

# Legislative Council

Tuesday, 13 September 1988

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 3.30 pm, and read prayers.

## BILLS (10) - ASSENT

Messages from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills -

1. Road Traffic Amendment Bill
2. Local Government Grants Amendment Bill
3. Justices Amendment Bill
4. Supreme Court Amendment Bill
5. Bail Amendment Bill
6. Acts Amendment and Repeal (Fair Trading) Bill
7. Road Traffic Amendment (Random Breath Tests) Bill
8. Real Estate and Business Agents Amendment Bill
9. State Engineering Works Repeal Bill
10. Electoral Amendment Bill

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Hon Margaret McAleer resolved -

That leave of absence for eight sitting days be granted to Hon C.J. Bell on the ground of urgent private business.

## APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

### *Consideration of Tabled Paper*

Debate resumed from 30 August.

HON G.E. MASTERS (West - Leader of the Opposition) [3.37 pm]: It is interesting to note that the title of this tabled paper is Estimates of Expenditure 1988-89. I also note that this is the earliest introduction of such a document that I can recall since my entering Parliament. We should ask ourselves why. The Government would say that this is because it is more efficient, but when the Minister for Budget Management tabled this paper earlier in the session he was utterly exhausted. That this document has been tabled so early was not the choice of the Minister. Perhaps one or two reasons exist for the early tabling of this document.

Hon J.M. Brown: Jumping at shadows!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: That could well be.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members, please cease all audible conversations.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: One reason for the early tabling of this document could be that it gives the Government the option of an early election. Perhaps that is the Government's strategy. Obviously serious consideration is being given to an early election - say, 1 October which was mentioned a week or 10 days ago.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Your consideration.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: That was a change of direction and maybe the Government will consider the option whenever it suits it. I suppose that is what a Government is all about.

Hon Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I am going to. That is one option. It may be a Government strategy and one of the reasons for bringing the papers into this place early. If that is not the case, it

is certainly a reason for the Government's wanting to get out of Parliament as quickly as it can. It is obvious that it is endeavouring to avoid debating more of the scandals that are revealing themselves to the public daily.

Hon B.L. Jones: Ha, ha!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Does the member think that is not the case? Has she read the Sunday papers or does she not bother? We have read about more wheeling and dealing by the Government and a further loss of \$8 million. We have also read about the Government's propping up its mates. I suggest that members regard the Government's recent activities as an embezzling of public funds; that is the best way that I can describe it.

Hon Mark Nevill: Who are the Government's mates?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I have no doubt that if the Premier and the Attorney General were the chairman and accountant of a public company, that company would be in serious trouble. I believe that someone would be imprisoned in Fremantle Prison. Public companies are required under the law to give account of themselves and of the funds that they administer and invest for business purposes. It is even more proper for Governments to be accountable to the public. After all, they deal with the public's funds. Time and time again the Government has refused to account for the funds it administers and for its business dealings. We have all heard of WA Inc. Recently, the Government, when challenged to supply information on the petrochemical deal, replied that the secrecy clauses in the deal prevented it from making information available to the public. Companies, big businesses and small businesses are required to reveal the substance of the deals they make and the Government must be accountable in the same way.

Recently the State Government Insurance Commission revealed an unaudited profit of about \$132 million. The Opposition responded that it would not believe the figure until the accounts were made public. It was a ploy by the Government to take the heat off it. Having announced the profit, the Government decided how it would spend that money with no reference to the Parliament. Many members of Parliament, including many Government members, do not have the faintest idea of what is going on. The Westminster system of Parliament requires Governments to be accountable to the public. If there is any hint of corruption or scandal in money deals, the Minister responsible should resign. When talking about accountability, the former Deputy Premier, Mr Bryce said that Governments should be more accountable. That is okay for him! He has feathered his nest at the public's expense. He engineered many of these deals and has now walked away and said that the Government should be more accountable. At the same time, his ex-boss, Mr Burke, is off mincing around Ireland.

Hon B.L. Jones: I am sure he does not mince.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: It looks to me like he does. Nowhere else, except in the most outrageous banana republics, has there been such scandalous situations. I do not know whether Government members attend many functions and talk to many people from other countries. If they did they would understand the concern of Australians and people from overseas about what is happening in this State. These people cannot believe what they hear. I know that many companies have moved their headquarters from Western Australia so that they do not become involved with the Government. Many diplomats and representatives of other countries shake their heads in astonishment and ask how is it possible that this situation could flourish the way it has. Many Government members know what I say is true because they talk to the same people.

Hon D.K. Dans: Be specific? What do they talk about? What flourishes?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: They are talking about WA Inc. They are also talking about the Teachers Credit Society, the Rothwells deal, the petrochemical plant, the \$150 million guarantee for a bank -

Hon T.G. Butler: Who does?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: People from the Eastern States and overseas. It is not difficult to understand why they are so concerned. Public funds are certainly being misplaced in a way they should never be misplaced.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Siphoned off.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I am absolutely certain that many traditional Labor Party supporters, such as Hon Fred McKenzie, Hon Sam Piantadosi and Hon Jim Brown, do not support the Government's actions and are bitterly and violently opposed to WA Inc. However, they are locked into the system. We have to ask ourselves whether the Government is just incompetent, whether it is being outmanoeuvred, or whether it is misusing its power. I have referred to corruption of privilege before and have explained exactly what that means. The Labor Government has destroyed the integrity and high standing of this State, a State we are all proud of. It has destroyed what former Governments have fought for and protected for many years. It still goes on. Anyone would think that a new Premier would make changes. However, the petrochemical deal was a crafty way of saving the Government embarrassment at having to pay up for the \$150 million guarantee in the Rothwells deal.

Hon Tom Stephens: Your speeches are getting worse the longer you are here.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: The member has shaved his beard off. It was better before because it hid his face.

Hon Tom Stephens: Would you like a kiss, Mr Masters?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: That deal saved the Government the embarrassment of forking out \$150 million.

Hon John Halden: It means 1 700 jobs.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I understand the deal was going through in any event at an estimated cost of between \$600 million and \$700 million. The Government has said it is creating jobs! It is only attempting to get itself off the hook. Can Hon John Halden tell us the exact figure involved in that deal?

Hon John Halden: No.

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: He can't add up.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Of course, he cannot add up. The Government will not provide the sum because it says there is a secrecy clause. The Government valued a project at between \$600 million or \$700 million and \$1 billion. So far, we have a beautiful block of land and a plan. The Government has put the public of Western Australia in hock for at least \$150 million.

Hon Mark Nevill: What about the contracts?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: The thing must first be built. The member is talking absolute rubbish.

Hon S.M. Piantadosi: You don't believe in contracts.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: If honourable members opposite think it is such a wonderful idea, they might answer a simple question: Would any of them risk their superannuation payouts by putting their money into the petrochemical deal?

Hon Tom Stephens: I would, if given the opportunity.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I think we can arrange that.

Hon P.G. Pendal: Mr Dans is silent. He is the first cab off the rank.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Government members know very well that they would not risk a single dollar of their money in the project.

Hon D.K. Dans: You must be aware that most modern Governments have what are called OBAs or Off Budget Authorities. We had to drag our State into that position.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Mr Dans and his Government have dragged us into a situation unheard of in any other country with the Westminster system of Government, and he knows it. We have been made the laughing stock of the world and people in Australia, let alone Western Australia, have been deeply embarrassed.

Hon Mark Nevill: Tell us about Mr Lightfoot.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Let us consider the record of the Labor Government. The 1987-88 Treasury figures which are available for all to see emphasise what can only be described as

fiscal extortion of the ordinary Western Australian person. Extortion is the only word we can use. The State tax take last year was increased by 28.5 per cent, the reason being that the Government wanted to reduce it this year to make it look like a good manager. The increased figure of 28.5 per cent does not take into account the State fuel levy, which is very difficult to find in the papers that have been presented to the House. The honourable member opposite who is laughing could perhaps point to the relevant pages on which it might appear. In the meantime, while he is whisking through his documents, I will carry on with my speech.

The State fuel levy is not included directly in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I have managed to trace some of it and I will make reference to it later. Between the financial years 1983-84 and 1987-88 State tax receipts were increased by 120 per cent. That is the record of this Government.

Hon John Halden: It is growth.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: It is not growth. What has happened to the loot that the Government has collected? The Government is looting the public and looting the public purse. The Minister for Budget Management when asked where the Government would find the \$119 million rescue packet for the Teachers Credit Society said, "It can be absorbed." We assume from what he said that the Government will raise further taxes. It has spent the rainy day money.

Hon John Halden: Would you have let those people with deposits in the society go under?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Certainly not.

Hon John Halden: What would you have done?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: We would have called a halt to it months before. The Government allowed it to roll on despite all the warnings. Some of the Government's mates and others got out tens of millions of dollars. They were all getting their fingers in the till. The \$119 million is not to be taken out of the rainy day fund of some \$200 million that the Government had in its back pocket because it has spent that buying votes in this Budget. The Teachers Credit Society rescue will be a cost to the public, yet Mr Berinson glibly says that it can be absorbed. The Government can absorb it simply by putting up taxes.

Hon John Halden: We didn't do that.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Let us consider where else it might have gone by going through the figures. Has the money gone into education? My colleague, Hon Norman Moore, would most certainly dispute that because there are not enough teachers to implement the new Unit Curriculum. I am sure my colleague when he makes his speech will assure the House that the number of teachers is now less than it was a few years ago. Has the money gone to law and order? The Government has suddenly realised that law and order is an issue and has said that it will increase the size of the Police Force by 1 000 police officers over the next three years. It is too late. It should have been done earlier. The public know that it is just a ruse and that the promise was made just to get the Government off the hook.

Hon John Halden: Better than your last three years in Government.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: As it happens, there are fewer police officers than there were two years ago.

Hon T.G. Butler: That's rubbish!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: The crime rate is high. The public are crying out for something to be done about it. The Government, knowing that an election is coming up, made all sorts of promises. It was frantic in covering itself, but it is too late.

The problems relating to health care have not been addressed by the Government. Certain standover tactics were applied to some of the lower paid nurses to prevent their receiving a rise.

Hon T.G. Butler: Ha, ha!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: The member opposite ought to be ashamed of himself. Has the money gone into roads? Has the Government spent the massive increase in funds collected

on roads? I put it to the House that it has not. Indeed, truck fees have been greatly increased to help pay for road costs and road funding. We have the highest State fuel levy in Australia today and it is not being properly used. It is not being used for the very purpose it was intended; that is, for roads and road maintenance. In the failure of the Government to perform we have a burgeoning bureaucracy, bigger and bigger Government.

Hon John Halden: Public Service numbers are dropping. You are wrong again.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: If the honourable member listened to Hon Joe Berinson when he answered a question I asked him only 10 days ago with respect to whether there had been a three per cent decrease in the public sector, he would have heard that was only for the 1986-87 year and that in some departments the Government achieved a three per cent reduction in its work force, but only for one year. If the member looks at some of the departmental reports, for example, that of the Department of Corrective Services, he will find that the figures are now higher than they were three years ago. Public Service numbers are increasing.

Hon John Halden: You are wrong.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not ask Hon John Halden to stop interjecting again. He has constantly defied the Chair all afternoon. I do not mind a fair go, but this continual conversation is not only rude, but also out of order. It does not do anything for the decorum of this place. I suggest that as soon as Hon G.E. Masters completes his speech, Hon John Halden will have the opportunity to contradict him if he wishes.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Thank you, Mr President. I was saying that we have a public sector that is increasing greatly and that the so called reductions announced by the Government with a loud fanfare were achieved only in the short term and then numbers are getting out of hand once again. There has been no reduction in the size of Government; there has been a great increase in it. In addition, the Government has involved itself in competing with the private sector at great cost to the public and to the taxpayer. Without a shadow of doubt the figures prove that the Western Australian public have suffered more than taxpayers in other States from increased State taxation. No State has come remotely close to Western Australia's increased rate of State taxation. For the record, I will give the figures which have been obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The reference No. is 5506 and the figures are those which applied on 15 April 1988. Between the financial years 1982-83 and 1986-87 State taxes increased in New South Wales by 57 per cent; in Victoria, by 45.7 per cent; in Queensland, by 45.2 per cent; in South Australia, by 69.1 per cent; in Tasmania, by 71.7 per cent; and in Western Australia by 88.9 per cent. If that is not a serious situation, I do not know what is! When I say the Western Australian public suffered more than the people in any other State in Australia, that is the reason for it.

Hon T.G. Butler: You don't believe it yourself, do you?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Mr President, I have just read out the official figures from public documents which demonstrate that Western Australians have had and suffered an 88.9 per cent increase in taxes; one cannot argue with those figures - they are not my figures, but public ones. I say that the public have suffered greatly under the Government of the member who just interjected.

Hon T.G. Butler: You know that is not true.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I suggest to the honourable member that he reads *Hansard* later as they are the official figures as at 15 April 1988.

Hon T.G. Butler: With a wrong emphasis put on them by you.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I will read them backwards, if that will help the member. The end result is that between the financial years 1982-83 and 1986-87 Western Australians suffered increases in taxes and charges of 88.9 per cent, which is far higher than the figure for any other State.

Hon T.G. Butler: That is rubbish, and you know it.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Then the member should stand and give figures to refute them. The Government member says it is rubbish. However, there were new taxes; for example, FID, which was a complete rort, a method, if you like, of enabling the Government to raise money

very quickly. There was also a tax on life assurance policies and increased rates of existing taxes such as stamp duty and mortgages. I will make those figures available to members in a few moments. There were also increases for the transfer of motor vehicles and in payroll tax. The Government boasts it has reduced taxes but they are more and more each year. That is because of increased activity, says the Government, but I will prove that is not the reason and that the Government has far exceeded the rates in Western Australia. The liquor tax is exorbitant. We know how high the tobacco tax is in Western Australia. I have already made reference to the fuel tax. All of these taxes are gross impositions on the public of Western Australia and the Government, if it were doing its job, would be able to reduce those taxes considerably rather than spend, spend, spend, which is exactly what it has done.

Hon S.M. Piantadosi: Thank God George is coming.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Who is George?

Hon S.M. Piantadosi: George Cash. He might give a bit of life to the Opposition next year.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Mr President, I understand the Government's embarrassment, and that it is in a difficult position. It has, as I have already said, overcharged the public of Western Australia to an extent that no other Government has dreamed of in recent years. I have already said that State taxation is up, and I will not keep repeating that. I have given the official figures, but let us get down to per head of population, every man, woman and child and how much taxation increases last year have affected them.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not know about all the taxes, but I know that my patience is being taxed to the extreme. I ask honourable members to cease their audible conversations and interjections and perhaps the honourable member could then complete his speech sooner.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I have a fair way to go.

The PRESIDENT: Then I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition stop talking to members and address the Chair.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Mr President, I understood that I was addressing the House through you, but I will do my very best. The increase in burden per head of population for every man, woman and child in Western Australia, as a result of the Government's activities last year, was \$140, or to be exact \$140.59. If one looks at this in another form, as State taxation per capita, one finds the State taxation burden on the community was \$704 for every man, woman and child in Western Australia. Significantly, last year it was \$563, so there has been a very large further imposition on the public over the past 12 months. That needs to be taken account of. It is no good the Minister or the Premier saying that they are reducing the burden of Government taxes and charges when they are, in fact, increasing greatly. When we have talked of this Government's increased taxation Mr Berinson has glibly said on a number of occasions that it is due to increased activity and new business, that the State is booming and that is why the Government is collecting more money. That is not true! Western Australian economic growth, calculated in real terms for last year and above the inflation rate, was 3.98 per cent, under four per cent, yet the Government take in the same period was 28.5 per cent; so whatever the inflation was - say seven per cent, plus four per cent, which is 11 per cent - the Government's increased taxation last year was 28.5 per cent; it was enormous, more than double the growth rate allowing for inflation.

Hon P.G. Pandal: That is how they care about the little bloke.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: They do not care at all. These are exact figures taken from the Government's own records; that total tax taken by the State Government in 1986-87 was \$832 million, but this year is \$1.070 million, so there was an enormous growth. If one looks at that figure in its true perspective one finds the claims of the Minister leading this House, and of the Premier, are obviously untrue. Indeed, the increased Government take is not only as a result of growth but partly as a result of growth; in fact, only half is a result of growth. The fuel levy is around \$90 million this year. I have already made reference to that and to the fact that every person who fills their fuel tank pays 30c per litre in tax, either to the

Federal Government or the State Government. Every person who fills the average family car tank - and I do not know how much that would be, probably 65 litres - is paying in the region of \$2.65 to the Western Australian Government. As I have pointed out previously, these greatly increased charges are not being put to the purpose for which they are raised; that is, for roads. They are being hived off for other purposes.

In 1987-88 the tobacco tax raised \$65 million. Anticipated tax revenue on tobacco this year is \$78 million, again a large increase. The liquor tax, \$56 million last year, is expected to rise to \$65.5 million next year, and these are Government figures, not mine. Land tax for 1982-83 was \$35 million but for 1986-87 it was \$59 million, and I guess it is anticipated to rise again. Stamp duty has increased greatly. We have heard the Government say that it is taking the pressure off stamp duty, but stamp duty cost per capita in Western Australia - that is, for every man, woman and child - is directly or indirectly \$283 per head. If members want that in dollar terms for the whole State the amount collected in 1986-87 was \$272.9 million and in 1987-88 was \$431 million, an increase of \$160 million. The worst example without any shadow of doubt is the fuel levy for road funds, or partly for road funds.

Hon H.W. Gayfer: It is just as well the member is talking to the President as no-one else is listening.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I am not surprised. However, let us get it on the record that the worst example is the fuel levy, which is intended for road funds. I recently read a document put out by the Royal Automobile Club which points out the accident rate on the roads as a result of bad road engineering and lack of maintenance. I think we should pay attention to what is being said because it is very important. A couple of weeks ago legislation went through on random breath testing, where the Government was claiming that drink driving was the cause of all accidents. I dispute that, and in time it will be proved that not sufficient funds are being spent on roads to avoid to a large extent the accidents people are suffering. The Government is pocketing this money, playing monopoly with the public purse. Without a shadow of doubt this Government is the reverse of Robin Hood: It is robbing the poor and giving to the rich. That is the end result of its activities. Who is paying for all these things?

Hon Tom Stephens: You are like Pinocchio; your nose is growing longer.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I assure the member that is not the case; and he should not be interjecting from his leader's chair, he should sit in his own chair. What he is saying is totally wrong.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon John Williams): Hon Tom Stephens is not sitting in his place so I cannot see him, therefore I cannot hear him either.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: What I was saying is that the Government is the reverse of Robin Hood: it is robbing the poor and giving to the rich. Indeed the public are well aware of what is happening and will react accordingly. One would think that with a new broom we would have the opportunity to show the difference between this Government and its predecessor. We hoped to see a change from a greedy, high spending Government to a caring Government, but that has not been the case. Last year, unbelievably, the Government received \$263 million more than it expected from taxation. Mr Berinson would say that represents an increase in business activity, but it does not. At the end of the day the Government has received \$263 million more than it budgeted for this time last year.

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: It spent the lot, did it not?

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Certainly. It has made \$40 million on earnings on investments, so we are talking about \$300 million. But let us just talk about the \$263 million, because Mr Berinson, as Hon David Wordsworth said, boasted of a Budget surplus. He said, "We have done a wonderful job." But what he has not said is that the Government spent \$260 million more than it budgeted for 12 months ago. It was not difficult to achieve a \$3 million surplus when there was a surplus in revenue of \$260 million. That is not good management; it is damned bad management. If the Government kept within the bounds of last year's Budget a lot less tax would have to be paid by the public this year, but the Government spent it one way or another, and in many cases quite recklessly. That is nothing for the Minister for Budget Management to be proud of. There was something like a 16.2 per cent increase in spending by the Government last year. This is by far and away the highest increase in Australia. If the Government had budgeted properly and saved dipping into the public purse

it could have considered moves such as the abolition of FID tax, which would have cost \$32 million. That tax was unnecessary, and it has proved to be unnecessary. The Government could have got away without it.

Several members interjected.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: Are members opposite saying it is a good tax?

Hon P.G. Pendal: They could have given the people at Rockingham some physiotherapy.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: The Government could have abolished FID and halved the stamp duty on motor vehicles, which would have saved \$27 million to the public. It could have reduced the fuel tax by 2c a litre. It is the highest fuel tax in Australia, and the public would have been saved \$50 million. The Government could have exempted from stamp duty mortgaged owned and occupied dwellings, which would have meant \$15 million saved. Those figures amount to \$124 million. The Government could have given a tax present to the public of at least \$120 million had it been prudent last year, but more particularly if it were prepared to be prudent this year. We all know the Government is on a massive vote buying exercise which will see State spending increase by something like 17 per cent in 1988-89, at a time when all other States and the Commonwealth are cutting back and trying to save the public purse and keep down the level of taxation. The Government had something like \$199 million in its back pocket, and we would have expected it to put that forward as a contribution to reducing taxes. It did not; it decided to spend the lot, and that is contained in these papers which we are now discussing.

The Premier claims the tax cuts over the last five years by this State Government have been in the region of \$80 million. How can that be possible when the Government took \$260 million more than it expected last year? The Government cut out some taxes and cut back to the tune of \$80 million, but at the same time, on a calculation made not by me but by an expert, the Western Australian taxpayers over the past five years have paid an additional \$900 million in tax. At a time when the nation is urging restraint, when other Australian Governments are attempting to reduce tax and spending, this Government has gone on a spending spree. It is the height of economic irresponsibility. I pity the poor working man.

These papers we are discussing will be followed by Budget papers and appropriation papers and we will debate these matters again. I put it to members that the Government has been irresponsible, high spending, and in a unique position this year to make substantial tax cuts. It has not done that; it has gone about the exercise of buying votes knowing that an election is coming up and it hopes that people will forget they have been all but bled to death in the last four or five years. I do not think the people will forget; I think the Government will be judged on its activities, and it has been irresponsible to say the least.

HON T.G. BUTLER (North East Metropolitan) [4.17 pm]: I congratulate the Government on bringing down such a responsible Budget.

Hon Tom Stephens: Hear, Hear!

Hon G.E. Masters: Irresponsible!

Hon T.G. BUTLER: Oppositions are expected to criticise Governments, but in doing so they should be more constructive than Hon Gordon Masters. It is unfortunate that his mind is in a continual state of outrage and he sees standover tactics and corruption in practically every corner of any document that he reads. That is a pity because I have respect for him, but he unfortunately tends to wear that respect fairly thin. Members opposite were never able to handle their Budgets when they were in Government. Since the 1985 election the Labor Government has had to work very hard to turn the economy of this State around from where it was when it took office. What really gets up the nose of the Leader of the Opposition and people on the other side is that we have succeeded in restoring the confidence of the community, and we have created the best economy of any State in Australia. One should not put too much faith in the figures Hon Gordon Masters quotes, because, as I said by way of interjection, they can be construed in any way one wants to apply them.

Hon H.W. Gayfer: On what authority do you base your comment that Western Australia has the best economy of any State in Australia?

Hon T.G. BUTLER: I suggest the member look at the Budget papers and there will be no need for me to explain.



I wish to talk briefly on the present state of the housing industry. I was somewhat surprised to find in *The West Australian* recently an article calling for more skilled migrants because of the housing crisis. The call came from the Construction and Housing Association of Australia; there was also a strong plea from the Housing Industry Association of Western Australia. The housing industry is vulnerable at any time but more so when the economy is buoyant and the industry reaches a boom situation. The housing industry is deregulated and it runs along its own little way without any regard for awards or for regulated wages, working primarily on the subcontract system. As a result prices for those subcontractors are kept so low that there is no scope for the training of apprentices in the industry. It annoys me that an industry as large as the housing industry can get away with a situation like that. It takes everything it can out of the industry but returns nothing to it by way of teaching skills and so on. However, all of a sudden the housing industry has realised there is a shortage and it will have to embark upon a training scheme which will provide about 400 semi-trained persons by the end of the year - people who really will not be able to carry out the building of houses with the skill we see at present. They will be half-trained and the result of that will be that people who have saved hard and long to make the biggest investment of their lives will find themselves buying houses which are the result of second rate workmanship.

I support the comments of the President of the Construction, Mining and Energy Workers Union, Mr Bill Ethell, who in the Press this morning was reported as calling for key sections of the home building industry to look at themselves as an organisation which had been prepared to exploit a deregulated industry while not training people to fill the gap. Mr Ethell called for a revamping of the training system and also the retraining of older workers. We also see the housing industry wanting to train people in specialised sections of the building industry, such as roofing. That is all very well, but it is only a short term solution because once the industry slows down these people will no longer be wanted and will be thrown back on the scrap heap because their skills in the industry are limited. The Housing Industry Association has not provided any answers and it needs to look long and hard at itself to get round the problem.

Another problem exacerbated by the present housing crisis, and which was reported in the *Sunday Times* this week, is the practice of signing documents with the proviso that if all the necessary shire permits and so on are cleared within 60 days there will be no increase in the contracted price. One of my constituents has a problem in this regard; that person entered into a contract on 20 May this year with a builder who was going to build a house at a set price. Again, it had that proviso in the contract, which the builder informed the person about; that is, if all of the permits were cleared within 60 days, there would not be an increase in the price. However the builder said, as they all do, "Don't worry about it because they will be cleared within 60 days." In this instance the builder had the plans for 39 days before submitting them to the council, which then had the plans for a further 36 days; during that time the council returned them to the builder because the block was low lying and had a water problem which needed a sandbank construction. The builder had the plans for something like 51 days, which allowed the shire only nine days in which to clear them. The builder was very critical of the council, and so was I, because the council kept the plans longer than it should have; nevertheless the builder had the plans for 51 days, nine days short of the 60 days provided for in the contract. The builder is now saying that my constituent must pay another \$8 000. It seems to me that this practice is just a catch, where the builder says to somebody, "I can build you a house for \$50 000 providing this does not happen, but it will not happen"; the person signs up for \$50 000 but inside of six weeks, because the matter has not been cleared through absolutely no fault of his, he is charged another \$8 000. That is an intolerable situation which needs to be looked at seriously.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Have they been to the Department of Consumer Affairs on that?

Hon T.G. BUTLER: We are chasing it up, but it is not an unusual situation. A similar problem is being faced by a young couple who are also constituents of mine. People are being encouraged to enter into these contracts for building purposes; but, as newspaper articles will tell members, what is happening is that builders are signing contracts for people when they cannot produce houses short of six months' or a year's time. They are grabbing these contracts one after another, irrespective of their clients' situations. The young couple I referred to did not even have a block of land when the contract for the house was signed. They were told they had 60 days to get the permits through the shire but they were told not to

worry because the permits would go through. They did not get their block of land finalised until two weeks after they had signed their contract, so that was 14 days out of the 60 gone. By the time the plans had gone through the various sections of the building industry and then on to the shire, the 60 days were gone and the young couple were up for another \$4 000. That is not money which is added to their mortgage; it is cash money they have to come up with before the keys to their home will be handed over. This is a problem Hon John Halden and I have discussed. People are being stung left, right and centre in this sort of situation. We must look seriously at ways to do away with this practice.

**HON FRED McKENZIE** (North East Metropolitan) [4.30 pm]: In supporting the Budget I have the opportunity to speak on a number of subjects that, while not directly connected to the Budget, have some relevance to the community.

I am concerned about the debate that has been raging in Australia on immigration, and particularly its relevance to Asian people. I have many Asian friends and do not believe them to be different from anybody else. I am appalled that this debate has been allowed to continue in the community and has been fanned by the media for what I believe are mischievous purposes. One means of bringing the debate to the fore was the telephone surveys conducted by the television stations. I have always believed that these polls could be rigged and that has been confirmed by an article which appeared in *The West Australian* on Tuesday, 23 August 1988. In order that members will be aware of how inaccurate are community feelings as indicated by these polls, I will read the article in full. Mr Dennis Lingane is mentioned in the article, but I am not sure whether he wrote it. The article states -

Last year technology writer Dennis Lingane deliberately sabotaged a Channel Seven TV phone survey on the Old Swan Brewery issue.

He was clocking 514 votes an hour on his automatic dialling telephone. His aim was to prove that the phone surveys are open to abuse.

That survey clocked 10 000 total votes and 10 people putting in one hour of dialling each could cast 5 000, and in two hours create a landslide victory.

Ten people using an automatic dialling system which can record 514 votes an hour could cast 5 000 votes. There are more than 10 wealthy people in this community who could afford to do that. There are many poor people who could not. Those 10 wealthy people could record 5 000 votes. In other words, 20 people using an automatic dialling system could record all of the 10 000 votes lodged.

Hon Tom Stephens: The Opposition could be using the Parliament House phone system.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon John Williams): Order! I consider that remark very unparliamentary and ask the member to withdraw it. He has accused Opposition members of falsifying a poll by using Parliament House phones.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: In deference to the Chair, I withdraw.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I do not think anybody in this Parliament would do that because everybody in this Chamber is responsible. I cannot say that about people at the other end of Parliament House, but I assume they are the same. I have not suggested that at all. I am pointing out how telephone surveys can be rigged by using an automatic dialling device that can record 514 votes each hour. The article continued -

The publicity following the Channel Nine *A Current Affair* TV poll on Asian migration is indicative that people are taking these telephone surveys very seriously indeed.

Of course they are; that is exactly what happens. They take notice of the surveys and, before they know where they are, a community attitude has developed indicating that the majority of people are opposed to Asian migration. I do not think that is true. On many occasions it is a matter of how the questions are phrased and I will come to that later.

Hon W.N. Stretch: We saw what happened on last Saturday week.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Is the member referring to the referendum?

Hon W.N. Stretch: Yes.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: That is another way that people can mischievously interpret questions and it was done.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is the funniest thing I have heard since I have been here.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I have read the Constitutional Commission's reports. The questions raised by it were the questions put to the people and a completely different meaning was put on them - I say that quite seriously. However, let us not get onto that subject. I can talk on that for some time too. We will rue the day that we did not change the Constitution because I believe it was necessary on that occasion. We live in an ever changing world.

Hon T.G. Butler: Some of us do.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I believe that if the community had been educated properly, the result would have been different. Another great tactic was used in relation to the referendum - that is, the instilling of fear into the people about what the future might hold. That led to the negative attitude adopted by many of them.

The article continued -

Dennis Lingane spoke to the president of the WA branch of the Australian Marketing Institute, Mike Smith, who is also head of the Marketing Centre - WA's biggest professional research company.

TV polls are inaccurate and dangerous, because they can whip up public emotion, according to marketing chief Mike Smith, who has slammed the recent Channel Nine handling of the Asian migration issue.

Mr Smith says that the Australian Marketing Institute is very concerned about the increasing use of TV telephone surveys.

"The *Current Affair* programme whipped up public emotion with unscientifically handled debates and polling," he said.

"This method, of TV telephone surveys, is questionable and dangerous.

"TV telephone surveys give credence to results that could be dramatically wrong."

He said that the question was couched in a biased way and it was predictable that the overwhelming answer to "Should Asian migration be restricted" would be "yes".

Of course it was a loaded question. Migration is restricted, not only for Asian people, but also for people from all over the world. How many members here have people visit them endeavouring to have their friends, relatives and other people join them from all parts of the globe? I would be surprised if any member of this House had not received such an approach. I have had many. It is very hard for people to migrate to Australia; a rigid test is laid down and entry is permitted to only a small percentage of those wishing to migrate. A lot of people want to come to Australia, and we cannot accept them all. One of the main reasons why we cannot, as I understand it, is the unemployment situation. We do not have full employment here, and we must be mindful of that fact. Some people argue that migrants create work. I am sure they do, but to what extent I am not certain. I am not qualified to say whether the statement that migrants create work in the country can be sustained. Unemployment problems must be borne in mind, and I am not suggesting there should be no restriction on migration. To ask the question, "Should Asian migration be restricted?" naturally prompts the answer yes. Many people in this country desperately wish to bring in blood relatives - brothers or sisters, for example - as migrants.

The article further states -

"There was an emotional debate, with the 'open Asia migration' views dealt with in a moderate manner and the anti-views in an emotional manner," he said.

"That, followed by the loaded question, was bound to get the result it got.

"Had the question been: 'Should Australia have racist immigration policies?' my bet is it would have been a completely different result.

I agree with Mike Smith that the result would have been totally different. Running a program as emotional as this affects the response. I wanted to bring to the attention of members the impact that telephone surveys have on questions put to people, and the effect they subsequently have in conditioning people to accept a viewpoint which is often founded on bad reasoning.

Hon A.A. Lewis: Would you recommend that all political parties go the way their surveys show? People like ANOP?

Hon FRED McKENZIE: It would depend on how the question has been put. I know that all political parties take note of surveys.

Hon T.G. Butler: They certainly do.

Hon A.A. Lewis: The Labor Party is ringing round Collie every second week to find out whether it is losing any more votes.

Hon P.G. Pandal interjected.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Surveys are usually remarkably accurate, although there have been examples of some inaccuracies - that is what enables us to argue different points of view. It is not only surveys that can be used in a mischievous manner, but also statistics. I know that Hon Phillip Pandal, who interjected, quotes statistics at length. I also know that he uses them to advantage by choosing those he would wish to use.

Hon S.M. Piantadosi: He supports Asian migration.

Hon P.G. Pandal: That is a vituperative remark.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: One example is when he moved the amendment to the Address-in-Reply to the Governor.

Hon P.G. Pandal: They come from the ABS - they are your own figures.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I could have put up another set of statistics, but Hon Phillip Pandal put them in another way. I say good luck to the member, I just do not like his mischievous ways.

Hon A.A. Lewis: Mr McKenzie, you are a fair man and you see that it happens on both sides of the House. I think you are being mischievous now.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: That interjection distracted me from what I was to say next.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Get back to the facts.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Get back to the statistics.

Hon A.A. Lewis: Get your whip out.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I am concerned, as I know other members are from the debate during the recent Children's Court of Western Australia Bill, about car thefts. There must be few people who have owned Holden Commodores for a long time who have not suffered an attempt to dispossess them of their motor cars. I have had that experience, and I know quite recently Hon Mark Nevill's car was tampered with. On two occasions my dear old 1979 Holden Commodore which, for the benefit of members' information, I own - there are no interest payments due on it any more -

Hon A.A. Lewis: It will not have to go on Mr Edwards' register of motor cars.

Hon P.G. Pandal: The museum was on the phone the other day wanting to see you about it.

Several members interjected.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: It has got to be that sort of piece but, then again, I live in a working class electorate and it does not do to be seen in a new Commodore or Mercedes.

Hon H.W. Gayfer: My car happens to be a 1976 model.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I know that, it is a beautiful car, and it is a Mercedes. I have a common old Holden Commodore.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon FRED McKENZIE: My car has been tampered with twice. I have had two broken windows.

Hon G.E. Masters: You should do what the rest of your colleagues do - get a Government car.

Hon P.G. Pental: You are the only one who has not got one.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I think Whips should have a car. Nobody else agrees with me, and I do not have the numbers. I would be quite generous about it, because I believe Opposition members should have cars too.

Hon P.G. Pental: If you get the sack, you will get a car.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Fred McKenzie is making a speech, and we do not want a conversation.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Serious consideration should be given to giving members of Parliament motor vehicles in which to travel around and visit their constituencies.

Hon A.A. Lewis: You come and talk to your representative of the local Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, and I will see what I can do for you.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I am pleased that we appointed Hon A.A. Lewis to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, because we will receive fair treatment from him.

I am prepared to go without a Government motor vehicle and to continue using my Holden Commodore, but it irks me when people break into cars and, worse still, steal them. I have been lucky in that as I have an old car thieves have been unable to start it and it has been left behind, but they rip everything out of it. They take the padding out so that they can hot wire it - whatever the term is. It is inconvenient and the damage can cost \$400 or \$500. I urge the Government to look at the penalties for car theft. I agree with Opposition speakers who were speaking about another Bill - I do not want to refer to that debate - that we have to look at this matter because there is an ever increasing number of cars being stolen. Cars are expensive items, and the sentences handed down are insufficient. I do not know whether the answer is to send people to gaol; I think we should find some other method of dealing with these offenders in an attempt to avoid some of these experiences. A speech entitled "Car Theft" presented by Phil Franzone, training development officer, at a seminar organised by the Insurance Council of Australia to discuss the legal and socioeconomic effects of car theft on the community at large, appeared in "Motor Industry" of December 1987. It stated -

The answer undoubtedly is electronics. The introduction of solid state chip technology to the motor industry has paved the way for electronic anti-theft devices capable of truly immobilizing a vehicle. Gone are the days of hot wiring an ignition system. Most cars today, and certainly all cars in the very near future, will be equipped with complex electronic engine management systems. Our incessant search for environmentally cleaner and more efficient engines deems this essential.

Car manufacturers should also take some responsibility for ensuring that the cars they manufacture cannot be broken into easily. Presently cars have insufficient inbuilt protection to prevent their theft. No legislation exists to assist the consumer in this regard. I suppose one could say that the people who continue to buy Holden Commodores are foolish; far more of this model of car are stolen than of any other type simply because it is so easy for car thieves to get them on the road. That aspect should have been attended to a long time ago. I am not sure whether improvements have been made to later models, but until a couple of years ago the Holden Commodore was the easiest car to steal and, consequently, more of them were stolen. The Parliaments should thrust more responsibility for this matter on the vehicle manufacturers to ensure that the cars are designed to be more secure.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Did you know that it takes six seconds to get into a Holden Commodore, and 14 seconds if it is fitted with a steering lock?

Hon FRED McKENZIE: No, I did not. What chance do car owners have if car thieves can get the vehicles started that quickly? That is almost as quick as the winking of an eyelid.

Hon G.E. Masters: It is quicker than you can get into the car with a key.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: At my age, it is quicker! The onus is on the Government to introduce some legislation in this area.

My next point deals with my opposition to the privatisation of public enterprises; I make no

secret of the fact that I am very much opposed to it, and I hope good sense prevails in the Labor Party and such privatisation does not take place. There is no place for the privatisation of Telecom, Australia Post, Qantas or Australian Airlines.

Hon P.G. Pental: What about Westrail?

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Nobody seems to want Westrail, but of course I would be opposed to that also. I have some comments to make about Westrail later on and I am sure members would be disappointed if I did not do so.

Hon P.G. Pental: Yes, we would.

Hon A.A. Lewis: Would you tell us about the railway at Boyup Brook?

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I noted that Hon Sandy Lewis asked a question about the Boyup Brook railway this session; he asks that question every session and he always gets the same answer.

Hon A.A. Lewis: This Government has closed more railways than any other Government has.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Although I am opposed to privatisation, I can understand the Government's thinking on this matter because it is under pressure. I would not yield to such pressure, but I am not in a position to make those sorts of decisions and I do not want to be critical of the people who are forced to consider privatisation, particularly in view of the comments made by Sir Roderick Carnegie. It is a tragedy, but we are faced with that situation. I can understand why some people who formerly supported enterprise being owned by the people have changed their minds. Certainly a dramatic change has taken place in the thinking of a number of people. A recent article, quoting statements made by Sir Roderick Carnegie, gives some insight into what is taking place. This article appeared in *The West Australian* on 5 October 1987 - it is somewhat out of date - in the West Business Money Matters section, under the heading of "Carnegie: Business controls our future", and states -

New York: Business Council of Australia president, Sir Roderick Carnegie asserted on the weekend that business was now in control of Australia's future.

Sir Roderick told New York investors both the Australian Government and the union movement had no option but to follow the business sector which controlled the nation's future through its investment decisions.

"Business men are changing the power structure of Australia," Sir Roderick said.

Members can see quite clearly the difficulties faced by the nation's leaders when statements such as that are made. On the one hand they may have confidence in the ability of the public sector to run as efficiently and profitably as any organisation in the private sector, and they may wish that to be the situation. I certainly have that confidence. The only difference between the public sector and the private sector is that in the private sector the profits go into the pockets of a few and in the public sector the profits go back to the people. That is why I support the public enterprise system. It is evident that the people have benefited from some of the deals to which Hon Sandy Lewis referred, involving WA Inc. Many of the programs in which the Government is involved will benefit the people and these programs began from that area.

Hon A.A. Lewis: I have been reading about it in the paper - \$10 million lost.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: The Government is putting families first and many of its initiatives are the result of public enterprise. On the other hand, Governments are thinking that if they do not take the initiative, if the Liberal-National Party coalition takes office, it will sell off the public assets and have a wonderful time with the profits. But at the end of the day what shall we be left with when those profits are gone? As far as I am concerned there should be no privatisation of any public enterprises; we should be expanding rather than shrinking the public enterprise system.

I now refer to an article which appeared in *The Civil Service Journal* of 19 August 1988. My main hope is that a large number of people in the community read *Hansard* and that it has some very avid fans, because I do not know how else to get the message across. It is all very well in the lead up to an election for people to forget all the wonderful things this

Government has done, and to concentrate on what they expect to get from the Opposition, if it wins the election. I have only an hour in which to speak which is not sufficient time to list all the good things the Government has done in the last five years; I would need a week or a month to explain to people the benefits they have received.

[Questions taken.]

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I hope a lot of people read *Hansard* so that they can understand, in the lead up to an election, how they can be lulled into a false sense of security. It is very clear, if one reads this article in *The Civil Service Journal* - and of course many others - how that occurred in New South Wales. The people there had forgotten the benefits that had been achieved under a Labor Government and as a result the Greiner Liberal Government was elected. Now we are starting to see the results of that.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is not because they forgot about the Labor Party but because they found out about it. They tossed it out on its ear.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon FRED McKENZIE: The same tactics employed in New South Wales will be employed here by the Liberal Party. It has all the hallmarks and is following the same pattern. A lot of mud was thrown in New South Wales before the State election there.

Hon N.F. Moore: And Mr Wran had to go before he was thrown out altogether.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: What has been the result? I will read from the article in *The Civil Service Journal*. It is on page 5 of the 19 August 1988 edition under the heading "New South Wales Public Service is under siege", and reads in part -

We all thought Premier Brian Burke was a bit of an ogre in the way he treated public servants, but compared to the new Premier of New South Wales, Mr Nick Greiner he shapes up as a bit of a softie.

And he sure was. We have been criticised here for the way in which the Functional Review Committee has examined the Public Service, and the resultant efficiencies which of course brought with them redundancies in the Public Service. We have suffered very badly; but members should believe me when I say that if there is a change of Government, heaven knows what will happen to the State Public Service. It simply cannot afford to be dismantled.

Hon N.F. Moore: It will be depoliticised first of all.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: If a Liberal Government is elected at the next State election things will be quite different. Work that rightly belongs to the Public Service will be taken away and let out to private contract. The article continues -

Nick has been running amok with a big axe, chopping at public servant heads wherever he sees them and there is no indication that he is about to stop for a break.

There is worse to come. The article continues -

There will be 2,200 less teachers and 800 fewer school ancillary staff.

Not only that, but the article indicates that an officer can be accused, found guilty and sacked by a departmental head without the opportunity of a warning. Later it says -

Greiner's manic desire to have his own way and serve the interests of employers will return NSW to the dark days of the Fraser era.

And so it goes on, although I will not quote any more from the article.

Currently we are looking at the position facing railway workers in Victoria. Railway workers have not been doing too well here, and I have not been happy with the Government's efforts to create efficiencies in the railway industry. I believe the Government has gone too far. Perhaps it was necessary to bring about some efficiencies, but I will go on public record as saying I am opposed to the current proposal and I hope it does not eventuate.

Hon N.F. Moore: Did you support the drivers' strike last week?

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I will talk about the drivers. Here again, they do not realise what is in front of them. Is the member telling me he would be so kind to the drivers? The argument with the railways is based on demarcation disputes and I will not take sides.

Hon N.F. Moore: You used to when you were on this side of the House.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I will not take sides. The argument is about demarcation disputes because of the reduction in staff. I do not agree with the reduction and I will oppose it within the party.

Hon N.F. Moore: You are in the minority there.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Maybe I am, but I will oppose it. For example, during the term of this Government we have cut train crews on suburban railways from three to two. That went far enough, but departmental proposals are afoot to cut them down to one man. On the face of it I accept that is sensible because other parts of the world have cut train crews down to one man.

Hon John Halden: The Liberal Party policy is for no trains at all.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: That is right. But I will show members that this is exactly what will happen if the Liberals win in Victoria. At least they have been honest enough in Victoria to say what they will do. Will the Liberals on the other side of this House be honest and say what they will do?

Hon N.F. Moore: You will see our policy when it comes out.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Members opposite will lull the people into a false sense of security just as Nick Greiner did and thousands of workers will be similarly affected.

Hon N.F. Moore: You have just admitted that you sacked thousands of workers; all your former union mates were sacked by your Government, and yet you blame us.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: They were not sacked; they became redundant.

Hon N.F. Moore: Be consistent. You called it sacking when you were on this side.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Some of that was necessary; some unnecessary. Unfortunately we succumbed to big business.

Hon T.G. Butler: Let us not forget that the Liberal Party conference in Esperance held Nick Greiner up as the light on the hill.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: The only answer I have to that is that it must have been a misprint.

Hon H.W. Gayfer: Does the member know that in 1959 the Labor Party and the Liberal Party voted on the same side of the House to sack 824 railway workers in Western Australia, and the only opposition came from the Country Party?

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I do know because you have told me 25 times.

Hon E.J. Charlton: You sounded as though you needed reminding.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I oppose the cutting down of train crews to one. We have been told this happens in Europe, America and the United Kingdom but those areas are not similar to Western Australia where we have open access stations. How many stations in suburban Perth are manned? Fremantle, Perth, Midland and Armadale. I should say "staffed".

Hon N.F. Moore: That is your biggest mistake today.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I am 55 years of age. I grew up in another era. The word to use is staffed; it is not manned or womanned.

Hon T.G. Butler interjected.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: The member should not forget it was his female secretary who wrote the word down in his absence. In this State we do not have stations with personnel on duty. The Government will place machines on those stations and people will purchase their tickets.

What about security? The unions are very concerned about security and the Government has misjudged the situation, because security is very important. In the Eastern States the trains in many areas are covered in graffiti. In this State our trains are in reasonably good shape because they are supervised. When we talk about guards these days we should remember



they not only perform guard duties but also sell tickets. In the future guards could have the responsibility for checking tickets as well as a security role to keep our trains relatively crime free. We do have incidents here where young people on trains run wild and this has not occurred to a great degree due to the security provided by an additional person on the train. The locomotive driver will not have the ability to control that type of behaviour on suburban trains, so I urge the Government not to introduce one man trains.

I also urge the Government - when the report of the consultative committee comes down - in considering the options for the northern corridor to include the option of rail. Unfortunately our suburban rail service is quite small but it would receive a wonderful boost if it were extended into the northern corridor, where ample commuters would utilise that public transport system. Whatever the consultants determine I urge the Government to consider rail as an option. Although experience has shown that busways are cheaper, very few busways have been successful. Eventually bus systems have been returned to rail because they have not worked. The same will occur here. The initial capital expenditure for rail systems is huge. The costs which occur with busways are certainly less but over a long period the rail system will come to the fore. A rail system for the northern corridor should be seriously considered as it will improve the viability of the suburban rail system.

I return to my earlier remarks about the false sense of security that people may have in the lead-up to the election. I remarked on the honesty of the Liberals in Victoria, but from a party point of view that may not be the sensible way to go. Last Saturday an article appeared on the front page of the *Melbourne Age* entitled "Union threat on Libs' rail plan" and it reads as follows -

Railway unions last night threatened industrial action if a Liberal Government implemented its radical plan to axe 7 000 railway jobs and build two Melbourne ring roads within four years.

The Victorian Trades Hall Council and the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemmen yesterday warned of industrial action if public transport jobs were lost.

So 7 000 are to go in Victoria.

The State secretary of the Australian Railways' Union, Mr Joe Sibberas, said the Liberal proposal to scrap guards on suburban trains would leave the public unprotected and lead to anarchy on trains.

I urge this Government not to do that.

Hon N.F. Moore: Your Government is about to do it!

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Yes, but it has not done it yet.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is about to, and the drivers are on strike because of that. When it decides not to, you can be critical of Mr Kennett.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: It is crass stupidity to take the men off the trains.

Hon N.F. Moore: The member should describe Mr Pearce in the same language.

Hon Kay Hallahan: We do not use that language.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I am a member of the party which is in Government and if that party does reduce the train crew to one then I will dissociate myself from that course of action.

Hon N.F. Moore: You are criticising the Victorian Liberal Party for doing what your Government is about to do.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: At least I have the courage to disagree with my party. The Opposition is likely to do what it did years ago and unfortunately my friends in the railway do not realise this. The Opposition will do the same thing again but next time it will not stop at closing the Perth-Fremantle line, it will close the whole lot down.

Hon N.F. Moore: Rubbish.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: The Opposition's former spokesman on transport has been reported in a number of papers as saying the system ought to be closed down.

An Opposition member: Who was that?

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Ian Laurance.

Hon N.F. Moore: He is not in Parliament any more.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: This will be done by stealth, not out in the open like Mr Kennett, or as the Labor Party has done. Nick Greiner did the same thing in New South Wales.

Hon G.E. Masters: When your party moves in that direction we look forward to the member's joining us over here.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: The article continues -

The secretary of the Victorian Branch of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen's, Mr Frank Hussey, said the railway system could not take more staffing cuts and warned that the union would fight the proposals "tooth and nail".

The Transport Minister, Mr Kennan, said the Liberal policy would lead to rail line closures, increased fares and industrial chaos.

I mention this issue in this debate because the former Government, made up of parties to which members opposite belong, implemented that sort of proposal. At least this Government has initiated an electrification program, but the previous Government closed down a railway line and aimed to close down other lines. The conservatives did it once and they will do it again.

I support the Budget papers.

HON E.J. CHARLTON (Central) [5.31 pm]: I shall refer to a couple of points which carry on from the comments made by Hon Fred McKenzie regarding transport. I ask members to recognise the cost, for which the State Government is responsible, of transporting commodities within the State. Everyone in the grain industry in this State recognises the reductions that have occurred in the cost of transporting grain. I will refer to the affect of the Federal Government's proposed changes to grain marketing on the wheat industry. I find it unbelievable that about 2 000 Western Australian farmers gathered at three separate public forums to discuss the proposed changes, yet the media coverage of those forums has been abysmal. If 10 people were standing at the edge of Fremantle harbour waving flags about nuclear warships every television camera would be on site and it would receive prime time coverage on the ABC and other television channels. We see this sort of coverage for all sorts of issues which do not effect the majority of people. In most instances, people could not care less. This is a unique issue which affects everyone and 350 farmers met at Mingenew, 450 at Wyalkatchem and more than 1 000 at Newdegate. The most important point is that not one of those farmers put up his hand to agree to the proposals that are being put forward by the Federal Government. I call upon the State Government to recognise what took place and I put it to the Minister in this House, representing the Minister for Agriculture, that he take the matter up with him and ask him to advise the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Kerin, in the strongest possible terms that the wheat growers in Western Australia do not agree, in any shape or form, with the proposal outlined in the so-called Kerin plan.

Hon J.M. Brown: He knows that.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I do not think he does.

Hon J.M. Brown: Who, Mr Grill?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I spoke with Mr Grill on Saturday and he did not know how many farmers attended the meetings and he did not know what were their thoughts. The meetings that were held were above party politics and involved farmers from all political persuasions and they are absolutely opposed to the proposed changes.

Hon J.M. Brown: Mr Grill knows about it.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: If he does, I hope we can look forward to his telling Minister Kerin what the farmers think. Is Hon Jim Brown telling me that the Minister knows about it?

Hon J.M. Brown: He does.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I am pleased to hear that, but the most important thing is that when

he speaks with Mr Kerin he lets him know, in no uncertain terms, that the wheat growers in Western Australia, as well as those people who have had the opportunity to look at the broadly based proposals, oppose them. If there are to be any changes to wheat marketing in this nation it should be the industry which makes those changes and not a group of bureaucrats. The bureaucrats who represented Mr Kerin at the meetings to which I have referred were a disgrace in respect of their attitude towards the proposals.

Hon J.M. Brown: I do not agree with that statement.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: It is good if the member does not agree with me. However, those bureaucrats representing Mr Kerin did not seem to be interested and they gave me the impression they were of the opinion that the farmers in Western Australia could think what they liked, but they had been sent to advise them what would occur and were not interested in what was said. Their responses to the questions asked were low key and Mr Kerin's representatives did not become enthusiastic about what was said. I understand that after one meeting someone heard one of the bureaucrats say that although the wheat growers were of a particular opinion, that is what they expected.

Hon J.M. Brown: You must have been at a different meeting from me.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I draw the attention of members to the seriousness of this proposal. The wheat industry in Australia has been held up as an example of efficiency, not only across Australia but also throughout the world. No one denies that. Those people who had the opportunity to visit the wheat growing industry in the United States of America are convinced that the Australian wheat industry is the most efficient wheat industry in the world. I cannot understand the reason that the Federal Government, with the assistance of a few traders who want to get in on the act and make money - not for the benefit of the consumers of Australia and certainly not for the benefit of the wheat growers - wants to make changes to the system under which this industry operates without a request being made for such changes from those people who produce the commodity.

Perhaps some fine tuning is required, but the three main changes proposed - that is, to underwriting, exporting and freeing up the domestic wheat market - are totally unacceptable. Members in this place need to demonstrate their opposition to the proposals. I really cannot understand why the media can allow the rest of the community to remain unaware about what is proposed, especially when 2 000 wheat growers attended meetings throughout the wheatbelt. Very little has been said about them. If the incomes and profitability of the wheat growers in this State are affected because of these changes the whole State will suffer. We have seen what has happened as a result of wheat growers not receiving a profit from their operations. The transport system, the consumers and retailers of this nation have suffered. If Government, which has the numbers on the floor of the Parliament, forces through legislation that is detrimental to the wheat industry of this nation, it has a lot to answer for. I hope that the wheat growers of Western Australia will not only continue to be vocal, but also demonstrate in every way possible and draw the attention of the community to the plight which confronts them at this time.

Hon Mark Nevill: What is Mr Tuckey's position on this?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Mr Tuckey does not have a position as far as I understand. He did not attend the Cabinet meeting and recent comments in the Press indicate that he has not decided where he stands. That is interesting because I believe he represents the largest wheat growing electorate in the world. As a representative of those wheat growers I expect him to vigorously defend the wheat growers of this nation both in his party and in the coalition in Canberra.

Hon G.E. Masters: You can guarantee that he will be there fighting for them. He is a great representative.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I am pleased to hear that. I am not being critical, but I am saying that at the moment those involved in State and Federal Parliaments are very quiet about where they stand. Only a handful of members of Parliament have publicly declared their support for the grain industry. The National Party is the only party at a State and Federal level which has declared its support for the wheat growers of this nation.

Hon A.A. Lewis: They usually go off half cocked at anything they do.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I will treat that interjection with the contempt it deserves; it is not worth commenting upon. I remind Mr Lewis, with his farm machinery connections, of what happens if the farmers are not profitable. John Elliott will not be buying any headers. This could be the most important and critical legislation introduced in Parliament in recent times with regard to its effect on the nation's economy. It is unbelievable that Mr Kerin should continue with this proposal when more than 95 per cent of the grain industry is opposed to the proposals that have been outlined - as loose as they are. Everyone in this State should take a little more interest in the outlined proposals and support an industry that has received no assistance from the taxpayers of this nation in the past. At the one time when, because of the present marketing plan, it appears that the industry may be in a position to give a little, the Government wants to throw out methods which have proved themselves over the last 50 years.

Hon J.M. Brown: You should rethink that statement about it being an industry which has had no assistance from the taxpayers.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Hon Jim Brown should know better than anyone that the people in the wheat industry are paying extra for every input into their industry because those inputs are made from protected industries. The industry is currently taking a corrupted price for its product because of the situation in the United States and the EEC, and yet it has managed to stay in business and it is one of the greatest contributors to the nation's economy, along with the other primary producers. Yet this irresponsible proposal has been made to introduce wholesale and critical changes. Nobody will be better off as a result of these changes, apart from three or four companies in the middle. That is the crux of the matter. No call for these changes has been made by the consumers of Australia. If these ridiculous proposals are implemented, I guarantee that at the end of the line the consumers of Australia will not get a cheaper commodity than they are now getting. Certainly the producers will get less. Therefore, who will benefit? It is proposed to introduce into the system people who are not required and who will not create extra sales or production of grain.

The National Party implores the members of every political party and organisation to do their utmost when in contact with their Federal counterparts to oppose this proposal, and to inform them that although they may have some personal interest in supporting these changes for one reason or another, it will be totally against the interests of the members of the industry. I did not think this nation would ever witness a political party going out on a limb to assist three or four traders at the expense of 40 000 people directly involved in the industry affected. It will also affect people down the line, such as fuel agents, distributors, the people who supply chemicals, retailers and so forth. They will all be the losers if these changes are introduced. Wheat growers requested that all members of Parliament should be called upon to state their position and to oppose in the most vigorous way the implementation of any of these proposed changes. I trust that wherever members travel they will seek the opinions of wheat growers and the people associated with this industry, and will voice their disapproval of the Kerin plan.

HON TOM HELM (North) [5.47 pm]: Firstly, I congratulate the Government on its Budget, and refer to the point I made the last time we debated a Budget in this place: that is, I invite the Opposition to put forward some policies that the Government can look at and which the people of Western Australia can consider. This is the last Budget speech before the election, yet we still have not heard from the Opposition what it would do if it became the Government of this State - heaven forbid!

Hon W.N. Stretch: We have 30 policies but you have not read them.

Hon TOM HELM: Perhaps rather than having an interpreter for my comments, an interpreter is needed to explain the Opposition's policies to the people of Western Australia.

Hon A.A. Lewis: I make it very clear they would need to have an atom of intelligence to be able to read them. You and Mr Nevill couldn't do that.

Hon TOM HELM: If the Opposition would present those policies we would have an opportunity to read them.

With regard to the Budget brought down by this Government, so far much has been said, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition in this House, about how well this State is operating because of increased revenue and increased activity in industry, and the acceptance

by the rest of this nation of how far ahead Western Australia is in terms of employment. The increased employment obviously generates more revenue from payroll tax and so on, and that in turn allows the Government to generate more business activity. However, the Opposition seems to object to the fact that the Government can generate money using the skills employed in private enterprise. The Opposition seems to object to the fact that the State Government Insurance Commission was able to put money into the economy by way of the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch. We have heard Hon Phillip Pendal talk in this place about the family, law and order and crime and yet, when it was proposed that the State Government Insurance Commission, WA Inc or different Government agencies take part in the bullish activities of the Western Australian market, the Opposition prevented those instrumentalities from being answerable to this Parliament. Now that they are not answerable, and are able to act with all the confidentiality of other private enterprises, objection is raised. Money is coming back, not from the taxpayers' pocket, but from the financial activities of those enterprises. Neighbourhood Watch is an example of the successful activities of the State Government Insurance Commission in addressing the issues of law and order which have been raised, although not so much lately, by the Opposition.

Hon T.G. Butler: You can't say that doesn't get up their nose.

Hon P.G. Pendal: We want more than a public relations response - not a PR hype.

Hon TOM HELM: We have been reminded by the Opposition that law and order and families are the kinds of issues that the Government should be addressing, and the Budget addresses them very well indeed. We have not heard much from the Opposition about how the funds which the Government has available can be used to address those problems. Speaking on behalf of the members of my electorate in the Pilbara and the Kimberley, the family package brought down by the Government is something which we recognise as being very important. We have a family centre in Karratha which addresses a number of problems and is well used. Treloar House in Hedland is a similar centre where families and older and younger people can mix together. As an example of how the family package is being used in the north, I would like to tell the House about the money given to the South Hedland Bowling Club by the Minister for Sport and Recreation to enable people in the community, who play lawn green or crown green bowls, to teach high school children how to play bowls. That is an interesting and innovative demonstration of how to use the relationship between older and younger people in our community.

Hon P.G. Pendal: Clubs have been doing that for years. Are you not aware of that?

Hon TOM HELM: We, in the Pilbara, are probably at the pinnacle of problems caused by having no extended family. That is why we can see that the family package is so important. Just this afternoon the Mining Unions Association in Newman proposed withdrawing from the Iron Ore Industry Consultative Council. That is a very important step for those people to take, and it has been considered for some time. The reason why the MUA has chosen to take that step is because the Mt Newman Mining Company has applied to the commission to withdraw from the industrial relations agreement which has been put in place. The mining company has issued instructions to its staff that from today there will be no recognition of convenors on the mining site in Newman. In effect, that means that all the management and the foreman can do is talk to the workers themselves, the shop stewards or the State officials. It causes a great deal of alarm, consternation and uncertainty - as if we have not got enough uncertainty in the Pilbara - if iron ore companies take the same step taken by Peko Wallsend, the effects of which we still feel now.

Convenors in the iron ore industry have been responsible for the production we read about in the newspapers. The company magazine, in the edition before last, was full of praise for the workers - tonnages were up, the work force had gone down, productivity had gone up, tonnage railed had gone up and tonnage shipped had gone up. In every area in which the work force was involved the production had gone up. This is at Newman where there has not been a strike for some time, where convenors - those vilified people whom Peko Wallsend were quite willing to choose as the target responsible for activities which were less than social on the iron ore front - have done a 180 degree turn, in the eyes of the iron ore company, and have been responsible for raising the level of productivity and putting in place everything for which the company has been asking for the last three or four years. Those convenors are no longer recognised as a responsible group of people within the industry.

That has shaken Newman and Port Hedland, because in Newman the mining companies are the sole employer and in Port Hedland they have the most employees. On the one hand we are told that the Government is wrong in taxing so high and taking the responsibility it does, and yet the iron ore companies, which are the major employers, decide willy nilly not to recognise the people responsible for the activities which have taken place, for which they have received so much praise.

Hon E.J. Charlton interjected.

Hon TOM HELM: Jack Marks, who was the president of the MUA, takes a great deal of responsibility for the activities that are taking place within the iron ore industry.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM HELM: If those people can be identified, they can only be praised, because they are the ones who, previously, were said to be responsible for the Reds under the bed, Communist activities and anti-Australian activities. When the bad things happen, they are the ones responsible; and when the good things go down they have the responsibility.

The Government has to take responsibility for keeping together the families in the most isolated part of our State, and getting together some of the assets and resources this State has to offer. The Government has taken responsibility for encouraging people to go to the Pilbara. This was mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place, who went to the Pilbara - everybody who is anybody goes to the Pilbara at this time of the year because it is like the Garden of Eden.

Hon N.F. Moore interjected.

Hon TOM HELM: The Government gets praise for saying the Pilbara is a place in which people like to live. That is because the people back home have been party to the activities of this Government, which was elected in 1983, to make the Pilbara into a place which we can call home, and stay and bring up our families. On the one hand, it is a compliment for the Government, and we are pleased to hear that because it is nice to have somebody from the Opposition saying good things about the Government. On the other hand, the Opposition tells the people in the Pilbara that they should have the petrochemical plant which is proposed for Kwinana. I know the Opposition is very much opposed to Government money being used in private enterprise. We have heard on a number of occasions in the Press about \$150 million -

Hon A.A. Lewis: What about the extra \$1 million?

Hon TOM HELM: I support the Government spending taxpayers' money to produce jobs and industries from the natural gas and other assets we have in the north.

Hon E.J. Charlton interjected.

Hon TOM HELM: I was making inquiries months ago in David Parker's office to see about that. It would appear to the most simple of people - and I think I am one - that we have natural gas and salt, which are the two major commodities needed, and they should be brought together to make PVCs and caustic soda. It is a by-product of natural gas and salt, which makes that industry a viable enterprise.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM HELM: It will cost us, the taxpayers, if the Government takes some responsibility, an extra \$100 million. It will give us an industry, but only in the short term, and that is not what we want in the Pilbara. We need viable industries. We have a \$30 million monument of bad thinking and planning in Dampier. We have a plant which has not worked since 1980; it was only there for a few years. Research was not done and investors' capital and, in this case, perhaps our capital as taxpayers, went into an industry which is not viable. That, in itself, is bad enough, but what members opposite are doing is adding to the pain, to the uncertainty, to the fear that people feel. We all feel it, and our morale goes down. We see a promise in the headlines that is not delivered or is only delivered for a short time.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

Hon TOM HELM: I have touched on the problems facing the Pilbara, recent events in the

area, the need for the Government to allocate funds to protect the family, and the topic of law and order. I have been informed by way of interjection about the policies which the Opposition has put together, and that someone with my intelligence may be able to understand those policies. Perhaps those policies exist in writing but they have not been expounded in this place. Those policies will not become clearer hidden away on some dusty shelf where no-one can read them. On a number of occasions the Opposition has mentioned that the Labor Government has stolen the thunder of the Liberal Party to a degree. Perhaps that is the reason why the Liberals have no policies - although we have heard criticism about how the taxpayers' money is spent, and accusations about stolen policies, and still the Opposition complains.

The problems of the Pilbara need to be addressed and the Government is addressing them very well. The electors of this State should be made aware of this because they will be asked to go to the polls shortly. The public should be informed about who is doing what, who is promising what and who is keeping quiet. Apart from accusations about people who cannot defend themselves, and about corruption over the past five years, we have not heard much about what the Opposition would do if it won Government. We have heard accusations of malpractice, but after inquiries take place the malpractice is not proven; evidence of malpractice has not been put forward. That is the situation which we put up with in this House and in this State. The Opposition is not able to put together policies or alternatives; it continues to say that the Labor Government takes Liberal policies on board for the benefit of the people of this State. We will have the opportunity sooner rather than later to put the record of the Labor Government on trial and we will see what the people of this State have to say at that time.

In the Pilbara today the Mining Unions Association at Mt Newman has decided to withdraw from the iron ore consultative council because the situation has been turned around. The irresponsible management people involved are the same ones involved in putting in place the target set by Mt Newman Mining, which is owned by BHP. The industrial relations record of that company is not exactly the best in Australia. The same convenors who are responsible for the work force have met and indeed surpassed the target set by the company - the convenors no longer recognised by the company - so the relationship between the work force and the company over the last few years has not been recognised. The work done by those convenors has not been recognised; therefore we are left with the situation where the communities of Mt Newman and Hedland have been shaken once more. We will need more Government support because families are left uncertain about their future, and the company is acting irresponsibly.

Perhaps this is an appropriate time to dwell on the fact that the Opposition talks about the bad things that nationalisation can bring about inside a nation. Being an ex employee of Hamersley Iron and a resident of Hedland, I am aware of the Mt Newman Mining operations. We could not do worse with nationalisation because the events there, including the irresponsible attitude of the management, have such an effect on the State and on the taxpayers. If nationalisation means the success of the State Government Insurance Commission, WADC, Exim, GoldCorp or other instruments of this progressive and imaginative Government, and the retention of employees, then surely a case exists for having the companies manage the assets of this State in a more responsible way. Irresponsible attitudes mean that the Government is required to put in more support systems, and more opportunity for families to stay together. These are the problems which we face in the north; the Government is aware of the problems and is taking appropriate action.

The Budget is welcomed and I congratulate the Government. The Budget allocation for the north is an example of the Government's response to community needs. One area of allocation will be for the road between Paraburdoo and highway No 1. The link will be sealed all the way from Tom Price to Paraburdoo and highway No 1.

Hon N.F. Moore: That took a long time.

Hon TOM HELM: It took a long time because the Government is a responsible Government and listens to the Opposition carping about the amount of money we should not be spending, about this Government spending too much money and how the Government is too big. When the Government responds to community needs the Opposition says the money should not be spent and that we should introduce ways to reduce Government involvement. Maybe

this would occur if we had more responsible management in the private sector and did not need the sorts of things this Government puts in place to make the north - to use the words of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the other place - a more welcome place in which to live. I congratulate the Government on the Budget.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon A.A. Lewis.

## SWAN RIVER TRUST BILL ACTS AMENDMENT (SWAN RIVER TRUST) BILL

### *Cognate Debate*

On motion by Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), resolved -

That leave be granted for the Bills to be discussed concurrently at the second reading stage in accordance with Standing Order No 256.

### *Second Readings*

Debate resumed from 30 August.

**HON A.A. LEWIS** (Lower Central) [7.41 pm]: Again, the Government has introduced another hotchpotch arrangement to put in place its brilliant idea for the management of the Swan River. It has had much to say about various departments and we have seen many good public servants leave the Public Service over time because of administrative arrangements thrust upon them by a domineering Government. The last senior public servant to go was the head of the Health Department, Dr Bill Roberts, who could not take any more of the management style of this Government.

Hon J.M. Brown: Did he say that?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: No, he did not, but I imagine that is what he will say in the future.

Hon T.G. Butler: Why?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Because everybody else realises it and I will not reveal confidences placed in me by a number of senior public servants who have informed me of their problems and have pulled the pin because of interference in their departments by advisers who have no accountability to the Parliament or to the people of Western Australia. The less said about that the better. I am not like members of the Labor Party who reveal information confided in them, as did the previous Premier who revealed information relating to someone's bank account and informed the Parliament of that person's monetary arrangements, or as other people do who employ people to find out what others do with their money to score cheap political points. However, I promised the Minister that we would debate this legislation in a charming way. We cannot do that if rowdy interjections are allowed to continue. Mr President, I hope you will protect me from that rowdiness.

Recently I read a comment in the *Australian Torts Reporter* relating to the case Parramatta City Council versus Lutz which was heard by Mr Justice Kirby. The comment reminded me a little of this legislation. It stated -

What happened in the six months following the owner's failure to comply with the notice was described by the President of the Court as "an ill-directed activity by numerous officials with overlapping functions operating within inefficient systems all too content with postponing positions and delaying the performance of their duties, apparently satisfied to substitute the preparation of still more memoranda for resolute actions".

This, he said, was "a common problem of late 20th century public administration".

I believe this pair of Bills is a prime example of that.

Second reading speeches are meant to assist members. They have tended to become a political forum under this Government rather than be of any help to the House in making its decision. The second reading speech on the Swan River Trust Bill states -

It has become increasingly clear to the Government that in order to balance all of the conflicting demands and provide protection for the waters, foreshores and catchments, the river system must be treated as a single entity. For example, there are



currently 10 State Government agencies and 20 local government authorities with certain responsibilities for planning and management of all or parts of the rivers.

The Minister continued -

In the past, the responsibilities of the various bodies, State and local, have not always been well coordinated and there have been some inconsistencies, overlaps and gaps, both in management and planning activities.

The Government then established two closely related reviews to provide a strong sense of direction for planning, use and management of the rivers. The second reading speech referred to the Zelestis review, but the writer of that review did not refer to that direction. The writer's recommendations beginning on page 100 did not agree with the Government. He said that he felt, in the main, that things were going quite well. In paragraph 14.2 he referred to the improved coordination of the existing mechanisms and roles by establishing a new body specifically for that purpose or by giving the responsibility for such coordination to an existing body such as the State Planning Commission, the Swan River Management Authority, or the Waterways Commission. Nothing in the second reading speech refers to the reason for the Government choosing a single authority outside those three authorities to manage the rivers.

The writer of the review then referred to improved coordination and, at the same time, conferring on the Swan River Management Authority and relevant local authorities the power to refuse applications for development approval with provisions for appeals from the refused. He also referred to establishing a new body to exercise legal powers in relation to the planning, development, management and protection of the river. This agency would have overall responsibility for the river. Nobody will disagree that the river and its foreshores have to be protected. However, the Minister has referred to the 10 Government authorities which are already involved in its management. In reading the Bill, one sees that the number of referrals from one authority to another will be worse than the referrals that presently exist when one wants to put in a swimming pool in the City of Perth. That requires 11 different certificates.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Eleven?

Hon Kay Hallahan: For a swimming pool, you mean?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: One needs to go through 11 channels to put in a swimming pool. One of my friends who lives just over the road and whose chimney pot intrudes on parliamentary precinct space - a fact about which I have reminded him several times - told me he needed 11 different stamps to put in a swimming pool across the road from here.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Wouldn't you agree that that is an unusual situation because of the parliamentary precinct position?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: The swimming pool did not intrude; it was not that high. I was talking about the chimney pot.

Hon D.K. Dans interjected.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: At times, Mr Dans, we have stood on the parliamentary steps and looked at it, but Mr Dans probably could not remember that.

Hon T.G. Butler: What's a chimney pot got to do with it?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I am just telling the House how many stamps are needed from Government officials before getting approval to put in a simple thing like a swimming pool. In the second reading speech the Minister states -

It must also be stated very clearly that the trust will not take over the existing implementation and management roles of local government . . .

I applaud the Government for that, but I worry because the Zelestis report suggested that if the number of representatives on the trust were to be increased, the extra representative should be from local government. I cannot hear any reply from Government members on that point. Local government did not get the extra representative; there is only one representative from local government on the trust. I am referring to the report on which the Minister is basing her case for this legislation. Unfortunately, I have not had time to research

all the background material. I would like to have seen the author of the report and debated some of the matters with him, but I have been far too busy looking after other interests of the Parliament. The second reading speech continues -

While the trust would have the responsibility of reporting to the Minister for Waterways on use and development of the rivers, responsibility for such matters as navigation and management of foreshore reserves will remain with the relevant State and local government bodies.

Thus although the trust reports to the Minister, management costs and those sorts of things will be left to the local government authorities and the other State bodies. The second reading speech says that this will give local government a direct input into the planning and management of the Swan and Canning Rivers. It would appear that that "direct" input would entail going to the trust and then to the Minister. If a squabble developed between the local government authority and the Minister for Conservation and Land Management or the Minister for Waterways the matter would be put before the Cabinet where the decision should have been made originally anyway. Thus the direct input is of doubtful benefit to local government. If I were a member of a local government involved, I would be a little worried about the whole thing. The second reading speech continues -

The trust will therefore have a very important role, to work in partnership with all of the involved bodies, to ensure that the best overall planning and management of the rivers takes place. In this sense the trust can be said to be accountable for overall planning and management while other State bodies will be responsible for particular aspects of planning and management such as navigation, management of conservation reserves, definition of the parks and recreation area and flood control.

I wonder why we have not had any comment in talk about rivers about the 100 year flood level, because some people were very keen on imposing the 100 year flood level on the House several years ago. You may remember, Sir, that we had quite interesting debates about it. I wonder whose responsibility it is and who will pay the piper if we have one of those 100 year floods because the trust, although it reports to the Minister for Waterways, is virtually only a coordinating body, if that. The second reading speech continues -

The Government's intention is that the Bill will not be proclaimed until regulations and administrative procedures have been developed to clearly set out how the development approval process will work in practice.

Here we have another example of nothing being thought out all the way through. The Government is talking about proclaiming this Bill in early 1989. That gives us between four and five months for the regulations to be drawn up. It would seem to me that if we are being asked to pass a Bill, we should know the broad outline of the regulations. We should be given some information about how these things will speed up the process and how they will be beneficial to the community as a whole. The Government has a horrible habit of bringing things before the House that have not been thought through all the way. It makes extravagant claims. I will not blame the Minister handling the Bill, but last year we dealt with a Bill on which Government advice was that everything in the garden was rosy and everyone had been consulted. I was given the assurance that certain people were all for the Bill and I debated it at some length. I was given assurances only to find out three or four months after the Bill was proclaimed that the organisations that allegedly had been consulted did not know what was in the Bill. Certain others members in the House were approached in the same way that I was. Members were inundated with calls from people who had not been approached about how the business was going to work. It worries me that before this Bill was brought to the House a basic management plan was not drawn up to tell us, as the legislators, how these procedures would work. It seems to me again that we get this funny idea of mother knows best.

Hon Kay Hallahan: What a wonderful thing!

Hon A.A. LEWIS: The Minister can laugh, but often when dealing in Committee with legislation she gives me the feeling that mother does know best and that I am a naughty little boy who should sit down and not argue.

Hon T.G. Butler: That's a good idea.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: But she has been proved wrong, like Hon Tom Butler, so many times that

I am beginning to wonder whether this parental control is as good as it should be. The Government has a tendency to tell us all that it knows how it will work. It also has a tendency to make all these comments when dealing with a Bill. It seems to me that it has been proven to be not very successful; not only the fact that it does not have the guidelines to give this House, but also the fact that those employed in various departments and local authorities seem to lose their enthusiasm because of the bungling that goes on. I have seen this happen in the land management area over the period of this Government and my worry is that the Minister who is handling these matters at present in the other place will go down in history as the Minister who did more damage to land management than any other Minister in the history of this State. I do not say this lightly as I am desperately worried about it.

Hon J.M. Brown: Releasing a million acres a year.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: If the member who just interjected knew anything about my history he would know that I opposed that right from the start.

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: Mr Brown might not be farming if it were not for that.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: That might be the case. I have occasionally stood out against my party, which is more than some people here have done who tend to interject, Mr President; and I should direct my remarks to you, because you are controlling this debate. The Government's intention is that the Bill will not be proclaimed until regulations and administrative procedures have been developed to clearly set out the development approval and how that approval will work in practice. I hope that in her reply the Minister can tell me how these things will work so that we do not get into a long and involved Committee stage on this Bill because, as the Minister knows, I get a little tenacious when we get into Committee and tend to want answers. The second reading continued -

This is most important as the Government wants to remove any current confusion about the way in which development applications are referred and handled.

So here we are; the Government wants to remove the current confusion - it admits there is confusion with this Bill - but by early 1989 when the Act and regulations are ready to be proclaimed it claims it will have got over the confusion. My idea is that usually one sees the people, discusses a matter with them, works out development procedures and how the form will run, and then brings a Bill into this House, preferably with a heap of information as to how the regulations are to be applied and what is to happen in the whole of the progress of that trust. The Minister continued in her second reading -

If there should be a dispute as to the boundary of the land - that is, whether it is within the trust's management area - provision is made for ascertaining the views of affected persons or bodies and submission to the Governor for a final decision.

I may be a cynic, but, Mr President, whom do you think the Governor - who will make the final decision, that is the Cabinet - will believe, the local authority or the Minister who is running it? I am sure that you know, Sir, as well as I, that Cabinet will take the Minister's opinion and the small bloke will be kicked in the teeth again. The second reading continued -

It is intended that the management area be extended in the future to include new foreshore reserve along the rivers as it is established under the metropolitan region scheme.

Here we have mention of the metropolitan region scheme. One knows, as one looks at the Bill and its complexity, that everybody gets into the act one way or the other, but all have gone on to refer to the Swan River Trust. The second reading continued - and those people living along the river representing the local authorities will be fascinated by this -

Changes to the management area will be by regulation -

Unless somebody is bright enough to pick up the regulations in this or another place they will be foisted on the public without a murmur -

and the Bill provides that in each case local government and the Minister for Planning will be consulted before any regulations are made.

They will be consulted. What if they disagree? Then, as I read it, it will go back and the Minister for Waterways will make a recommendation to the Governor; in other words,

Caesar unto Caesar, and off we go again. This is a typical Labor Party policy, and may I congratulate members opposite for being so consistent with their attempts, bumbling as they may be, to be consistent.

I now come to the composition of the board, which is to be of eight members. In his report Zelestis says that the membership of the commission could become rather large if the number of management authorities were increased, and consideration should be given to altering the membership to a maximum of seven or nine people, not eight as mentioned in the Bill. He says that members should be drawn from relevant Government agencies, management authorities or local committees, and the public. He also says that consultation between the chairmen of individual management authorities or local committees can be achieved through the establishment of a committee. He goes on to say that, if it consists of nine people, an extra local government person should be put on the board. However, here we have a committee of eight and the extra independent.

Hon J.M. Brown: They might put you on it.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: They might well, and I would fit the bill well. I hope the member mentions that. However, I do not know whether some people would appreciate that. Of the eight members, the chairman and two others are to be independent, and three are to be nominated by the Ministers administering the State Planning Commission Act, the Marine and Harbours Act and the Water Authority Act respectively. This Government has set up a land management authority - and with "land" read "water", as I said before - called the Department of Conservation and Land Management, and surely in order to have management we should have somebody who can manage. I do not have much against the State Planning Commission, but that is an organisation of planners, not managers. The Department of Marine and Harbours manages certain things, and marine and harbour matters could be referred to that department for the sort of management we need. It has not been spelt out to me why it is necessary to have included the Water Authority but not the Department of Conservation and Land Management. The Swan River Trust is being set up to serve this Government's ministerial structure.

There will also be a nominee from the Local Government Association. The Bill provides for additional local government representation from the various municipalities when those municipalities are being discussed. The Bill does not say that that representative will have sufficient power to do any real good on the commission.

The Minister says -

The functions of the trust are set out in clause 7. They include the specific role of advising and recommending to the Government on all development proposals and the broader role of working with other State and local bodies to protect and enhance the rivers for recreation, conservation and a range of uses.

I can see the trust making recommendations to the Minister about matters affecting the Department of Conservation and Land Management, the Water Authority, and the Department of Marine and Harbours, and the trust could affect any one of 10 other departments. So we have here another trust having its oar in the river, and saying what is going to happen. The Minister says that the trust will control pollution in the rivers as a delegated body under the Environmental Protection Act. The Minister said also that some additional staff will be provided to enable the trust to carry out its functions. We could ask how many, and what are they to be used for. Why can we not be told how many additional inspectors will be put in under this trust?

I would like to know also whether this body will escape the financial provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, because it is a trust and will be receiving donations and bequests. It is proposed also that all applications for development within the management area will be referred to the Swan River Trust, which will in turn be required to consult widely before reporting to the Minister for Waterways. That is rhetoric of the highest order. We do not know how the Government is to do this because the regulations have not yet been drawn up. The rhetoric is there but the basic administration is not. The Bill says that when an application is on the foreshore reserve within the management area, it will be forwarded to the trust by the local government authority together with its recommendations, and where the application is for development over the water, it will be submitted by the

developer direct to the trust. Why should it not go also to the local authority when it is a development over the water? If a person were wanting to develop a restaurant over the water, the local authority abutting it would be responsible for the roads and parking, so I believe it should be obligatory for the developer to send an application to the local authority.

Another example of the superb rhetoric in the Minister's second reading speech is found in the statement that the trust will determine the level of documents to be submitted with an application and may advertise the proposed development for public comment. Everything done under the Environmental Protection Act is advertised for public comment, so why should not this be? I love the statement about the level of documents to be submitted. I remember the days when Hon Graham MacKinnon was Minister for Education, and we were building preprimary centres when the Liberal Government wanted to provide education for five year olds. This Government has promised - among its many promises - to provide education for four year olds, but that has not yet happened.

Hon John Halden: You made a mess of it.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: We used to get the specifications, and we needed to let a few shire councils build those centres. We found that the cost of the preprimary centres was within about one or two per cent directly proportional to the weight of the documents. A preprimary centre which was built by the Public Works Department would in terms of the level of documents weigh about twice as much as a centre built by a local government, and would cost twice as much. I think you, Mr President, would probably remember us putting these things on the scales, and whenever I read about the level of documents to be submitted -

Hon John Halden interjected.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I am talking about somebody who honours promises to give preprimary education - unlike this Government, which has not honoured promises for education for four year olds. So let us not talk about good or bad administration. Members can imagine that the phrase "level of documents to be submitted" hit my eye very quickly. The Bill says that -

Once the trust has reported to the Minister copies of the report shall be provided to the applicant, each relevant public authority and local government authority, and any person who made a submission if the proposal was advertised. The Minister may publish the trust's report.

Why does it say the Minister may publish the trust's report; why does it not say the Minister shall publish the trust's report? Or it could be tabled. If it is going to go to the applicant, each relevant public authority, the local government authority - and there maybe two, or three, or four of those in any one proposal - and any person who made a submission, I believe it should be published. The Minister's second reading speech continues -

After considering the trust's report the Minister will determine the application by approval, approval in a modified form with or without conditions or restrictions, or refusal of approval. Any approval must be consistent with policies or approvals granted under the Environmental Protection Act and the trust's management program.

That is a heap of gobbledegook. Again, it is the Minister making the goddamn decision. It is saying the Minister's approval must be consistent with the policies that he is setting up. I just wonder why we need the trust when the whole thing is reverting to the Minister anyway. Is it another way to stick something on the back burner and wait and hope that something comes out of it? I think it is. At the bottom of page 10 of the second reading speech the Minister goes on -

Inspectors and authorised persons will be empowered to inspect and enter premises for the purpose of enforcing part 5 . . .

I know how the House loves those sorts of powers. The second reading speech continues -

The trust's inspectors will be its eyes and ears and will demonstrate to the public that the trust is effectively monitoring the development approval process.

I hope the Minister can tell me how many extra staff are to be the eyes and ears so that the public can be assured that the trust is effectively monitoring the approval process. The Minister's speech continues -

Provision is made in the Bill for honorary inspectors so that responsible and interested members of the public can be actively involved in caring for the rivers.

I heartily commend the Government in this. Hon Fred McKenzie and I have made recommendations about honorary inspectors and wardens in other Bills. What I want to know is how they are appointed and what are their qualifications. I remember the old days of honorary fishing inspectors - they were the blokes who wanted to keep the marron dams to themselves so they kicked everybody else off the good marron dams or parts of the river.

Hon J.M. Brown: They got the best catch.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Mr Brown is dead right - he can remember it too. I am just a little worried about how the honorary inspectors will be chosen. Here is another point about which your constituents, Sir, would be very pleased. The Minister's second reading speech says -

Inspectors and authorised persons will be able to take action where offences occur and in the case of minor offences will be able to serve on-the-spot infringement notices. Mostly the inspectors will have an educative role . . .

They will have an educative role but they are to be allowed to issue on-the-spot infringement notices. What will be the level of these infringement notices? What are some examples of what the infringements will be, and what are the corresponding infringement charges? Will an honorary inspector be allowed to issue on-the-spot infringement notices? It is probably not worth it if he is not; but is he to be paid by the Government to follow these infringement notices through if a person takes it to court? It is not quite as simple as it looks. I am very keen on education, although we do not have much of it in this State at the moment under this Government; but I am very interested to read about these inspectors. I just wonder whether, if Mr Dans pulls his boat up on the side of the river the wrong way, he will be issued with an infringement notice.

Hon D.K. Dans: I very rarely do that.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Hon Des Dans probably gets somebody else to do it for him.

I hope the Minister can answer those questions about the infringement notices and whether honorary inspectors will be able to take action and, if an honorary inspector issues an on-the-spot infringement notice, what procedures will apply if a person refuses to pay and the matter goes to court. There could be some problems there. The Minister's second reading speech also says -

Power is provided to the trust to serve notices to either stop or modify a development that contravenes an approval. If such a notice is served the affected person can appeal to the Minister who can confirm or vary the direction.

How long will this process take? If a multimillion dollar building is being erected on the foreshore or on the river and it is stopped by an inspector or an authorised person, is there a limit to the time for which the work on that project can be stopped, or is there not? Is the time unlimited? How long will the appeal take to be heard? I can see great dangers for the developer here. The Minister's second reading speech continues -

A further important enforcement provision allows the trust to remove property that is abandoned, derelict or dangerous . . .

That is the part that refers to Hon Des Dans. The Minister's speech continues -

. . . provided adequate notice has been served on the owner if that person can be found. Under the Waterways Conservation Act it is often very difficult to remove derelict or dangerous boats and some hazardous situations have occasionally continued longer than desirable.

I can understand that, but how will that operate? How long will the inspector try to find the owner? Will he waltz up to him and hand him the notice or will reams of paper go through the post? I would like the Minister to explain how that enforcement procedure will be implemented. My last comment on this Bill relates to page 12 of the Minister's second reading speech where it says -

Provision is made in part 7 for the Minister to review the operation and effectiveness

of the trust Act as soon as practicable after five years and report to both Houses of Parliament.

What is "as soon as practicable after five years"? When the Minister gets around to it, I suppose. As for reporting to both Houses of Parliament, the Parliament will not be able to deal with it - we cannot get the Bill back. This is a Clayton's sunset clause - it is the sunset clause you have when you are not having a sunset clause. I apologise to the House - there is one more point. The Minister's speech further says -

An important additional power to regulate is provided to control or prohibit the exhibition of advertisements or signs in the management area.

I wonder how far that provision goes, because the management area includes the river. If *Miss Houghton* sails up the river, she is an advertisement, is she not? And *Miss Sandalford* is the same.

Hon D.K. Dans: I think you are drawing a longbow there. What about a yacht with a spinnaker?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: What about *Freedom* in Crawley? Hon Des Dans must have seen it. Is that advertising? Can the trust demand that it be removed?

Hon Kay Hallahan: Demand that what be removed?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: As Hon Des Dans has said, on the mainsail of a yacht there is advertising. *Freedom* clothes are being advertised.

Hon D.K. Dans: I do not know anything about it.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: There is advertising on the mainsail of a boat - I think it is 6KY - moored in Crawley all the time. I know the owner; I have been on it. Just how far does this advertising in the management area go? We should be given these answers.

Moving to the second Bill under debate, part 2 provides a consultative mechanism between the trust and the Department of Conservation and Land Management where marine and land nature reserves or parks are to be established in the trust's management area or where any amendment is proposed to such parks and reserves. The Department of Conservation and Land Management should be given total management in this area because its regulations cover it. We seem to be producing another body that we do not need.

Part 4 amends the Land Act so that the Swan River Trust is consulted before any land in the management area is reserved, or the purpose of any such reserve is changed. I cannot see anything wrong with that. Then the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act and the metropolitan region scheme are both amended to ensure that amendments made under the region scheme are not contrary to the provisions of the Swan River Trust Bill. What is the use of the metropolitan region scheme anyway? The scheme is meant to be a total one but is not allowed to have anything in it which runs contrary to the Swan River Trust. This part also mentions that certain clauses of the metropolitan region scheme do not apply to a development to which the development control provisions of the Swan River Trust Bill apply, and that a planning control area under the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act cannot be declared in the management area of the trust.

Part 7 also amends the region scheme to provide that where an application for development crosses into or abuts the trust's management area where a foreshore reserve does not exist, the State Planning Commission shall give full particulars of the application to the Minister for Waterways. Why is this power given to the Minister for Waterways? Why not give it to the Swan River Trust? I know that he will make all the decisions because he is the boss. Frankly he is becoming the boss of everything. We will not be able to move without the Minister for Waterways telling us which way. If a difference or dispute arises provision is made for consultation at ministerial level to resolve the matter. Caesar unto Caesar! It is intended that in these cases the application should go through the normal planning process but that the Minister for Waterways should have a strong say in the decision making for the development as it affects the rivers. Can the Minister enlighten us about what a strong say is? Does the Minister have total charge of this? Does he just mouth rude words? What is a strong say? This does not appear to me to be one of those phrases which would convey anything in a legal sense. I would hate to be debating in a court of law that a person had a strong say.

The second reading speech states that part 9 continues the theme by providing that where there is an appeal under the planning process against a decision of the State Planning Commission the Minister for Waterways shall have the same standing in the appeal as the Minister for Planning. Poor old Bob Pearce has had his chips. I would like to see the Swan River Trust under the jurisdiction of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations.

The Waterways Conservation Act 1976 is amended to make it clear that the powers and functions of the Waterways Commission under the Waterways Conservation Act do not apply to the trust's management area. It seems that we have spawned another QANGO. I doubt whether this is necessary. I doubt whether we are being very wise in continuing along the course this Government is attempting to lead us. I am not saying this with any ill will but I just wonder whether the management procedures for the benefit of the people of this State could not be made far easier and less restrictive than at present. I also wonder about the heaps of paper - the level of documents, I think the Minister called it - that we will end up with in all these planning decisions. If "planning decisions" means that appeal provisions follow, we should think again about the direction in which we wish the State to go.

I reiterate my worries about the inspectorial service. We may reach the stage where we have so many inspectors we will not need local government. Local government powers of control will be taken away by these inspectors who will overrule local government in various areas of management. That would be a great pity.

The Opposition supports the Bill. I urge the Minister to answer our questions, otherwise we will need to go through a fairly long and torrid Committee stage.

**HON KAY HALLAHAN** (South East Metropolitan - Minister for Community Services) [8.40 pm]: I am very pleased to have the support of the Opposition parties for the Bills before the House. They are important Bills and the thorough and comprehensive consideration which Hon Sandy Lewis has given to them has been appreciated by all members. We all appreciate the value of the Swan River. As I get older I find that I appreciate the amenity of that river more and more. I guess it is from a visual point of view because I am not a person who uses it recreationally except for the occasional walk. It gives a wonderful vista to our city and I guess that the support for the Bill is borne by a concern that we all have to maintain and protect that wonderful heritage. I will answer some of the points raised by Hon Sandy Lewis because I am sure they are burning issues with many members. If I fail to cover all the matters raised by the honourable member I will be happy to answer questions during the Committee stage. I am sure the honourable member will find that the number of responses I wish to make to his speech will cover his concerns.

Hon Sandy Lewis expressed concern that this Bill will slow down things. It really is a misunderstanding of the situation. All the key players will be involved in the procedures. We all know that it is a job and a half getting together a lot of busy and usually senior people to consult, but when it occurs we have results. We all know the benefit of having people gathered together in one place to make decisions at that time. While it may appear to be cumbersome, it is a speedier process and I reassure the honourable member on that point. There will be a strengthening of the role of the Swan River Management Authority by the replacement of that authority with the Swan River Trust, which is the reason for this Bill. The Swan River Trust will be the single and the central contact point and, therefore, will reduce a lot of confusion that does arise if there is not an identifiable place to raise issues relating to the river. As a result of that a number of approvals will be reduced. The number of licences that are required from the Swan River Management Authority will also be reduced. The Government is proceeding in the direction in which members would wish it to go.

Hon Sandy Lewis' question regarding local government representation is very important. There will actually be two representatives from local government on the trust and not one member. One member will be a permanent member, but in addition to that person a representative from the local authority that is affected in relation to a particular issue will also be eligible to serve on the trust and, therefore, the number of local government representatives will be brought to two.

**Hon A.A. Lewis:** That is not the way it is stated in the report.



Hon KAY HALLAHAN: We all know that reports are useful and the Zelestis report was very valuable. However, it does not mean that one has to slavishly follow the report. It is the basis for the Bill before the House tonight. The honourable member's concerns in that regard are not warranted. The member referred to the 100 year flood level which is defined by the Water Authority and, as he is probably aware, it is controlled by local government. Much of the area covered by the 100 year flood level is outside the trust's management area. Perhaps that answers the issue. If it does not - the honourable member is shaking his head in the negative - we will refer to it in the Committee stage. I refer now to the proclamation of the Bill, which is important. We all know the process of getting Bills through both Houses of Parliament and that the proclamation is the final stage. It is the intention of the Government to proclaim this Bill early in 1989. It is true that the regulations and procedures have to be drawn up and checked with local government. It would be a foolish enterprise to draw up the regulations and procedures prior to the Bill being passed by both Houses of Parliament. A lot of consultation has taken place to get the Bill to this point and the process of consultation will continue in drawing up the procedures and regulations. To answer the honourable member I am assured that that process will be achieved to allow for the proclamation of the Bill early next year. It is not something about which we should worry as the honourable member thought we should.

Hon Sandy Lewis referred on more than one occasion to matters ultimately being referred to the Minister. It is the Government's point of view that when it comes to the final decision it is the elected representatives of the people who should make that decision and they should have a view about how they are representing the community of Western Australia. In matters of this kind it is the Government's view that this is an appropriate decision making place. The membership of the trust was referred to and I advise members that there will be eight full time members. As I said earlier, the membership will be extended by an additional local government representative when matters dealing with local government are being considered. I guess there will not be many cases in this regard, but when it does occur the trust will comprise of nine members. If members are concerned about the report in the same way as Hon Sandy Lewis is, at least we have a conforming to the recommendation of the report in that regard.

A question was raised about the Department of Conservation and Land Management. CALM does not have a direct role in the overall management of the Swan and Canning Rivers. For that reason, it was not appropriate for CALM to have a full management role. It does have a management role in some small areas, but they are not related to the overall Swan and Canning Rivers. Although I know that Hon Sandy Lewis is a constant supporter of CALM and he would see it as appropriate to have CALM represented on the trust and on any board members can think of, I am sure there are times when CALM would not have time to attend all those meetings. CALM is represented on boards and committees where it is appropriate and this trust is not one of them.

In relation to additional staff the existing staff, including the inspectors on the Swan River, will work for the trust. Two additional staff have been approved: One is a planning officer and the other is an administrative secretary. There will be a strengthening in the planning and administrative areas with the transfer of existing staff to carry out the responsibility of the trust. With regard to the Financial Administration and Audit Act the trust will most certainly come under the requirements of that Act and I am sure that is a matter of great relief to all of us.

Hon A.A. Lewis: I thought you would lessen the requests you get.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: It may be that Hon Sandy Lewis is making a valid point, but at the same time it would be an unsatisfactory position for the trust not to be subject to that Act. Quite frankly, if it were not I would expect him to be quite critical. Throughout his speech the honourable member made some very good points, one of which referred to honorary inspectors. They must be chosen very carefully and they will be. In general terms they will not be serving infringement notices unless they are specifically authorised to do so. I am sure the member is aware that the serving of infringement notices is a common practice which obviates lengthy court processes. It is not new, and these days it takes place under the provisions of many Acts. With regard to infringement notices, which will refer to minor offences, and littering is an obvious example, the member will be pleased to hear that the fines and penalties will be prescribed by regulation. At present that system is working very

well under the Swan River Management Authority and for that reason will work in a similar way under the provisions of this Bill. At present no powers exist to control advertising on the river. Therefore the situation raised by the member with regard to the yacht would not be covered. However, any unsightly and obtrusive signs would have to be dealt with. I may need to clarify that point in the Committee stage and will be pleased to do so.

Many of the matters raised have been answered and I am sure a satisfactory answer can be given to the points the honourable member made. I know he has a longstanding and genuine concern for matters of a conservation nature and in my view this Bill is a very important part of protecting that wonderful heritage, the Swan River. The people in this city are extraordinarily lucky to have that river as part of the city's geography. Its present condition is a tribute to Western Australians and a sign of their appreciation of it. However, I am sure that had it not been for sensible monitoring it would not be in the attractive state it is in today.

Some minor amendments will be proposed in the Committee stage; one to the major Bill relates directly to an issue raised by the Opposition in another place. The Government was pleased to take that on board and will move the amendment in this House. It is a very satisfactory debate about a very important issue, and I thank members for their support. I commend the Bill to the House.

Questions put and passed.

Bills read a second time.

### Swan River Trust Bill

#### *Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon John Williams) in the Chair, Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title -

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I thank the Minister for her replies. I thought perhaps we could go quickly through some of the points to which she has not replied and perhaps she can provide the answers. I am a little confused by her comment that it would be foolish to draw up regulations prior to bringing things to Parliament but it is a speedier process.

Hon Kay Hallahan: I did not say that.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: The Minister said it would be a speedier process.

Hon Kay Hallahan: When it is in place.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: How do we know when the Minister has not drawn up the forms we should follow? I have to accept her assertion that it will be speedier but there is no proof for the Committee that it will be.

With regard to the 100 year flood level, I was referring to the compensation payable in the management area and asking who is responsible for that compensation. The Minister referred to the final decision being made by the Minister and I agree with that. In fact, she is virtually saying that the Swan River Trust is an advisory committee to the Minister. I thank the Minister for her comments about CALM. The old Forests Department could have run the whole thing but, as the Minister has indicated, that is a fairly biased comment. The reason I asked about the Financial Administration and Audit Act was that I thought the body was set up as a trust with trust moneys. I am not sure that the people bequeathing large amounts of money would want it to be covered by the Financial Administration and Audit Act, but it was a harmless comment.

The Minister did not answer my query about honorary inspectors and infringement notices.

Hon Kay Hallahan: I think I did.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I asked about the notices being contested in court. The Minister said that the honorary inspectors would seldom give these notices and, even if they did, they would follow through to court. It worries me in many ways. The Minister mentioned that changes to the management area will be by regulation. I note that any area larger than one hectare must come before the Parliament but I am a little concerned about changing areas by regulation. I do not think that is a good thing.

The Minister did not answer my query about applications for development over water. It is proposed that the application be referred directly to the trust, but I believe the application should be made to the trust and to the local authority that abuts the proposed development area. For example, if a restaurant were proposed, parking and other facilities could be involved. I wonder why it is not intended that the application shall go to the local authority. With regard to the level of documentation, the Minister has not presented any ideas from her or the department on this matter.

Hon Kay Hallahan: What do you mean?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: If a person makes an application to the Swan River Trust, what level of documentation has to go into that application? Will it be just a simple initial application, followed up by management procedures, so that the bloke knows straight off when he applies that he has no chance, or will it be like so many of our current bureaucracies, where a 40 or 50 page document is required for approval to put in a block of toilets on the side of the river? I want to know how the approvals are to be carried out, because I am not asking the Minister to dot every "i" and cross every "t" -

Hon Kay Hallahan: I am relieved to hear that.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: If I were in a bad mood I would, but I am not in a bad mood. The Minister is being so nice to me I will be nice to her.

I wonder what is in the Minister's mind, because the world has reached a stage of everyone always having to fill out documents. I went for a test today having already filled out four pages of forms, and when I arrived at the place to do the test I had to fill out another three pages of forms. The doctor filled out another three pages, all of which duplicated the forms I had originally filled out. I think we have gone berserk about forms, and I want to know if the Minister's advisor could tell her something about the approval forms, because we are completely in the dark. I know the Government can change it at will by regulation, but how many forms will we need?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I appreciate the considered debate we are having on this Bill. I have sought the information that the member requires, and I hope he will find it to his satisfaction. His first inquiry related to the development approval process. Part 5 of the Bill sets that out clearly, so we are not in the dark about that. His second inquiry related to who was responsible for compensation in the management area. The trust will have that responsibility. It is a requirement of all financial Acts that they comply with the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. I do not believe that will discourage bequests. It may be the case that in time to come the member is right, and who can predict that there will not be a wrong, but I think it is true that people accept there has to be accountability, and I think we will find this provision to be satisfactory.

If honorary inspectors become involved in cases which go to court, and need to give evidence about the acts which they have observed, that will be regarded as part of the responsibility they have taken on, so that is a reasonable expectation. With regard to the worry that local government is not consulted simultaneously, members need to understand that local government will be an equal partner on the trust; therefore, anything that is lodged with the trust will be lodged also with the local government, and local government will be consulted where the areas it has responsibility for are directly involved. I do not think the member would want people to have to lodge applications for development with this trust and having also to tear off to the local city council to lodge another set of papers. We are trying to simplify the procedure and to work in the best interests and convenience of people who need to do business in this way.

The level of documents will very much depend on the size and scale of the development. It is our expectation that the trust will work in a consultative manner with people coming to it. Guidelines will need to be established, but if a development is small, the requirements will match that; and if it is a large development, there will be a requirement for a more detailed and complex submission. That can be arrived at in a working relationship with the trust. The approval forms mentioned by the member - and I was not sure whether he was still talking about the level of documentation - are simple in nature, and similar to those currently used under planning legislation. They have proved their value and will be used under this legislation. I hope I have covered the matters raised and that we are getting to the point of clarifying any matters needing clarification.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I thank the Minister for her answers. The Minister says in the second reading speech that where an application is on the foreshore reserve within the management area, it will be forwarded by the trust to the local government authority with its recommendation, and where the application is for development over the water, it will be submitted by the developer direct to the trust. I mentioned local government because of the roads and parking that may be required. The Minister said that local government will have a representative on the trust, but would it not be a faster process for the developer to give one set of plans to the trust and one set to the local government abutting the proposed development, so they can both be working on the proposal to see if there are any objections, rather than just giving an application to the trust, the trust having to meet the local government member, and then having to take the application back to the local authority? In other words I am trying to speed up the process. If the trust and the local government authority received them at the same time they could work through them and speed up their decisions. It is only a suggestion.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I maintain the position I outlined before. It is true local government does not have boundaries over the water; we all accept that. There is an area in East Fremantle where that is the case, but generally it is not the position. The trust is obliged to refer applications to the proper local authority, and we must consider the situation where there may be more than one local government authority. We get back to another set of plans, another authority, another set of stamps, another bit of petrol and all that. I maintain it is better to have simplicity. If there is one area where people do their business and they are concerned about issues related to the Swan and Canning rivers, we should be consistent. I accept the honourable member's statement, and also the fact that it is not something he feels is horrendously worrying. It is my view that he can be reasonably reassured that what is proposed is workable, simple, convenient and all those wonderfully good things we want for the citizens of Western Australia.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 62 put and passed.

Clause 63: Compensation -

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I move -

Page 32, lines 13 to 15 - To delete "that is reserved under clause 12 of the Metropolitan Region Scheme for "parks and recreation area" ".

I gave notice of this at the end of my second reading reply. This amendment arises as a result of comments and the contribution made by the Opposition in another place, so I anticipate that Hon Sandy Lewis will find it to his liking that the Government has taken those comments on board. The removal of the words set out in the amendment actually strengthens the compensation clause by enabling compensation to be paid to a private landowner anywhere in the Swan River Trust management area. It is a significant amendment, a strengthening of the provisions, and I am very hopeful it will meet with approval. It is a simple and good amendment.

Hon A.A. Lewis: I am not opposing it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 64 to 72 put and passed.

Schedule 1 -

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I move -

Page 39, line 28 - To delete the line and substitute the following -

- (v) of the Canning River to its confluence with Stinton Creek, that are reserved under clause 12 of the Metropolitan Region Scheme for "waterways".

Page 39, lines 30 and 31 - To delete "and certain other land delineated on the maps referred to in this Schedule".

Again, in the spirit of better legislation for Western Australia and compromise between all

political parties, this arises from suggestions made by the Opposition in another place. The two amendments to the schedule are designed to make it absolutely clear that the trust's management area set out in the 11 maps covers only the land and water reserved under the metropolitan region scheme. In addition to that there was a small area of ambiguity, and that has now been clarified and the maps adjusted accordingly. Members may rest assured the maps are utterly correct, and the schedule we are now amending supports that view; there is absolute clarity about where this management area applies.

**Amendments put and passed.**

**Schedule, as amended, put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

**Bill reported, with amendments.**

### **Acts Amendment (Swan River Trust) Bill**

#### *Committee and Report*

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

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.22 pm*

---

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FAMILY CENTRES  
*Conduct - New Regulations*

216. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to draw up new regulations for the conduct of family centres?
- (2) Is it expected that these regulations will be tabled in Parliament during this session?
- (3) Which regulations will govern the conduct of family centres until the new regulations are agreed to?
- (4) If the answer to (1) is no, which regulations will govern the conduct of family centres?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2)-(3) Not applicable.
- (4) The current child care regulations.

COMMUNITY SERVICES, DEPARTMENT FOR - PRIVATE EDUCATION  
*Playgroups - Four Year Olds*

298. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Does her department have any jurisdiction over teachers or teaching methods in private playgroups for four year olds?
- (2) If so, what is the basis of that jurisdiction?
- (3) What avenues for funding are available for private playgroups?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The question needs clarification.

AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF - LAND  
*Analysis - Soil Type Mapping*

310. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to my question 230 of 23 August 1988 regarding the analysis of the State's diverse land resource, is soil type mapping included in the current program?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Department of Agriculture is carrying out soil type mapping as part of resource surveys in the following areas -

Esperance - south coast;  
Manjimup-Nannup;  
Geraldton; and  
Northam.

**INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT - BUNBURY**  
*Industrial Park - Town Site Considerations*

311. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for The South West:

Further to my question 245 of 23 August 1988 regarding an industrial park, were towns other than Bunbury considered for the park?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The South West Development Authority is aware of private enterprise proposals to develop industrial estates in a number of locations throughout the south west.

**"SOUTH WEST STRATEGY"**  
*Government Printer - Pamphlet Costs*

312. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for The South West:

Further to my question 265 of 23 August 1988 regarding the cost of the "South West Strategy", when is it expected the Government Printer will know the cost of the pamphlets?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Due to demand, another print run of the strategy document is proposed. Final unit costings will not be available until this is completed.

**FEDERAL GOVERNMENT - AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS**  
*State Government - Westrail*

313. Hon H.W. GAYFER to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What further negotiations have taken place between the -
  - (a) Commonwealth Government and/or Australian National Railways; and
  - (b) State Government and/or Westrail
 in respect of the sale or transfer of Westrail to Australian National Railways?
- (2) If there is no negotiating taking place, has the proposition been put forward by any of the parties to each other?
- (3) If (2) is yes, by whom has the approach been made?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(3)

A study into various options for some form of amalgamation between Westrail and Australian National Railways was carried out by the Federal Department of Transport and Communications in conjunction with the State and Commonwealth transport authorities. The study report is still under consideration by the Commonwealth and State Governments. At this stage the Minister for Transport does not favour any amalgamation as similar economic benefits can be achieved through continuation of Westrail's successful efficiency program and by addressing areas of joint operations between the two systems which can be rationalised.

**ROAD CONSTRUCTION**  
*Median Strip - Shepperton Road, Victoria Park*

316. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the planned construction of a median strip between Duncan and Oats Streets, on Shepperton Road, Victoria Park, and ask -

Will it be necessary to widen Shepperton Road in order to construct the median strip?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Minor widening of the carriageway may be required, however survey data needed to determine the matter is not yet available

### BRIDGES - BURSWOOD ISLAND

#### *Alignment - Alterations*

317. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the alignment for the Burswood Island bridge to be altered?
- (2) If so, why?
- (3) What has been the cost of the earthworks so far?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A new location adjacent to the Bunbury railway bridge will provide a more cost effective solution to the whole of the redevelopment of East Perth, including the new road.
- (3) \$1.95 million. Some of the material will be re-used on the new alignment.

### "GOVERNMENT STRATEGY PLAN ON WASTE MANAGEMENT"

#### *Draft Report - Release*

325. Hon NEIL OLIVER to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) When will the draft report into the "Government Strategy Plan on Waste Management" within the metropolitan area be released by the working party appointed in mid 1966?
- (2) Will the draft report and its recommendations be forwarded to local government authorities for comment prior to it being considered by Government?
- (3) If no to (2), why not?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) It is expected that a discussion paper will be released within two months.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.

### BEGGS, HON P.A. - ROTTNEST ISLAND FINANCES

#### *Pendal, Hon P.G. - Assertions*

326. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to her assertions during questions without notice on 24 August and ask -

- (1) Will she expand on, and give full details of, her assertion that the questioner embroils innocent public servants in his politicising every single issue?
- (2) Will she expand on, and give full details of, why the questioner's procedure for obtaining information is an issue?
- (3) Will she expand on, and give full details of, her assertion that she has received complaints from several departments in her area of responsibility?



Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(3)

The Minister is not willing to further involve public servants in this issue but there have been a number of incidents where embarrassment has been caused by the member's direct approach to departments and public servants. The member himself will be aware of several incidents reported in the Press when he has complained of the information processes where he has ignored the normal protocols.

**DENTAL PRACTICES**  
*Incorporation - Legislation*

327. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it still the Government's intention to introduce legislation to allow dental practitioners in WA to incorporate their practices?
- (2) Will this legislation be introduced in this session of Parliament as was indicated by the Government in the last session in answer to my question 191 of 22 June 1988?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes, it is the Government's intention to allow dental practitioners to incorporate their practices.
- (2) No. It has not been possible to have the amendments prepared in time for their inclusion in this session.

**LOTTERIES**  
*Financial Aspects*

328. Hon TOM McNEIL to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) What is the gross take in -
  - (a) a standard \$2 lottery; and
  - (b) a standard \$5 lottery?
- (2) What is the average weekly take for -
  - (a) Instant Lotteries during the last three months;
  - (b) midweek Lotto over the last three months; and
  - (c) weekend Lotto over the last three months?
- (3) What was the expenditure through advertising for -
  - (a) standard lotteries;
  - (b) Instant Lotteries;
  - (c) midweek Lotto; and
  - (d) weekend Lottofor the past 12 months?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1)
  - (a) \$200 000; and
  - (b) commission does not operate a \$5 lottery.
- (2)
  - (a) \$898 967;
  - (b) \$846 539; and
  - (c) \$1 824 657.

- (3) (a) \$ 5 795;
- (b) \$246 268;
- (c) \$725 882; and
- (d) \$679 603

per annum. This does not include publication and production costs. Total advertising expenditure is kept to within 1.5 per cent of sales.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY - FREMANTLE HARBOUR**  
*North Mole - Appeals*

329. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that work on the north mole at Fremantle began on 15 August 1988, fully eight days before the closing date for appeals against the Environmental Protection Authority's report?
- (2) If so, has he, his department or the EPA taken any steps to discover why this occurred in contravention of the laws of the State?
- (3) If yes to (2), what has been the outcome of these inquiries?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(3)

The work done on the north mole at Fremantle beginning on 15 August was not part of the proposal assessed and reported to me by the Environmental Protection Authority.

**COMMUNITY SERVICES, DEPARTMENT FOR - HISTORIC DOCUMENTS**  
*Disposal - Inquiries*

331. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is it correct that a series of historic maps and plans produced and/or used by earlier Western Australian explorers have been disposed of by the Minister's department or officers within it?
- (2) If so, will she supply a list of all such maps, plans and any other documents involved?
- (3) Have any inquiries been instituted to ascertain -
  - (a) who purchased the historic documents; and
  - (b) how these priceless pieces of the State's heritage can be repatriated to WA?
- (4) If no to (3), will she say why?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) The department has not disposed of original maps and plans which can be considered to have historical value.

For some years the department has sold mounted facsimile copies of early exploration plans to the public and these have been moderately successful.

The records of the department date back over many years. They are working documents which are used by officers of the department and others, such as surveyors, who require to refer to the records of original surveys of the State. Recognising the significance of many early departmental records, a program of the placement of the more historical documents in the Battye Library was instituted some years ago. Copies are retained for operational use.

The advent of highly sophisticated technology has now made it possible to microfilm all survey documents. In the past this has been difficult because of the nature and quality of the original documents. In April 1988 the

department commenced a microfilming program which will facilitate security and the preservation of the State's original survey documents. Some documents have been found to be not in place and not marked out to any person. The Plan Bank is a working record system and it is not possible to say when any of these plans might have gone missing. Given the volume of documents and the nature of departmental operations, it is not impossible that records have been misfiled over the years.

- (2) A list of the maps/plans which could not be located has been made.  
 (3)-(4) Not relevant.

#### MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - PERSONNEL *Employment Level*

332. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

How many -

- (a) teaching staff;
- (b) teacher aides;
- (c) clerical and ancillary staff; and
- (d) cleaning and wages staff

were employed by the Education Ministry/Department in

- (i) preschool centres;
- (ii) preprimary and primary education;
- (iii) secondary education;
- (iv) education services; and
- (v) guidance and education support

in each of the financial years from 1982-83 to 1987-88?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(a)-(d)

Tables, as detailed below, in the annual reports and "Education Statistics Bulletin" answer the above questions.

#### *Annual Reports*

1982 - Table 4:12 (P54), Table 4:13 (P55) and Table 5:3 (P56)

1983 - Table 4:12 (P68), Table 4:13 (P70) and Table 5:3 (P71)

1984 - Table 4:12 (P107), Table 4:13 (P109) and Table 5:3 (P110)

1985 - Table 4:12 (P80), Table 4:13 (P82) and Table 5:3 (P83)

1986 - Table 4:12 (P73) and Table 4:13 (P75).

#### *"Education Statistics Bulletin"*

No 7, 1987 - Table 3.05 (P52) and Table 3.04 (P51).

July 1988 statistics not yet available.

#### GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS - EDUCATIONAL ADMISSION *Primary Education - Secondary Education*

333. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

What is the total enrolment of students in Government primary and secondary schools in 1988?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Total student enrolment is 234 263.

Includes distance education - 524, and education support schools/centres - 2191.

### MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - TEACHERS

#### *Breakfast/Lunch Functions*

334. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Which teacher groups or associations have attended breakfasts or lunches provided by the Ministry of Education in recent months?
- (2) What has been the purpose of each function?
- (3) What was the cost of each function?
- (4) Is it planned to hold further such functions and, if so, which groups or associations are to be invited?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

It is Ministry policy to provide lunch or breakfast where appropriate to invited groups providing advice and expertise to the Ministry as part of the consultative process promised by this Government. It is also policy to include these costs in professional development initiatives.

- (3) Each responsible officer has the task of judging the appropriateness and budget for these occasions and is expected to operate at minimum costs.
- (4) Yes. I do not know at this stage.

### FAMILY CENTRES

#### *Location*

335. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Where will the 40 family centres be located?
- (2) When will each be ready for use?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Family centres will be located in areas with a high unmet need for services for four year old children.
- (2) Over a two year period, with a number of centres opening in early 1989.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### PENSIONERS - INCOME

##### *Investments*

152. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for The Aged:

I refer to the Federal Government's unprecedented decision to treat unrealised capital growth on market linked investments by pensioners as income.

- (1) Does the Western Australian Government have a view on this matter in light of the views expressed by other State Governments around Australia?
- (2) Has either the Minister or the Premier made representations to Mr Keating to have this matter reversed?
- (3) If not, why not?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(3)

The Western Australian Government has been very concerned about the effect of the Commonwealth Government's measures on the income of retired people, and the Premier will be approaching the Prime Minister on this matter.

### PENSIONERS - INCOME

#### *Investments*

153. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for The Aged:

Does either the Minister or the Western Australian Government endorse the action of the Hawke Government in treating market linked investments as income for pensioners?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Western Australian Government is concerned about any negative impact on the income of retired people.

Hon P.G. Pendal: Do you endorse the Federal Government's actions?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I have answered the question.

### SUPERMARKETS

#### *Scanners - Complaints*

154. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

To the Minister's knowledge, has there been any increase in the number of complaints concerning the use of scanners in supermarkets?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I am not aware of any increase in the number of complaints regarding scanners.

### SUPERMARKETS

#### *Scanners - Price Tags*

155. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

I draw the Minister's attention - if he has not already seen it - to an article in *The Australian* headed "Grocery price tags reintroduction by the Government". I note that this is the subject of a discussion between the various State Ministers. Would the Minister give us an indication of what his views are on the use of scanners and whether he would support the reintroduction of price tags?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

This matter was discussed, along with a number of other matters, and if the member cares to put the question on notice I will give him a full and comprehensive briefing on all the discussion that took place.

### SWIMMING POOL SAFETY

#### *Newspaper Article - Report*

156. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

I thank the Minister for the information he has given. I will put the question on notice because it is important that we receive an answer.

I draw the Minister's attention to an article in the *Sunday Times* of 11 September headed "Pools may get tight new rules" referring to a review of swimming pool safety. In view of the comment that there will be a report, would he be prepared to table it and the final recommendations of the safety committee?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Yes.

### PENSIONERS - INCOME

#### *Investments*

157. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for The Aged:

- (1) As a consequence of the Minister's earlier answers, does she realise that, notwithstanding the abandonment of the retrospective elements of the new attack on pensioners by the Federal Government, pensioners with a nest egg as small as \$10 000 will be adversely affected and thousands of Western Australian pensioners will have their pensions cut?
- (2) Will the Minister give an urgent assurance to those thousands of Western Australian pensioners that she will oppose the Federal Government's decision to treat these investments as income for pension purposes?

The PRESIDENT: The first part of the question is asking for an opinion, and is out of order. The second part of the question is in order.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I thought I had made my position and that of the Government's clear, and that answer still stands.

Hon P.G. Pendal: Do you oppose it?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I have indicated that this Government - I think justifiably - can say it has done a great deal to support the case of retired people on incomes, whether they be from investments or pensions, and will continue to advocate on their behalf.

### PENSIONERS - INCOME

#### *Investments*

158. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for The Aged:

Will the Minister convey to the Federal Government the Western Australian Government's strong opposition to the action taken in relation to those investments?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

In my first response to the member I made it clear that the Premier would be discussing the matter with the Prime Minister.

Hon P.G. Pendal: So you will not oppose it? Thank you.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: That is not so.

### FAMILY CENTRES

#### *Location*

159. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services:

I refer the Minister to question 335 on today's Notice Paper, where I ask, "Where will the 40 family centres be located?" Does the Minister's answer to that question indicate that she has not yet decided the exact locality of each family centre?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

That is correct.

### FAMILY CENTRES

#### *Opening*

160. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services:

Can the Minister tell me which family centres will be opened in early 1989, presuming that it has already been decided where they will be located?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The member makes a false assumption and presumption. I have indicated that those decisions have not been made, but some centres will be opened by early 1989. A decision will be made very soon about the location of those centres in time for their construction and other matters that need to be taken into account, and when I have the locations I will be happy to make them available to the member.

## ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE - IMMIGRANT YOUTH

### *Federal Government Finance Cuts*

161. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Youth:

I draw the Minister's attention to the publication "Ethnic youth, the forgotten factor", which she launched last week, and ask her whether she agrees with the conclusion in the report that the cut back in funding by the Federal Government for the English as a Second Language program has contributed to the difficulties many recently arrived migrants have experienced at school?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I am not in the business of giving opinions on other areas of ministerial responsibility. If the member would care to put the question in some quantitative manner to the Minister for Education, I am sure he would receive the response he requires.

## MINING - MINISTER FOR MINES

### *Commissioner for Soil Conservation - Land Degradation*

162. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) In each of the years 1982-88, on how many occasions has the Minister for Mines been advised by the Commissioner for Soil Conservation that land degradation could take place or is taking place on a particular mining tenement?
- (2) Having received such advice, on how many occasions has the Minister for Mines varied, modified or revoked such lease or mining tenement?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I thank the member for giving the responsible Minister notice of this question.

(1)-(2)

The Minister is not aware of any occasion during the period 1982-88 on which the Minister for Mines was advised by the Commissioner for Soil Conservation that land degradation had taken place or was taking place on a particular mining tenement. The Minister understands that the commissioner has established a number of soil conservation district committees throughout the State. Where mining activities are occurring in specific areas, a representative from the Department of Mines has been appointed to the relevant committee. In addition, the Department of Mines works in close harmony with the appropriate Government departments when imposing or enforcing conditions placed on mining tenements for the protection of the environment.

## SOIL AND LAND CONSERVATION ACT

163. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Sport and Recreation representing the Minister for Agriculture:

In each of the years 1982 to 1988 -

- (1) What regulations have been made by the Governor under -

- (a) section 22(2); and
  - (b) section 46
- of the Soil and Land Conservation Act?
- (2) How many soil conservation notices, memorials and registrations have been served under part V of the Soil and Land Conservation Act?
  - (3) For what reason were they served?
  - (4) How many -
    - (a) are still in effect; or
    - (b) have been discharged?
  - (5) What sum of money is involved?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) (a) None;
- (b) section 48. Regulations requiring that the Commissioner of Soil Conservation be given prior notification of intent to clear more than one hectare of land.
- (2) Eighteen soil conservation notices have been served.
- (3) Seven for wind erosion; three for soil erosion; two for salinity control; four for land degradation from clearing; one for land degradation from over grazing; one for sheet and gully erosion from diverted runoff.
- (4) (a) Thirteen still in effect;
- (b) five have been discharged.
- (5) It is not clear what is meant by "What sum of money is involved?"

#### CORRECTIVE SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF - COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTRES

164. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Community Services in her capacity as Acting Leader of the House:

When will I receive an answer to question 302 which was asked over two weeks ago? It seems to me to require a fairly straightforward answer even though it will probably be embarrassing to the Government.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN\* replied:

I think the honourable member should ask the Leader of the House that question when he is here for question time.

Hon G.E. Masters: You are Acting Leader of the House.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The member knows when it is appropriate to ask questions and when it is not, and it is not appropriate now.

Hon G.E. Masters: Will you chase it up for me?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I certainly will.

Hon G.E. Masters: Tomorrow?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I will chase it up for the member, full stop.

#### FAMILY CENTRES *Work Commencement*

165. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Further to question 335, has work commenced on any of the family centres which will be opened in early 1989?
- (2) If so, which ones?



Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

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

Hon P.G. Pandal: They are still trying to work out what they actually are.

---