

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

*Amendment to Motion*

Resumed from 19 September, after the following amendment had been moved by Hon Kim Chance -

And further, regrets to advise Your Excellency that the Court Government is failing to give adequate resources and support to cope with the health and medical needs of the residents of metropolitan and regional Western Australia.

**HON J.A. SCOTT** (South Metropolitan) [5.32 pm]: I understand that I can speak generally because I have not spoken in this debate previously.

The PRESIDENT: That is correct.

Hon N.F. Moore: Let's have a vote on the amendment and get it out of the way. This is dopey.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: If I were to amend the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's speech, my amendment would not deal with the question raised by Hon Kim Chance. I would move an amendment about the Government's obsession with making short-term gains at the expense of the future.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Unfortunately it has few gains to show.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: We have no better example than the current fuel crisis. Members of the Government and the Labor Party are running around like chooks with their heads cut off. Government members are trying to blame either the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries or the oil companies, and Labor members are blaming the GST.

Hon Barry House: What would you do? You would double the price of fuel.

Hon Ken Travers: He wants a pushbike allowance for members.

The PRESIDENT: The member has spoken for less than a minute. Members should give him a bit of time before interjecting.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: The real crisis is that the world's oil supplies are dwindling and investment in infrastructure over the years has been minimal because of the low price of crude oil. The price for West Texas crude hit a 25-year low at \$11 a barrel. That was the beginning of a cycle that led to minimal investment. It will now take at least 18 months for the infrastructure - that is, the refining and drilling capacity - to get back on track to take up the slack in demand.

The downturn in the Asian economies has also been a factor because it resulted in a lower demand for oil. Therefore, as the Asian economies pick up, the oil suppliers will be hard pressed to meet the demand. By that time, supplies in some countries will have peaked and be going into decline. We will not see a marked change in the trend line of oil prices in the world no matter what we do with taxes or infrastructure. We must prepare ourselves for a different world - one in which we are more careful with our energy supplies. We need policies, especially during the transition period, to deal with this serious problem. It is already creating a great deal of discomfort to many people. It will be especially difficult in a State such as Western Australia, which has remote communities and an economy that is heavily dependent on energy supplies. I condemn the Government for not establishing concrete measures to deal with this situation.

We must plan for a future with low oil supplies and more expensive energy. Unfortunately, the Government's energy policy appears to involve using and selling our energy supplies as quickly as possible. There is no tomorrow in these plans. I do not know whether the Labor Party has a strategic energy use policy. If we do not develop those policies, we will see huge disruption in the economy and social structure of this State.

We must establish which activities waste the most oil in the State. Conversely, we must also determine the most important areas to which our oil supplies should be directed and alternatives we might put in place. It is easy to identify the most wasteful resource: Private car use, which is exacerbated by poor city planning. Most car use occurs in the city. Each car on a city trip contains an average of 1.3 people. Private car use is less energy efficient than bus or rail transport. Transport planning needs to be redirected away from urban highway construction, which is occurring all over the city. Wasteful projects are also taking place in some country areas, when the Government should simply upgrade the severely damaged, existing roads. We must identify the most important industries and users of energy in this State. Agriculture is totally energy dependent. There are not many alternatives when harvesting a paddock or delivering wheat to a silo than to fill an engine with diesel or petrol.

Hon W.N. Stretch: The farming sector has taken major steps in getting more efficiency from a gallon of fuel. No till and minimum till has made a massive difference to the amount of fuel used and the effectiveness of the agricultural industry.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am not criticising the agricultural industry, but we must identify to where future energy supplies should be directed. Agriculture is one of the most important industries, and we must ensure we do not waste our energy resources by driving around urban areas in private cars. We will need fuel for not only tractors and cars, but also fertilisers. Nitrogenous fertilisers come from natural gas. It has been estimated that nitrogenous fertilisers produced from natural gas have enabled a one-third increase in the world's population. The planet's population is 6 billion. If one-third of the population exists only because of nitrogenous fertilisers, and if no alternatives have been found by the time that gas runs out in 50 years and the population has increased to 9 billion, 6 billion people will die from starvation. That disaster will be passed onto future generations and we should start planning now to avoid it. Yet, the Government is doing nothing to deal with those sorts of problems. There is no forward planning.

We must also look at the freight transport issues in this State. Our industries, small population and remote communities leave us with no option but to freight goods over great distances. We must identify ways in which that can be managed more efficiently. Clearly, the greater use of rail is one option. During debate on the sale of Westrail, I said there would be a natural upsurgeance in the use of rail because energy prices would rise. Energy prices have risen earlier than I imagined. I predicted it would happen in a couple of years, but it happened almost immediately, even before the sale of Westrail freight. We must ensure a greater extension of rail services than that planned for in the past. As hard as it is for the truck drivers who are struggling to make a living within the narrow margins on which they operate, the realities of energy supplies mean we must begin using more efficient transport methods. Trucks are not one of those, partly because the building and upkeep of roads is energy intensive. We also need to maintain energy for key services and industries, such as water supplies and household energy. A great deal must be done to reduce fuel use in this State, yet we appear to be doing the reverse. Everybody is familiar with the anthem of the former Minister for Transport, Eric Charlton: Fix Australia, fix the roads. I think "fix" could be replaced with another f-word, because if we continue, as Eric wanted, to build major roads that encourage a greater use of road trains in urban areas in which rail is a viable alternative, great damage will be done to those roads, which will represent a huge increase in energy use. We will be in big trouble if we do not rationalise the way goods are freighted in the country.

I again remind members that Western Australia is probably one of the worst places in the world for conserving energy because of its huge distances and the types of industries on which the economy is based. Agriculture and mining are energy-intensive industries. Many other industries do not require high levels of energy, and there are many ways in which the mining industry could rationalise energy use. We should look closely at whether it is worth continuing to base this State's economic wellbeing on those types of industries. We must develop an industry policy based on low energy use and look at ways to encourage new types of industries that are far less energy hungry. That would have additional advantages, as this State is already exceeding its greenhouse emission levels, which could blow out of the water any chance the nation has of meeting its future greenhouse responsibilities. Recent moves by the State Government indicate that it is not concerned with reducing greenhouse emissions. It was recently stated that the Government would exempt the gas industry from inclusion in the greenhouse emission equation because gas produces far fewer greenhouse emissions than coal. The rationale was that sending gas around the world and using it ourselves would reduce greenhouse levels. There appears to be - I hope I am wrong - no understanding that some of the gas fields contain large stores of greenhouse gases in the aquifers from which natural gas is extracted.

For instance, between 19 and 21 per cent of carbon dioxide comes out with the natural gas in the Gorgon field. At this stage the developers do not know how they will deal with that additional gas. On its own, that gas would produce more greenhouse gas than the whole of New Zealand and it would easily wipe out the 8 per cent increase that we in Australia are allowed under the Kyoto agreement.

It is easy for the Government to make these statements that, when burnt, gas produces fewer greenhouse gases than does coal. However, we must look at the whole picture, and when we do we find that it is not the case. Australia will not get away with this; if it keeps this up it will cause sanctions to be brought against this country. We must be serious about this issue, because greenhouse gases are a real problem. We have already seen one island to the north of Australia go under water, and other low lying islands to the north of this State are threatened with inundation if we experience further ocean level rises.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Which island was that?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Unfortunately, I cannot remember the name.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Kiribati?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I think that island was under threat. It might have been one of the islands near Kiribati. A number of members of Parliament from that region were in this Parliament approximately 18 months ago and they were very concerned about this issue. Since their visit one of those islands has been inundated - it has gone underwater and disappeared.

Hon W.N. Stretch: The people from Kiribati were very concerned, but I do not think the situation has got much worse.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: There is also the problem of climate change. There is a gradual spread of tropical diseases in Australia which will begin to cause problems further south, and that has been tied to climate change. We in Western Australia are suffering a loss of coral reefs as a result of ocean warming. Global warming is creating significant problems, not the least of which is desertification, and that is moving further south in Western Australia. We really must take this issue seriously.

Over the past couple of years Australia has recorded its strongest ever cyclonic winds, even stronger than those in other parts of the world, including tornados and hurricanes and the worst storms that have been recorded in Europe. The climate change is real and it is happening right now. Another effect of climate change that should be looked at closely is referred to in some of the more recent information from the United Kingdom which states that the Amazon rainforest will die off within the next 50 years due to climate change. That, of course, threatens our forests here in Western Australia. I find it interesting when I hear the Liberals for Forests saying that they will support government policies on all things except forests. If they were to follow government policies, which are all for greenhouse production and therefore climate change, we would probably see the destruction of our south west forests faster than as a result of the woodchipping process.

Hon W.N. Stretch: You are drawing a long bow.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I do not think I am drawing a very long bow at all. Our south west forests are very vulnerable to climate change. The tingle and karri forests in particular are from a different climate period. They are struggling to cope with the climate change we have had already because of continental drift, and those forests do not need a great deal more change to start feeling the effects of global warming. There is also a fairly strong line of thought that dieback in our south west forests has been enhanced by the climate change since the clearing of agricultural areas. We have seen a 20 per cent reduction in rainfall in the wheatbelt and a corresponding increase in the areas that are still forested in the south west of this State.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Which dieback are you referring to?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Jarrah. Different diebacks affect different plants. One line of thought is that opening up forest areas with clear-felling creates a rise in water levels, and warmer climates are more supportive of fungus.

Hon W.N. Stretch: I do not think you are right. Those heavy rainfall areas are well drained and the water gets away quickly. In the wheatbelt, with drier varieties of dieback, you might have a point.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It was not my hypothesis, it was a scientific hypothesis by a scientist who worked in the area, and he indicated there was certainly that sort of change. A whole raft of changes is occurring in our ecological system of which we need to take serious note.

There are some simple things we can do about this, as I have already pointed out. We must move more towards providing public transport instead of more highways. We must also change our bureaucracies, because one of the major problems with excessive highway construction in this State arises due to the shape of the bureaucratic system. Main Roads has its own funding base rather than being a subset of the Department of Transport. I believe we should quickly relocate Main Roads as a subset of the Department of Transport. I would also like to see the Department of Transport as a subset of the Ministry for Planning, so that we could have overall planning. We could look at transport in conjunction with accessibility and then we could have an option of different transport types and that would be funded not directly to Main Roads but through the Department of Transport. It seems to be a hard thing to achieve at the moment, but it is very important that we do so if we are ever to make sensible changes in this State.

We will have to look at transitional fuel to a much greater extent, even though we must be very careful about those greenhouse emissions that are coming from some of the gas fields in the north of this State. We must find a much greater role for compressed natural gas in the future.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Before the dinner suspension I was talking about the failure of this and previous Governments to develop a strategic energy use policy to guide this State into a future in which we will have diminishing hydrocarbons and difficulty maintaining our economy. I discussed the wasteful use of energy and possible solutions. One solution would be to ensure that industry policies help us to move towards low energy

use. I am not suggesting that we give up everything we have today, but we must be careful not to encourage industries that use large amounts of energy, such as aluminium smelters, as we have done in the past.

We should look at what has happened in other places in the world. Al Gore, the Vice President of the United States, has pointed out that the green industries that have sprung up have generated more jobs in recent years than were generated during the industrial revolution. Therefore, we will not be causing problems if we encourage sustainable energy industries. In fact, we can improve our economy as the United States has done by encouraging the establishment of sunrise industries that involve new communication, telecommunications and computer technologies.

This Government can point to few examples of policies designed to control energy use; in fact, its policies have encouraged the reverse. Recent changes to energy-related legislation in this State have put our energy producers in competition with one another. Rather than conserving resources, they will be competing to see who can sell the most energy and be the most profitable. That is a terrible strategic mistake. It may bring short-term gains, but in the long term it will be a disaster.

The Government has implemented programs designed to save energy; for example, the so-called green power scheme. Under that scheme, alternative energy users pay more for their power than those who use polluting power. That is back to front. We will not attract much investment in alternative and sustainable energy forms in this State if that is how the Government intends to move forward.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Why do the Greens (WA) not support the tidal power proposal?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It will not prevent the production of greenhouse gasses. Recent studies have shown that tidal dams cause more greenhouse gas because of the methane produced by rotting vegetation in the river systems. It is not an effective way to reduce greenhouse gas. The tidal power scheme has other advantages for the local community involving recreation and other spin-offs, and they should be considered. However, more economically and environmentally sound measures can be promoted by spending that money elsewhere.

Hon M.D. Nixon: Would those mangroves rot in the water anyway?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: We are not necessarily talking about mangroves. Research conducted around the world indicates that when flooding occurs in areas not normally covered by saltwater, the vegetation dies off and creates methane.

Hon M.D. Nixon: Does the same thing not happen on every valley floor?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It certainly does when permanent flooding occurs and the vegetation is killed.

Hon M.D. Nixon: What about the effect of rainfall on forest floor litter?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: A mulching process deals with that in a completely different way. While some methane is produced, the growing forest counteracts it; it is not the same problem.

The Minister for Energy's energy-saving ideas are poor. They show a lack of understanding of or a general concern for greenhouse issues. They are tokenistic in the extreme.

A private group has a proposal to burn chicken manure to produce energy to eradicate stable fly in parts of the northern suburbs. Unfortunately that proposal is not the most effective solution. The best technology is a hydrolysis system that does not use oxygen or produce CO<sub>2</sub>. The current proposal involves the use of significant amounts of nitrous oxide. I am not sure how that will survive any environmental assessment process. It would have been much better to turn that material into compost - it would have caused far fewer air pollution problems in an urban area.

The most significant changes that could be made relate to planning. If we were clever with our planning, we could greatly reduce the need for people to travel. We could also limit the amount of land swallowed up by urban sprawl. Unfortunately, courage is required to take on the sacred cow of opening up more and more frontiers in the urban area.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: Thank heavens for our infill sewerage program, which allows inner-city and high-density housing to be developed. How about giving some praise for a change?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: In reality, the problem with the urban sewerage program -

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Does Hon Ken Travers want to have a go? The problem with the urban sewerage program is that it is highly energy intensive. In fact, only secondary treated sewage is pumped into the ocean. It is not a great system. There are far better systems around the world than the one being used in Perth. They are less expensive and more local, so that sewage is not transported for hundreds of miles through massive underground

pipes, which cost an absolute fortune and a huge amount of energy to put in place. There are better ways to do it.

Hon Bob Thomas: Like my tree farm sewerage system in Albany, about which I managed to convince the previous government.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Was that Hon Bob Thomas' proposal.

Hon Bob Thomas: Yes.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Good. There are better ways to do it. It is better than pumping the sewage into the river, as happened in the past. However, it is certainly no boon to the greenhouse effect.

Another point is that the Government is not tackling the issue of integrated land use to increase accessibility and to conserve some of our best horticultural areas. The horticultural industry is being pushed further out, away from good land. That means more transport is required.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: There is a significant amount of land in the Swan Valley, Spearwood and other areas. It has already happened in Wanneroo. The horticultural industry is further away and more transport, etc, is involved. With integrated land use, people are close to everything they need. If we are to provide accessibility, we should try to have a more holistic community so that people do not have to travel to obtain goods. That means that those goods should be within easy reach. By segregating our city into urban, commercial and industrial areas, the need for unnecessary travel is being created. That must be looked at in a serious way - not the way it is being looked at now.

Another issue on which the Government has failed is the southern rail extension. The Government has chosen the cheapest path; that is, the old freight route, which was located around the bottom of the city when trains were fairly noisy and smoky. It was put there to avoid the population centres. Therefore, the Government's southern rail link will avoid the populated areas. That does not make a lot of sense. With the current fuel crisis, it is time to start thinking about getting passengers onto these trains because that is the idea of them. I just thought I would send that message to the Government: The idea of urban passenger trains is to carry passengers.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Where would you put it?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Straight down the freeway.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Where would it go? It would go down the freeway!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Obviously, it would go through South Perth.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Over the Narrows?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Either over it or under it. People like Jeff Kenworthy have told me that tunnelling technology is becoming so good that, rather than buying land - not so much land has to be purchased when underground tunnelling is done - the tunnelling can be done almost as cheaply as locating the railway on the surface in a built-up urban area.

Hon M.D. Nixon: The Graham Farmer Freeway has been -

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Of course, that is not a tunnel; that is a trench with a lid on it. I do not know whether he meant that as well. The only problem with the Graham Farmer Freeway is that it is another exercise to encourage more vehicle traffic, and that is exactly what we do not want.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: It has saved travelling time. People are travelling shorter distances to get to their jobs.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I think Hon Bruce Donaldson has probably heard me say a hundred times in this place that the thing about building major new roads is that new traffic that did not exist before is created. That happens everywhere in the world, including Australia. It is estimated that an extra 30 per cent of traffic is generated. By building those roads, that extra traffic is being created.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: Wouldn't you like to have traffic flowing rather than it being stop-start? Let's face it, flowing traffic does not cause half as much pollution as a car idling in a parking lot.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: There is no stop-start traffic when there are really good light rail systems and good bus services, because not too many private cars are encouraged to travel into the centre of the city. Apart from that, all of Perth's planning has been completely messed up anyway, in the sense that people have been encouraged to live outside the city. On the riverside where the population should be located, we have massive parking areas. People would not have to travel in and out of the city if they lived in the city.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: First, we had to put in place the infill sewerage program. We cannot have sewage flowing into the Swan River like it did under the previous Government.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I was not talking about pumping sewage into the river; I was talking about inner urban living, with sewerage systems. Things have moved on since Koorda.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: Koorda had a very good sewerage system.

Hon Ken Travers: You have a fixation with this subject, don't you?

Hon B.K. Donaldson: It was a good sewerage program up there. We built it ourselves.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: With the southern rail extension, the Government is now even trying to not put a link through Rockingham. This plan completely ignores the whole purpose of a passenger rail system, especially when one considers that a huge percentage of the people who travel on the freeway into Perth every morning come from suburbs immediately adjacent to the south of the river, and the greatest traffic flow is in fact east-west, not north-south. Hon Bruce Donaldson will probably do something about that when he becomes Minister for Planning. When one considers that only about 20 000 of the vehicles that travel over the Narrows Bridge each morning come from south of South Lake, one can see from where in the southern regions most of the traffic into Perth originates. The vehicles travel east-west on South Street, Canning Highway and Marmion Street, etc, move onto the freeway and come into the city. If we are to do something about reducing car travel, we must get those people out of their cars and onto public transport. The way to do that is to provide a system to cater for those people, not to have a train service that goes through Jandakot, past Cannington and through a lot of unpopulated areas, so that people are required to drive back to catch a train which does a big circle around the city and which takes them twice as long to get there. This is the most ridiculous, stupid decision that has ever been made in planning.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Have you been to Cannington lately?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Yes, I go there often. I know that the Government wanted to put housing on top of the Jandakot water mound. I also know that it would like to put housing close to the Jandakot Airport and that it has made mistakes in the past in that way. However, those areas will not be built upon in the future because they are inappropriate development areas, and the member knows full well that that is the case. It is ridiculous to hope that that will ever be done. The sensible thing would have been to put the train line in an area where it will attract people, not in an area where it will cost less, or through a Liberal electorate - whatever the reason was for doing it that way.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: After you have taken the railway line underneath the Narrows, where do you go then - straight down the freeway?

Hon Bob Thomas: That is what Richard Lewis said.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: The line should go straight down the freeway.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Where should it turn right?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I do not know whether it should turn right. Feeder services could be provided with light rail systems down the coast.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Trams!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Not trams; hybrid rail links. I know that Hon Derrick Tomlinson does not have much knowledge of these things.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: No, I do not. Enlighten me.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I can enlighten him by asking him to go to Melbourne and jump on the St Kilda light rail system. Then he might learn a thing or two.

Hon J.A. Cowdell: He is beyond enlightenment. Do not worry.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Yes.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I am the way, the truth and the light.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: The only thing the member forgot to add is that he is also the noise. That probably describes him rather more adequately.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: When you get zapped, do not blame me.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is meant to be a serious debate. If members do not find it serious, they should step outside into the courtyard, have a cup of coffee and talk about whatever they want to talk about.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I want to talk about the planning process in the Wattleup-Hope Valley region and the Government's proposal to use the strategic development label to foist planning proposals on people without providing adequate assessment processes. A number of scandalous decisions have been made affecting that area, particularly the motorplex project which is to be built next to Medina.

Hon N.F. Moore: Built where - Medina?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It is not very far away from Medina, which is a suburb of Kwinana and probably one of the closest to the motorplex. It has been very hard for the Government to get anyone to sign off on the individual risk management proposal that it must have for the area. My understanding is that it is still outstanding because the officers of the Department of Environmental Protection have been refusing to sign it. I have heard that a particular officer offered to resign rather than sign it because the person knows full well that the individual risk criteria cannot be adequately met in the area. We know how hard the Government has tried to avoid an assessment of the project by calling it a public works even though it is being built for two individuals and there have been some nice deals for taking over the Ravenswood speedway.

Hon N.F. Moore: What about the thousands and thousands of people who want a speedway? You are ignoring them completely.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: They can have the speedway if the Government puts it on a site where people will not be blown up or poisoned.

Hon Peter Foss: That is rubbish.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It is not rubbish at all.

The PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: The truth is that the speedway cannot comply with the normal noise regulations. The minister will have to override those. Let me hear the Attorney General deny that.

Hon Peter Foss: Was I looking as though I was about to deny it?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: No.

Hon Peter Foss: I was trying to ignore you. Stop provoking me.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Two people have been able to get to manage the speedway without any public process. No-one else has been allowed to be involved in this. There has been no tendering process -

Hon N.F. Moore: There has.

Hon Peter Foss: Who is managing it?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Gary Mioceovich and Con Migro.

Hon Peter Foss: They are not managing it.

Hon N.F. Moore: How do you know they are managing it?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Because I asked questions of the minister and other ministers in this place. That is what I have been told.

Hon Peter Foss: It is being run by a trust. You are probably lying about the answer, as you did about the national parks.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Hon Jim Scott is on to something.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I know. That is why they are jumping.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: You've got Ljiljanna; you are away.

The PRESIDENT: Order! One at a time. If Hon Jim Scott addresses me and, as someone said, does not provoke others, they will not interject.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr President; I will certainly try to do so as my time is starting to slip away.

The answers I have indicate that Mr Mioceovich and Mr Migro will be licensed to manage or operate the motorplex. From my investigations I have found that no-one else has been given the opportunity to get licences at this point.

Hon N.F. Moore: Who else wants to run drag racing?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Someone wanted to build a speedway there prior to this project but his project was knocked back by the Western Australian Planning Commission, which is now saying that this is a reasonable project even though at that time it said it was an inappropriate land use in that area. At that time, when the wrong people put up their hands to build a speedway, they were not given approval and were told that it was an inappropriate place in which to build such a facility. However, when the right people put up their hands, everything is changed so that they can get what they want, and the motorplex is called a public works even though it is for the benefit of two people.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is not true and you know it.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It is true and I do know it.

Hon N.F. Moore: You should bother to find out the facts before making such a silly statement.

Hon Ken Travers: The member is hitting a sore place.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is a conspiracy theory. We will all be dead tomorrow the way he is talking.

Hon Ken Travers: It is all a plot.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It is hardly a conspiracy theory when I have documentation -

Hon N.F. Moore: Here we go.

Hon Peter Foss: You have papers, do you?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: No, I have documents that had to be obtained through a freedom of information application because of the secrecy and unaccountability of this Government. The documentation shows that untruths have been told about this project. That can be easily proved. I can put that documentation in front of any minister and he can show me how it is not correct. I know he would not be able to do so because the documentation is quite damning.

Another issue of great significance which has not been handled particularly well is salinity.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Did you say senility?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Certainly Hon Derrick Tomlinson is not handling senility very well.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: No, no, no!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Yes. We have heard grandiose promises about hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent on addressing salinity but it turned out that that money was spent before the Federal Government said it would give it, which of course it did not. A pittance has been put into a major problem, which is far more important than motorplexes, belltowers and trying to get projects like Jervoise Bay going. That sort of money pumped into doing something about salinity would have given far better value to this State.

I missed something I wanted to say about planning; that is, there is great dissatisfaction in this State with the planning processes. People feel more and more alienated from the processes.

People believe that the so-called consultation processes of the Government are a farce. They want to get back some third party rights of appeal on a range of planning decisions. Those rights have been taken away by this Government. They also want the Government to make a real attempt to bring back something along the lines of the social impact unit that existed years ago and that looked at the right of communities to have things done in a way which was of value to them - rather than, as now, to meet the vested interests that seem to be running things. Third parties should have the right to appeal on rezoning matters and should have a greater ability to have standing in court procedures on matters of community importance.

Mobile telephone towers are causing a great deal of concern in the community. One.Tel Limited intends to put about 150 phone towers around the urban area in the next two years. The Federal Government has made a terrible botch of the legislation for phone towers, and this State Government, and the Opposition, should put some pressure on Canberra to give the States the ability to set up a proper planning process to gain greater control over the placement of phone towers. Perhaps we could incorporate into town planning schemes a community process in which the telecommunications people could examine the technical requirements; and, following consultation with the community, appropriate areas could be selected so that we had a rational way of dealing with the placement of phone towers rather than the mad race that is taking place between the various phone companies to find the best sites to obtain maximum coverage. There are no local or state powers to control the placement of phone towers, and it is time the State Parliament let the Federal Government know that people are not happy about the way phone towers are being placed in the community. The Greens (WA) believe



local governments should have the power to designate in town planning schemes where phone towers can be placed. Until we have something along that line, we will continue to have a battle in community after community to prevent phone towers from being set up beside schools, etc. The jury is still out on the effect of phone towers on people's health, and there are varied descriptions about that. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Muriel Patterson.