

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan - Attorney General) [10.18 pm]: I move -
That the House do now adjourn.

Hon Mark Nevill, Comments - Adjournment Debate

HON TOM HELM (Mining and Pastoral) [10.13 pm]: Before the House adjourns I will take this opportunity to correct allegations made by Hon Mark Nevill during the adjournment debate last night. I was on my feet explaining to the House some problems being experienced by people in Boulder, which they fear will increase once the realignment of the Kalgoorlie Bypass Road through the City of Kalgoorlie-Boulder is completed. He asked me whether I knew where Hainault was. I was not giving the House a geographical tour, so I did not need to know where it was. I assumed it was somewhere in Kalgoorlie -Boulder.

When I had completed my remarks I went outside the Chamber on parliamentary business. I was informed that Hon Mark Nevill took the opportunity during the adjournment debate to explain that Hainault had gone down the big pit. The thrust of what he was saying was that I did not understand where Hainault was, and that the people for whom I was taking up the case were not important, or the issue I was trying to bring to the attention of the House was not important. I got a few telephone calls asking me to explain to Hon Mark Nevill that Hainault is still alive and kicking. It is an area that comprises Hainault Road, Hamilton Street, Launceston Street, Milton Street, Johnston Street and Clancy Street. Hon Mark Nevill is mistaken in thinking that that area of the town has gone down the big pit. The Hainault shaft may have, but the houses and the people are still there. They are upset that this former resident of Kalgoorlie, and former Labor Party mines spokesman, did not know they were there.

Hon Mark Nevill: You would not have a clue. You have been a member of Parliament for 14 years and for 12 years never went near Kalgoorlie, which is one-third of your electorate.

Hon TOM HELM: Here we go again. Hon Mark Nevill did not know that the Hainault Residents Committee existed as a group in 1989-90. Where was Hon Mark Nevill when that group was working with Julian Grill and Ian Taylor to get Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines -

Hon Mark Nevill: I know the group you are talking about.

Hon TOM HELM: Hon Mark Nevill did not say that last night. I am bringing to the attention of the House that the member, maybe through ignorance, misled the House last night. What he did, probably intentionally -

Point of Order

Hon MARK NEVILL: I did not mislead the House last night either deliberately or unintentionally.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. There is a significant distinction between misleading the House unintentionally and wilfully misleading the House. Contextually, Hon Tom Helm is suggesting it was unintentional. He can correct me if I am wrong.

Debate Resumed

Hon TOM HELM: The fact is that that area of Kalgoorlie-Boulder did not disappear down the pit. This member chose to denigrate people rather than trying to act on their behalf. He may be a member of Parliament who does not take on constituency work. It may be that one of the reasons I went to Kalgoorlie was that people were not getting service from him and some of his colleagues who have represented the Mining and Pastoral Region for years.

Hon Mark Nevill also said that Mrs Dianne Mills and the people in this area were mostly squatters, as though these people were some kind of second-class citizens.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is an outright lie.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Mark Nevill might not like what is being said or believe what is being said, but the member has the right to say it. He will recall that the former President put it more eloquently. The trouble is that I have already called in a particular order the members to speak in the adjournment debate. If Hon Mark Nevill wants to speak I will put him at the end of the queue. At this time Hon Tom Helm has the floor.

Hon TOM HELM: We can read the transcript, but it is not available to quote from at the moment. I will explain what squatters are.

Hon Mark Nevill: Do not tell lies.

Hon TOM HELM: My comrade can read the transcript. Squatters are people who have bought houses but cannot get a freehold title or lease on their homes because they live in what has been described as mineralised

areas; that is, there is a possibility of minerals being found under those houses and if they had freehold title, that would create complications if those areas were mined.

Hon Mark Nevill: Some of them are on crown land.

Hon TOM HELM: That is right, and they cannot get leases because the Department of Land Administration will not give them leases. However, Mrs Mills has lived in the same house for 31 years. Her house has been paid for. She did not take it over from somebody. She bought it 31 years ago.

It is a disgrace when someone in this coward's castle, like Hon Mark Nevill, decides that rather than face the issue -

Hon Mark Nevill: You are a joke

Hon TOM HELM: There he goes again, denigrating the person rather than playing the ball. I do not know whether these people have a legitimate argument but I suggest they might have. Nonetheless, they are entitled to have the matter brought to the attention of the House and for the matter to be publicised so that they can have an equal go when they are being badly done by. It is my job to do what I can to help those people. Because I do not live among them like Hon Mark Nevill used to -

Hon Mark Nevill: The member does not understand the issues.

Hon TOM HELM: Hon Mark Nevill should do exactly that. He should understand and attack people on the issues, not their personalities. I want to make sure that the record shows that squatters are not second-class people. The people of the hills still live there. They say that they are affected by dust, noise, vibration and other things associated with mining. They have lived there for years. Some of them who have lived there for 50 years believe that it has become worse and that the realignment of the road will make it worse still. It is my job to bring the issue to the attention of the House. I am not personally attacking any member. Those people who are taxpayers and who helped to elect us - or in my case not to elect me - are entitled to a fair go. As long as I am here, they will get a fair go.

S-11 Protest - Adjournment Debate

HON CHRISTINE SHARP (South West) [10.21 pm]: I will share some thoughts and observations about the S-11 protest in Melbourne which I have attended. For the past three days Hon Jim Scott and I have been in Melbourne attending the protest outside the Melbourne Crown Casino where the World Economic Forum met. When I first heard about this gathering and the protest that would take place, I felt an immediate sense of responsibility to attend it. In many senses globalisation is the challenge of our times. It impinges on the democratic work of this Parliament. That is why I felt I had a responsibility to attend that protest. The movement that began at S30 in Seattle last year and which has continued with S-11 is a movement that had to happen because globalisation is developing in an extremely uneven and undemocratic way.

Globalisation is a complex and confusing topic. A lot of confusion exists about the ultimate objectives of the S-11 protest and of the concerns about globalisation. There is confusion about whether this is a movement which is against globalisation per se or whether it is a movement which is about changing or further developing globalisation. There is not an answer to that question at present. The movement, which is evolving rapidly, is made up of an enormous coalition of interest groups who come from an array of backgrounds including the social justice movement, many movements from third world countries, the socialist movement, the international labour movement, the churches and the green movement.

There is no fully developed critique about globalisation, only myriad concerns coming from different directions about the various effects that globalisation is having on communities throughout the planet. Of course, as has been pointed out by numerous commentators, globalisation is unstoppable in that information technology, the Internet, air communications and so on are making communication much easier. Globalisation has developed very rapidly over the past decade because the influence of technological developments is unstoppable - as it should be.

However, since 1994, when the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade proposed the formation of the World Trade Organisation, development of globalisation has not been balanced. Its development is very much dominated by global markets and the global corporatist agenda. That is the fundamental concern being voiced at S-11. Globalisation is very advanced in world financial markets and in the way that multinational corporations are able to influence the economic and political management of different sovereign states. However, when one looks at other aspects of globalisation in a political and regulatory sense, one sees that they are nowhere near as developed. Therein lies the problem. The International Court in The Hague and the United Nations, which relies on funding from its member states, are nowhere near effective in making sovereign states work together to ensure that the impact of globalisation does not undermine the protection of our communities and the environment.

One of the things that has dawned on me as a member of this Parliament is how globalisation is increasingly rendering democratically elected institutions ineffective. How often we hear that the Government cannot do something because of global factors. The most recent example of that in this place is the dairy industry deregulation. We were told that no-one wanted the deregulation, but it was inevitable. That is why people were at S-11. They are determined to say that there is something they can do; that is, they can voice their concerns.

One of the most eloquent speakers in voicing those concerns was a marvellous woman from India - Vandana Shiva. She spoke at the World Economic Forum and attempted to explain to the delegates the concerns of the people protesting outside. In addresses to the protestors, she talked about what is happening in India as a result of the World Trade Organisation's agricultural agreements. Those agreements are making it uneconomic for tea producers in Assam to continue growing tea. The Indian market is so flooded with cheap tea that the growers are burning tonnes of tea every day. They cannot sell it at prices that cover their basic production costs. Members will recognise that scenario from the dairy industry deregulation saga.

I felt very proud to be at the protest rally. I was there for two days - from the beginning in a hailstorm in the dark at 6.30 am on Monday. Of the 30 000 people who attended over those two days, probably 99.9 per cent were peaceful. Although they were practising civil disobedience, they did it in an extremely disciplined and peaceful way. The only ugly scene that I saw on the first day involved the incident with the car that was carrying our state Premier. I was right on the other side of this enormous complex when I happened to hear on a radio that had been switched on beside me that our Premier was being surrounded on the other side of the complex, so I made my way around the buildings, which cover over a block and a half, and when I got there some 20 minutes later, I found the Premier in his predicament. I then watched the police on horseback remove the Premier from that situation. I imagine that it was extremely traumatic for Premier Court to be in that situation, because although I was only a few metres away, I could not even see his car because it was so surrounded by people, and all he would have seen for nearly an hour was angry faces and the arms and legs of people who were jumping on top of his car. It must have been extremely frightening. At the same time, I ask why the Premier put himself in the situation in which he chose to use a car to move through a crowd of hundreds of people, when everyone in Australia knew that a blockade was taking place, and when the police instruction was clearly not to take individual vehicles into that centre. That was a very provocative action, and that was the cause of the ugliest scene that I saw on the first day of S-11.

Dairy Industry Deregulation - Adjournment Debate

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural) [10.31 pm]: I observe that often the most entertaining part of the day's proceedings is the adjournment motion. I am afraid I do not have anything quite as exciting as what has preceded me. However, I wish to raise a serious issue, which I intend to take up with the Minister for Planning, about which the House should know the fundamental details. Since the deregulation of the dairy industry, people in the south west of Western Australia have been attempting to come to grips with the consequences that have flowed from that decision. I referred to that matter just last week in another adjournment motion, and I noticed with interest and appreciation the comments that Hon Barry House made in his speech on the Address-in-Reply this evening.

Tonight I raise an entirely different aspect of the dairy deregulation issue. This is an important issue, to which we all need to apply some attention. One of the regional consequences of dairy deregulation has been that much of the land in the south west that was used for dairying will now be converted to alternative land uses as the supply of milk contracts diminishes in response to the absurd prices for milk as a direct consequence of deregulation. This is not a surprising outcome. We cannot say we did not think this would happen and we are not ready to deal with it yet. Government agencies at all three levels of jurisdiction have had ample warning of this traumatic change in land use patterns, both current and future. Most members will be aware of the submission by the Shire of Dardanup to the Senate committee inquiry into deregulation. A significant part of that Dardanup submission dealt with the very question of changes in land use patterns as a consequence of the deregulation of the industry.

I was called today by a farmer in Brunswick Junction. I will not name the farmer tonight, because I do not think it is relevant, although obviously I will in my communication with the Minister for Planning. This Dardanup farmer is going through a process which many south west dairy farmers will be seeking to address, if they have not done so already. He is making adjustments to his holdings to address the changed situation and his somewhat severely reduced income. One of the sound business decisions that one makes in those circumstances, if one has an opportunity to do so, is to sell off some assets to address one's debt situation to make the reduced income, and the reduced debt-servicing capacity which arises from that reduced income, more amenable to a capacity to pay.

The Shire of Dardanup in its evidence to the Senate committee, and presumably other shires in the south west, raised the issue of minimum subdivisional requirements. The Shire of Dardanup does not permit subdivisions of less than 40 hectares. Clearly, other shires would have similar requirements in areas zoned rural. In this case the

Hon Peter Foss; Hon Tom Helm; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott

farmer sought to subdivide a block of 451 acres, of which 30 acres had already been set aside by Main Roads for a new diversion road. He was seeking to subdivide the remaining 421 acres into three lots of some 140 acres each. To return to the Shire of Dardanup's example of a minimum subdivisional requirement of 40 hectares - which is about 100 acres - 140 acres converts to about 56 hectares; therefore, they would be substantial lots.

When the farmer made his application for that subdivision, it went through a process, as does any rural subdivision, of advice-taking from the relevant agencies, including the local government, Agriculture Western Australia and the Environmental Protection Authority. I understand approval was given by all three authorities. However, when the application went to the Ministry for Planning, it carried out its own assessment of the block and refused the application for subdivision. The bases for that refusal was that the land was waterlogged and of poor quality and, presumably, as a result of those two factors, deemed unsuitable for subdivisional purposes. I do not know much about the carrying capacity of south west land. Other members in this place would be more up to date than I am with the performance characteristics of south west pastures. However, these 451 acres are currently carrying 300 dairy cattle. I would have thought a carrying capacity of 300 dairy cattle was a phenomenal performance. On my standards I would need 7 000 or 8 000 acres to carry 300 dairy cattle. That performance is indicative that if 451 acres can carry 300 cattle in what has been quite a wet winter - wet winters in that part of the world mean generally poor pasture performance - it means that it is neither waterlogged nor of poor quality.

In addition, this farmer took separate scientific advice about the land from an independent agency, including soil testing of the land that established its excellent condition for both the generation of pasture and for horticulture, neither of which factors are consistent with the finding of Planning that it is waterlogged and of poor quality. The assessor who made that judgment of the farm did not spend 20 minutes on the farm. An amount of 451 acres is a large block of land in a south west holding. It was clearly a difficult task to try to assess a block of land of that size in 20 minutes, and a task at which this assessor appears to have failed.

Hon Barry House: They usually do it as a desktop study.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I was pleased he visited, but it might have been better had he not because a desktop study on these performance figures and indicators would show it was very good land. The decision has been to the minister. At this stage, as I understand it, the minister has affirmed the planning decision. The reason I am raising this matter here today is that, setting aside this example, in a general sense we need to be far more understanding of the problems facing south west farmers in these circumstances. We have known for a long time that planning issues will be important in the resolution of the financial problems these farmers are facing. They are not looking for any assistance but simply for some flexibility in future land-use patterns. We are not asking for people to go overboard and start allocating five-acre rural domestic-type blocks in a straight-out farming area, but we need to allow for flexibility to allow for the process of change in land use patterns to occur. I sincerely hope that government members particularly might also raise this matter with the minister and call for a more flexible approach from the agencies concerned.

S-11 Protest in Melbourne - Adjournment Debate

HON J.A. SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [10.42 pm]: Like my colleague Hon Christine Sharp, I want to talk about the S-11 protest in Melbourne. I saw a different process from that reported in the media. A comment made on the ABC on the second morning of the forum was that two protests seemed to be taking place in Melbourne - *The Herald* protest and *The Age* protest. Unfortunately the reporting followed the line of *The Herald* protest in most instances. *The Herald* focused on what it called violent protests when there were in fact not generally violent protests but generally violent reactions to protests on quite a few occasions.

Hon Peter Foss: The Premier's car spontaneously self-destructed, did it?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: No, that was an incident but it was not an incident against a person. Many, many protesters were smashed in the face with batons, trampled and kicked.

Hon Peter Foss: You do not see the incident with the car as a personal matter at all?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: It was certainly frightening for the Premier. Although I did not see the incident, I have seen a lot of footage of it and saw that a lot of it was clowning around.

Hon Peter Foss: He should have been laughing along with the crowd?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Unlike the Attorney General, I was there.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: You saw it in the footage. Get your story right!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am talking about the general protest.

Hon Peter Foss; Hon Tom Helm; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott

Hon Peter Foss: You sound like an apologist for illegal behaviour.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I said that from my point of view the incident probably went further than I would like to have seen, but, as my colleague Hon Christine Sharp said, the Victorian police told the Premier not to take that route. He chose, probably for political purposes, to go in that direction.

Hon Peter Foss: You should not provoke these things.

Hon Kim Chance: If you kick a dog and it bites, do you blame the dog?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I saw the extreme courage of many people coming from a wide variety of sectors in our community, not the uninformed rabble that was portrayed in the media. I met many people of various ages, including country people and farmers who were protesting against genetically modified food and the dairy adjustment schemes that are affecting their lives. These very real effects of globalisation are not being properly dealt with because of the imbalance of power. Globalisation takes no account of social aspects.

I also met people at the protest who had other concerns. People in defence of government schools in Victoria and New South Wales, a group known as DOGS, are very concerned about the impact of policies imposed on them. A huge variety of people were present, and most people were well informed about the issues being debated. Members opposite seem to miss, and have a lack of understanding about, what is happening to us through uneven globalisation. Members opposite display utter arrogance in not listening to the concerns of these people. Globalisation has good aspects. Unlike members opposite, I do not have a cargo cult mentality about the beauty of the market, and how it will provide everybody with a good relationship at home and make all our lives better in every way. I do not believe in a cargo cult, but in reality and in talking to people on the ground. Unlike others, I do not sit in my little tower.

The media failed to show the absolute courage of some of the young people who stood in lines with their arms linked. They were battered by the police. Young women were punched in the face and neck, yet, although weeping, they held on and refused to buckle under that pressure. They do not act for themselves, but are concerned about the lives of other people in the world. They were not like Bill Gates inside the casino who looked at how he could further increase his income from the zillions he already makes. They are not like the Nestle corporation, the reputation of which should be the lowest of the low in this world. Some of its practices in the third world -

Hon Kim Chance: Like killing babies in Africa.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: And it also occurred in Asia. One of Nestle's practices was to visit hospitals in Asia when women had just given birth and to quickly get the women feeding their babies on its milk formula by providing free batches. The mothers' breast milk dried up and they had to keep buying the Nestle product, even though they could not afford it. It was disgusting behaviour to make profits. A chemical company was selling vitamins in Bangladesh to people who needed food, and sold chemicals to keep down the swelling from malnutrition.

The people outside the Melbourne casino - which is an appropriate venue for such a dialogue to take place - are concerned about these issues. I refer to old and young people from all backgrounds who are concerned about the effects of globalisation. The Attorney General finds that incredibly amusing.

Hon Peter Foss: I find you amusing!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: He has such disregard for his fellow human being that he thinks it is a joke.

Hon Peter Foss interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to listen to Hon Jim Scott, Attorney General.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I was proud of those people. They stood up for principles and for democracy, which is being eroded by unelected people making decisions which force a loss of our sovereignty and citizenship in our countries, while our Governments trade away our rights to make a few extra bucks.

Hon Kim Chance: At least it saved the people of Melbourne \$10m by shutting the casino.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: That is right. It was not up to the casino entirely. Those protesters would probably have something to say about that. On the other hand, a lot of those families who were addicted to gambling and were shut out from gambling at the casino were probably very grateful.

The other aspect is that the people from the mainstream media certainly did nothing to present an even analysis of what went on, apart from a few. Funnily enough, some of the best were newspapers such as *The Australian Financial Review*; they looked at some of the issues behind the demonstrations and said that those issues were real and must be dealt with. Until these matters are dealt with there will continue to be problems. I estimate

there will be hundreds of thousands of people demonstrating in Prague next month at the World Trade Organisation. Until it is recognised that globalisation is to do with making more money, and that it has an effect on people's lives, these demonstrations will continue. If the mainstream media fail to grasp this, the alternative media - the Internet, the Channel 31s and so on - will become the mainstream media, because the confidence in the ability of the mainstream media to report will be lost. People will eventually see the other footage. Other stories are coming out of this globalisation issue. The Mr Packers and the Mr Murdochs, who were probably sitting inside, will find that they are no longer listened to.

Hon Tom Helm, Comments - Adjournment Debate

HON MARK NEVILL (Mining and Pastoral) [10.52 pm]: I want to correct the record as to what was said earlier tonight. Dianne Mills is the only squatter I know of in east Kalgoorlie. I do not know of any other people who are squatters and I have not suggested that anyone else there is a squatter. Over the years I have helped many people in Norseman and in Kalgoorlie-Boulder get title to land to which they did not have title. I am not aware how long Mrs Mills has lived there, but I know she does not have title to the land and is one of the people seeking compensation.

The Hainault shaft has now disappeared. It was situated where the super pit now is. There were houses from the Hainault shaft right down to the Boulder town district. The top end of Hainault Road has been cleared, the houses have been demolished and the land has been rehabilitated with trees. Dozens and dozens of houses have been purchased by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd and its predecessors at sometimes two or three times the market value. Some people have been given an existing house in the town as an incentive to move. Many of the houses in that area would probably be called the lowest quality houses in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. They were built right next to the mine site. Some people might refer to them almost as shanties. There is no doubt that those people were affected by noise and dust; they always were close to the mine, and the tailings dumps were all through that area. There was also an element of people wanting to get compensation for their properties, and I can understand that, and they were handsomely compensated. A large bund was placed between the Superpit and those houses to reduce the noise. Within that area there is now an exclusion zone of 400 metres from the pit because of noise, fly rock and things like that.

Hon Tom Helm admitted he did not know where Hainault was. That is part of the problem when we talk about things about which we know little. I consulted a colleague of mine about whether he had heard of the Hainault residents group referred to in Dr Andrew Penman's letter. That person had no recollection of a group of that name, but one or two prominent groups in that area have complained. I mentioned in my speech that a Mr Baker did lead one such group. Nothing I have said is incorrect. Hon Tom Helm is quite incorrect when he suggests that the Hainault area still has houses in it. The very western end of Hainault Road may have.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.54 pm
