sheep had been lost and 10 dogs had been caught in a year.

It takes a deal of time to catch these dogs. They are not captured easily. The dogger there at the moment, Bill Dale, is a very skilled person and it will be difficult to train another person to replace him. Apparently the present dogger finds it difficult coming from the pastoral area into the agricultural region, and it requires extra skills to catch the animals, which are doing a lot of damage. Training schools need to be set up because of the Department of Health requirements to control the use of poisons. Buffer baiting is required on the extremity of the area. It is done twice a year now but it may be necessary to do more baiting in that area. The reserves could well and truly be baited to protect the native animals, as they are down south. As I said, this area is the first line of defence. These people displayed a great deal of emotion when they spoke about wanting to see the sheep industry continue locally.

I was involved in the skeleton weed review program some time ago. Skeleton weed is still being found, which is a major concern. Fines have gone up dramatically. The way in which staffing arrangements were put in place has caused some concerns; there seems to be no communication. Communication might be the major problem. Farmers did not seem to communicate when a find was made on their area. We should not make any mistake; everybody is responsible for this issue, not just the Department of Agriculture or the Agriculture Protection Board. It is a problem for the community, and everybody must become involved. Some concerns have been raised that when skeleton weed is found, spray is not applied to it and the area that has been searched is not checked properly; as a result, further finds are made outside the area. It is necessary to recheck the search that has been done.

A deal of money has been spent on searching for skeleton weed this year. Some \$3.8 million has been spent, of which the Government contributes about \$380 000. The funding from the farming operations is increasing dramatically but the Government's funding arrangements are static. Therefore, the percentage paid by the producers is rapidly increasing and may have to go up even more to do the job properly. The last thing we want is for skeleton weed to get into the lupin industry because it would virtually wipe out that industry.

There were some problems with the season. Obviously, the season changed dramatically. Half way through it, an estimated \$2.6 million was required to be spent, yet \$3.8 million was actually spent. Fortunately, the farmers had complemented that with the amount of money that had been raised. I understand that about \$1 million is left over for the next season.

Problems with staffing changes and communications in that area must also be addressed. A person must be employed to deal with the skeleton weed problem. I do not agree with the suggestion that a single autonomous body be set up to deal with only skeleton weed. The mechanisms already in place must work properly. A specific senior officer who has the ability to make those decisions might be needed in that area. He could provide feedback to the producers so they know where they stand. The amount of Tordon 75D that was required

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Barry House; President; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Robin Chapple

was not fully available, but I understand that the APB had on hand something like 150 per cent of the amount of Tordon that they would normally expect to use. That is an argument that we can all run but not necessarily win. Legislation is required for this area and I would be more than happy to see its passage advance quickly. I understand that it would have to be passed by October to complement the necessity for further fundraising for next year. If that is the case, we must address that in this House.

A decision for skeleton weed will have to be made by 2 April. All the people who will have an input into this issue must well and truly recognise that skeleton weed is a major problem in the agricultural region. We need an organised arrangement in place to make sure that it does not spread any more rapidly than it already has.

Hon Kim Chance: Is that the review date?

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: On 2 April, people will come together to consider the industry as a whole. A decision may not be made on that day. We must introduce the legislation to Parliament so that the mechanisms can be put in place. We gave a year's extension last year.

Logging Industry, Sustainability - Adjournment Debate

HON CHRISTINE SHARP (South West) [10.25 pm]: I am obliged to take a little of the time of the House this evening to complete informing the House and the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of the unanimous resolutions of the ecoforestry forum that was held in Bunbury on 16 March. Last week I discussed that forum but was unable to finish outlining its resolutions. I talked about the need under ecologically sustainable forest management for habitat provisions to be changed, and about the forum's resolution that permanent habitat zones be established in state forests.

The current system of providing individual isolated habitat trees in the logging coupes and very thin strips of temporary exclusion zones to the sides of the logging coupes is an inadequate system over the long-term to ensure the preservation of habitat for our aboreal-loving mammals such as possums. The temporary exclusion zones will be removed under the next logging cycle, and the habitat trees are unable to grow in the kind of time frames that are necessary for the development of hollows. The youngest hollow trees are about 250 years old. The habitat provisions must be changed and we need permanent habitat zones within the state forests.

Another resolution of the forum stated that the timber industry should not be called "sustainable" until it is demonstrated to be so under the new model. The current model for predicting the sustainable yield, which has given rise to the figure that the minister uses of an indicative level in the jarrah forest of 140 000 cubic metres of first and second-grade logs, has been derived by using the earlier model but without the area of forest that has been included in the proposed reserves under the protection of old-growth forests. However, the same model will continue the longstanding pattern of over-cutting within the new reduced area of production forest. If the industry is to sustain the ecosystem and sawlogging in the future, the cut must be reduced to prevent over-cutting in the smaller area of forest that is now available.

The next resolution was that there should be more forums to explore common ground. That was a very good suggestion. There was a real sense that representatives from sawmillers, shire councillors, the green movement, the Forest Products Commission and the Department of Conservation and Land Management were able to stay in a room for a full day and communicate successfully without any animosity. That is a breakthrough because it has not happened for a long time. This morning I attended another forum at Murdoch University in the Lonergan lecture theatre. That forum, called "science and forest management", was conducted by the new Conservation Commission and was very well attended by a range of people with scientific interests, and other people from the community. Once again, I had a sense that a genuine dialogue was occurring between people in industry, the environmental movement, and foresters, which was incredibly refreshing. It was also very refreshing to hear from the new Chairman of the Conservation Commission about how seriously the commission is taking its job of developing the new forest management plan and how it is seriously exploring and implementing the concept of ecologically sustainable forest management. I like to think that we are on the verge of some groundbreaking forestry management in Western Australia.

I turn to the final unanimous resolution of the forum in Bunbury last week, which addressed the needs of the fine wood industry. The needs of the fine wood industry must be addressed in the forest management plan and timber strategy to ensure adequate wood supplies. Several members represented the fine wood industry at the forum. There was a lot of concern that the needs of that industry are not being addressed in two areas. The fine wood industry comprises several hundred fine wood craftspeople who are distributed throughout the south west and the metropolitan region. On average, each of them would use one or two cubic metres of fine wood per year. They are very small users of timber but the products they make could be worth many thousands of dollars because of the nature of their industry. They have two problems. The first is that it is very hard for craftspeople to access good quality timber because of the cessation of the craft wood licences. The second is that because of the Department of Conservation and Land Management's centralised log landing system, craftspeople can no

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Barry House; President; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Robin Chapple

longer go into the forest and choose suitable trees and are obliged to go to log landings, but no system exists to inform them when logs are available. Basically, the current system does not cater for their needs, although the degree to which they value add to the timber product is something that we should all be enormously proud of and has important export implications.

Another need of the fine wood industry that is not being addressed is for ongoing supplies of old-growth timber. In the fine wood industry 90 per cent of the timber that it uses to produce its quality product must be very high quality and extremely stable, slow-grown old wood. Huge concern exists that if the Government continues to shorten rotation lengths - the ever-increasing juvenilisation of the resource - into the future we will not sustain supplies of high quality sawlogs that are suitable for that sector of the industry, which is, after all, the most integrated sector of the industry in the small communities of the south west. Unfortunately, the Government seems to be looking the other way. Instead of allocating timber to the small users, it is thinking very much about a few big users. That will risk not only the long-term sustainability of the fine wood industry but also the integration of our timber industry into the community, which is exactly an eco forestry approach.

The Conservation Commission is taking ecologically sustainable forest management very seriously and a lot of people in the south west are now beginning to see that ESFM can be a real breakthrough. I hope that the Minister for Forestry is similarly inspired by the concept.

Ingrid Betancourt - Adjournment Debate

HON ROBIN CHAPPLE (Mining and Pastoral) [10.32 pm]: I wish to address the House tonight on the point of one of our green friends, Ingrid Betancourt. My Greens (WA) colleagues and I had the privilege of meeting Ingrid at the Global Greens Forum held in Canberra in April 2001. Ingrid is the founder of Colombia's Green Party and served as a senator for her party at that time. By 1989 Ingrid was a senior member of the campaign team for the liberal presidential candidate. That candidate was gunned down by the Medellin while Ingrid stood alongside him. Ingrid luckily dodged the bullets and subsequently went on in 1994 to run as an anticorruption candidate in congressional elections and was elected to the House of Representatives on a wave of popular support. Ingrid resigned from Parliament last year and announced she would be standing as a presidential candidate in the elections to be held this May.

On Saturday, 23 February 2002 she was denied air transport to San Vicente de Caguán by the army of Colombian president Andrés Pastrana. Ingrid was subsequently captured by FARC, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, when she attempted to travel by road to the town she wished to visit. Ingrid has been a well-known critic of both the Government and FARC, and has recently been Colombia's most prominent voice for peace in the country's long civil war. She is currently still held captive and there is little indication that she has the possibility of being released for at least another couple of years. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, the European Union, French President Jacques Chirac, and the Green federations of Europe and Africa have denounced her kidnapping and have urged the Colombian Government to do all in its power to facilitate her release. It seems that the Colombian Government does not want to facilitate her release because the president might find himself severely challenged by her candidacy.

Ingrid Betancourt is one of the world's most outspoken, charismatic and memorable people that any of us has ever met. She touched us dearly in Canberra. She must be free to speak, travel and campaign in the Colombian presidential elections. I urge the Western Australian Government to add its voice to that of the many Governments of the world in encouraging the Colombian Government to do all in its power to facilitate the release of this truly wonderful woman.

Aerial Baiting Program - Adjournment Debate

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural - Leader of the House) [10.35 pm]: I have a little over four minutes in which to respond to the issues raised by members. First, I will draw to the attention of the offices of the Premier and Hon Tom Stephens the comments of Hon Barry House.

I share the enthusiasm of Hon Christine Sharp for wanting to do something for both craft wood and other salvage operators - there is a range of salvage operators. I know what the difficulties are and sometimes those people do not all have the same view as my agency. We are working through those issues and attempting to meet people's legitimate aspirations. I acknowledge what the member said about craftspeople being the greatest value adders. They can turn a small amount of timber into something worth thousands of dollars. The work that I have seen has been quite remarkable.

I will respond to the issues raised by Hon Murray Criddle. Firstly, to those people at Southern Cross who expected to see me there today, I am sorry I could not be there. I had arranged a meeting with the Shire of Yilgarn for today which, because we were sitting today, I had to cancel, and on Friday last week I offered an

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Barry House; President; Hon Norman Moore; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Robin Chapple

alternative day to meet. I was not aware that somebody had taken it upon himself to organise a public meeting. I had not authorised or agreed to a public meeting, nor had I even been told about a public meeting. I was going to meet the shire, and Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday would have been time in which to contact the shire councillors to inform them of the altered day for a meeting. I am sorry for the people who were discommoded by my non-attendance. However, I did not authorise a meeting of that kind.

After a couple of very good years there has been a rapid build-up of dog numbers in Kalgoorlie. Kalgoorlie has fewer doggers now than it had 10 years ago. For a couple of years now only one dogger has remained in zone 9, which seems to be a problem. That has happened because of the increased reliance on aerial baiting. I sometimes wonder whether the aerial baiting program is quite as successful now as it was when it first started. We are getting some avoidance of baits through female dogs teaching their pups to avoid baits after the females have had a sub-lethal dose. We will certainly have to look at that. Although the dog problem is serious, skeleton weed is a much more serious problem.

I have already met a number of farmers in Kellerberrin, in conjunction with the Western Australian Farmers Federation zone council meeting, at which I spoke to farmers from Narembeen and Lake Grace in particular. It is a serious problem. Again, because of heavy summer rains over recent years we have had an increase in sites or, at the very least, in the visibility of sites. Some sites are being identified that have existed for some years without being identified. I believe that increased surveillance and good growing conditions have made those sites visible.

With regard to chemical control, Tordon 75D ran short after we began the season with 150 per cent of our normal requirement in stock. However, in the short term it was replaced with ester and glyphosate, which can at least hold the weed until Tordon is available.

I agree with Hon Murray Criddle that communications have been poor. One of the things I proposed at the Kellerberrin meeting was a stand-alone committee to support the district officer to carry out liaison work. That is absolutely essential and that is part of what we are proposing for the broader consultative process.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.40 pm
