

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 1 June 1988

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett) took the Chair at 2.15 pm, and read prayers.

PETITION

Conservation - Shark Bay

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [2.16 pm]: I have a petition which reads as follows -

The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned respectfully sheweth:

That following the Hon Minister for Planning's promises, made at the public meeting at Shark Bay on 24 March 1988 -

Mr Peter Dowding: Which page is this on?

Mr Troy: This petition has only six signatures!

Mr Pearce: I have immense credibility in the Shark Bay area, but you do not need to underline it every day.

The SPEAKER: Order! Everyone has the right to petition the Parliament.

Mr HASSELL: Yes, and members should take this petition seriously.

A Government member interjected.

Mr HASSELL: I will believe he has done a good job when the Commonwealth withdraws from trying to place the area on the World Heritage List.

Mr Pearce: Give the member some brownie points. He has done an excellent job. You were gnashing your teeth when they would not let you speak, and when you did stand up all they could do was groan.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HASSELL: This is an important petition, from people who are concerned about their future and about the power grab being made by Canberra.

Mr Peter Dowding: The difference is that the Minister for Planning has fixed it.

Mr HASSELL: I hope the Minister does better in stopping the -

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us get on with the petition.

Mr HASSELL: The petition continues -

in which he said "if the local people do not want Heritage Listing of the Hamelin Pool then the State Government will not proceed to nominate it and will oppose that Listing . . . in the most unequivocal terms that the State Government will oppose the total listing of Shark Bay for World Heritage at all . . .", that the people of Shark Bay and other citizens are deeply concerned that the Government has agreed that further consideration be given to World Heritage listing for Shark Bay, and -

- (a) believe the special features of the region can be best protected through finalisation, of the Shark Bay Plan in consultation with local people,
- (b) do not want transfer of control of the area to the Commonwealth or overseas influences,
- (c) call on the State Government and Parliament to cease consideration of World Heritage listing,
- (d) call on the State Government to oppose and fight against any World Heritage listing.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears eight signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 25.]

Mr Pearce: You are making a mockery of the people of Shark Bay by rolling in these petitions in dribs and drabs.

Mr HASSELL: I hope the member's Government is more effective on their behalf than it has been in relation to gold.

PETITION

Royal Commission into Laurie Potter Group

MR CUNNINGHAM (Balgas) [2.20 pm]: I have a petition couched in the following terms -

To: The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned respectfully request that the Government appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the affairs of the Laurie Potter Group of Organisations, its subsidiaries and interrelated bodies, and the Principals of those organisations, subsidiaries and interrelated bodies to determine the disbursement of funds collected to provide services to persons who paid in advance for services.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter your earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 5 443 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 26.]

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Televising

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett): Before calling for further petitions I remind members of my earlier advice in respect of filming by television stations today. As members are aware, it has become the practice in this House to allow television cameras to come in early in the session to take what is termed file footage for use by the television stations for the balance of the session. I am advised that insufficient footage was obtained on opening day. As a consequence I have authorised television stations to take more file footage for the first half to three quarters of an hour of today's sitting.

BILLS (5) - INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Swan River Trust Bill.
2. Acts Amendment (Swan River Trust) Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Hodge (Minister for Waterways), and read a first time.
3. Acts Amendment (Education) Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Dr Lawrence (Minister for Education), and read a first time.
4. Misuse of Drugs Amendment Bill (No 2).
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Taylor (Minister for Police and Emergency Services), and read a first time.
5. Acts Amendment (Taxi Cars) Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Cash, and read a first time.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON DELEGATED LEGISLATION

Membership

On motion by Mr Pearce (Leader of the House), resolved -

That in accordance with the rules of the Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation agreed to by both Houses, and the resolution of the Legislative Assembly of 9 December, 1987, the following Members continue as members of the Committee: The Member for Perth (Dr Alexander), the Member for Morley-Swan (Mr Donovan), the Member for Darling Range (Mr Greig) and the Member for Narrogin (Mr Wiese), and a message accordingly be sent to the Legislative Council.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - EIGHTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 31 May.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [2.32 pm]: I begin my contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate by congratulating the three new members of this House - the members for Dale, Ascot and Balga - and extending to them my best wishes for a fruitful stay in the Legislative Assembly.

I wish to speak on a matter I regard as being of critical importance and one that will affect the million people who live in the metropolitan region and their successors. Most people regard metropolitan Perth as one of the most beautiful places in the world. Virtually every visitor who comes here comments in that style. They give unqualified praise for the city's beauty, and its functionality. If one asks a citizen of Perth - if one takes away the traffic snarls that occur in the morning and afternoon rush hours - most of them have great difficulty in producing a single serious complaint about our city. However, a report issued last December entitled "Planning for the future of the Perth Metropolitan Region" lists a series of propositions, one of which would have a serious and detrimental affect to this enjoyment of our metropolis. I acknowledge that the Government has not accepted this report. In fact public submissions close tomorrow. Interestingly, this date has been extended for three successive months, and I am sure there will be many submissions against this proposal. This proposition is basically designed to squash Perthites more closely together and to take away our precious space and crowd us together like sardines in a can. It is proposed to do this in the full knowledge that the people of Perth do not want that to happen.

That brilliant and controversial Frenchman, Rousseau, said a long time ago -

Men are not made to be crowded together in anthills - the more they are massed together, the more corrupt they become.

It is obvious that in areas of Perth people choose to live more closely together, and in fact there are areas where people generally consider that is appropriate. As I have told the Minister, I support the Government's plan in respect of the redevelopment of East Perth. I think that is a logical place for higher density population; there are other places around central Perth, which we once called the inner city suburbs, which have considerable scope for higher densities. I reject out of hand the definition given in the report to inner suburbs and middle suburbs.

The major recommendation in this report is what it calls, "Urban Containment", which is a very significant increase in the density of our residential areas. The report precedes an argument supporting urban containment by a statement on page 114 that is headed "Innovation in New Residential Development". That particular statement puts forward the plan that must be adopted in order to allow this crowding of people more closely together in metropolitan Perth. It says, very euphemistically, that it will encourage a modest and gradual increase in densities. I do not accept those qualifications. The report continues that it will encourage the development of more compact residential areas containing a reasonable proportion of smaller lots, together with grouped and attached housing sites. The report says that this would encourage innovation in lot design, including reducing lot sizes, frontages and allowing houses to be built up to one boundary, zero lot line. In other words, there will be no side boundary on one side at all.

Those are some of the things proposed by this group of people, which began its work in May

1985 on the initiative of the Minister for Planning. These people worked for two and a half years; I think there was something like 15 or 18 of them, headed by Professor Neutze, and they put the report together, with the help of the State Planning Commission and other facilities the State Government was able to provide. I have long been opposed to this scheme of crowding the people of Perth closer together. It is an idea that has been about for at least 25 years in Western Australia. I have, with the exception of six years in the country, lived in Perth for over 50 years. I have seen how the city has changed in that time; I have seen the change over the years between the size of the blocks of land my father and my grandfather owned compared with the size of the land I own. I have also noticed that, apart from my bulk, as many other people find when they go into rooms, these rooms are far too small. This includes the most essential room in the house, the toilet, where one has to open the door fully before one can move in; before one can close the door, one has to stand in a corner.

Mr Pearce: The Liberal Party stands for bigger toilets. That is a good one.

Mr CLARKO: This is true of bathrooms and other rooms as well. I do not mind the Minister for Planning making jokes about it, but there are many people in Perth who live in homes in Mt Lawley or some other suburb and note the difference when there is a ceiling which is nine, 10 or 11 feet high. I understand the Deputy Premier lives in a renovated house in Fremantle, so he might also be privileged to have ceilings which are quite high.

Mr Parker: That has nothing to do with density.

Mr CLARKO: I know that. What is happening in Perth is that there has been a continual reduction in standards. People come from other places -

Mr Parker interjected.

Mr CLARKO: The Minister would need a room with only a four foot six ceiling. People who have come to Perth have gradually been crowded more closely together in the rooms of their houses. This proposition will crowd them even more closely together in our living lots. That is what we have before us, and it is not what the people of this State want. The member for Joondalup can laugh but she comes from a place which is crowded out - the United Kingdom, a place where one walks on the street and one can hardly move for stepping aside from the messages left by their favourite dogs.

I put to the House and to the people of Perth that this is completely and diametrically opposed to what ordinary citizens want. If people had the choice, if they had the money in their pockets, they would not go to those dog boxes. The millionaires buy apartments at the top of the highest apartments in Crawley, and there they can get away quite nicely without having any front garden, back door or things of that sort. However, the ordinary citizens, the ordinary mums and dads, with their two kids live in the suburbs.

Those people need living space. It is a deterioration in the standard of living to lose living space. Anyone who has anything to do with the unfortunate people who are required to live in Homeswest emergency accommodation in North Beach, in the three-storey blocks, should ask them whether they are living there through choice. They should be asked whether they would like to move. They would all love to move to a house with a garden, but because of economics they are crowded into these blocks of flats. The people living in high rise blocks in Balga do not want to live there at all. If they won the lottery, the first thing they would do is buy a conventional Australian house.

People coming here from other countries want the same thing. I was in the UK two years ago and lived in a mews close to Hyde Park. I am told the property was worth £Stg1 million. I had to walk through a little lane at the back of some shops to the front door, which opened onto a staircase. When one walked upstairs there were two small rooms and a bathroom, and downstairs was the equivalent of a lounge with a small dining room and kitchen. The man who owned it was a bachelor and his only garden was a window box. When it rained, we were cooped up inside with no external windows except those at the front which looked out onto the small lane.

In Perth we have a marvellous opportunity to live on land with space in which our families and children can live without such disabilities. We do not live as others who, for economic reasons, have to be helped by the State. It is unfortunate that they have to live in limited housing, but people on ordinary wages do not have to live like that; they live in conventional housing. Millionaires can live where they want to. Some people want to live in the city, in

central Perth, but the majority do not. I resent people coming here and trying to crowd us closer together like sardines. It reduces privacy.

I spent six years on the planning committee in Stirling. Our council led the way in Perth by refusing to allow our duplexes to have only a single wall between them. We ensured they had a double wall. We received many complaints from people about the fact that you can hear everything going on on the other side of a single wall. It is a lowering of living standards and reduces the aesthetics. A lot of people whinge about the use of water on Perth lawn. To me, the green lawns in front of conventional housing is one of the most spectacular things we can have - it gives us breathing space, is attractive and cool. Other problems are exacerbated when people are crowded together. There is more congestion in the streets, shops and parks. Many studies have been done about people who live in flats and apartments. Those studies show that crowded living leads to an increase in tension among the residents, causes a loss of efficiency and leads to an increase in incivility. There is no doubt it also leads to a rise in vandalism.

I was listening to the radio this morning and two Aboriginal women were talking about what they were trying to do to reduce the problems in Port Hedland. They came from South Hedland. I regard that place as one of the most disgraceful pieces of planning ever put together. The people there do not want to be there, and are not getting a fair opportunity to share in this *manana* land, and its way of life.

In Western Australia there are one million square miles, it is one of the biggest land areas in the world, yet people are talking about a shortage of land. Perth is said to have an easy pace of living, and visitors comment favourably on it. A lot of that is due to the fact that our homes are surrounded by plenty of elbow room and space in which people can move. As we lift the urban densities, which is what is proposed in this document -

Mr Parker interjected.

Mr CLARKO: The Minister is a little flea, and should dry up. He can speak for himself in a few minutes, if he wants to. I know a retired police inspector who, when he arrested the member for Fremantle for demonstrating in the streets, was abused by fellow constables who asked why he took the tiniest one there.

Mr Parker: He would have been invalided out of the force.

Mr CLARKO: The member for Fremantle never knows when to stop. Marshall McLuhan said the increasing and creeping high density is like the analogy of the temperature of the bathwater rising by one degree every half hour; when will the bather know when to scream? That is the situation we have been facing in Western Australia over the last 25 years.

Various developments have been put forward. I remember one in regard to Carine. That land was owned by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. The MRPA put to the City of Stirling Planning Committee that there was no need to have roads with the same pavement dimensions as in ordinary areas which had through streets. Many of my colleagues thought that was fair enough. I asked the officer of the MRPA should we still plan to have the front fence lines on each property the same distance apart as in ordinary streets. He said that they had to come in, too. The MRPA was trying to subdivide into more blocks and make more money. The people who advocate this situation see a quid in it for themselves and are favourable towards redevelopment. There is a considerable advantage in having extra space between one's own house and those on the other side of the road, and on either side.

If one looks at the figures put out in this document in relation to areas which are to be given higher densities, one finds that the number of lots in aggregate is not a great proportion of the number of lots needed. This report covers the period from 1986 to 2021. It states that during that period we will need another 365 000 residential lots.

Mr Thomas: Where would you put it?

Mr CLARKO: I will come to that in a moment. According to the report only an additional 33 000 dwelling lots will be provided by urban containment. The residential amenities of the people in Conesloe, Inglewood and Trigg will be spoiled simply to get 33 000 of the 365 000 needed.

The report makes mention of urban containment. In that regard it is of interest to read a letter written to one of my colleagues from the Claremont Council. It says, having been asked for comments about this report, that it was decided at a meeting in February this year -

That the review should not be seen as a contrivance to further reduce local government autonomy.

The hypothesis that higher residential density will lead to population increase is not supported by empirical research on population studies.

Cost of infrastructure in the fringe of urban areas should be weighed against the social cost of high density living.

Residents must be given the opportunity to comment on any proposal to amend densities and due consideration should be given to those densities.

Any decision to increase population density in the inner suburbs should not be uniformly applied, but should recognise;

That some local authorities have already taken responsible planning decisions to increase population density,

Finally it states -

The rights of local authorities to maintain single residential characteristics in their District.

That is one of the great weaknesses of this report. The review group's interaction with local authorities and the citizens of the areas where it proposes to have high density developments has been virtually nil. It has gone ahead and decided that it will crowd the people more closely together. It believes that once the report has been produced it can be made available to the public and if people are away or do not read the paper they will not oppose it and this type of development will be imposed on them. I am not saying that is the Government's stance. The Government has still to declare its position on this matter. I am trying to urge the Government not to take the course proposed in the report.

Mr Cash: It seems to concentrate more on economic costs rather than social costs that will become apparent.

Mr CLARKO: In effect the Government is saying that the cost of providing public utility services to the outer parts of metropolitan Perth is becoming more expensive and, therefore, it will evade the high costs by crowding people in other areas.

It is interesting for people to know what this report means when it refers to the so-called inner and middle suburbs. I suggest to members that the inner suburbs referred to in this report are, in total, larger than they think. It includes the City of Perth, the City of Subiaco, the City of Nedlands, the Town of Cottesloe, the Shire of Peppermint Grove, and the Town of Mosman Park. Does any member think that Mosman Park is an inner suburb?

Dr Alexander: It is closer than other suburbs.

Mr CLARKO: It is all right for the member for Perth. He has come from Manchester where people are crowded together like rats and they cannot breathe. Perhaps that is what caused both the member for Perth and his father to become Communists in the early days. I can imagine a person becoming a Communist if he lived in an area where people live close together. That is not the case in metropolitan Perth and most of the suburbs are the envy of people around the world, irrespective of the socioeconomic level of that suburb. Some of the suburbs have been spoilt; for example, some people in Balga and Girrawheen have been housed in accommodation which is disgraceful.

By the way, Homeswest has produced many excellent subdivisions and some of the houses in those subdivisions would be the pride of many people. Some parts of Balga are better than Floreat Park. I am referring to the middle suburbs where the Government wants to crowd people together - Bayswater, Bassendean, Belmont and Cannington. Even the City of Canning is referred to as a middle suburb.

Dr Watson: What is wrong with it?

Mr CLARKO: It is not a middle suburb. I will drive the member to Cannington in 30 minutes and we will find cows grazing in that suburb. It is not an inner suburb. The City of Stirling area is called a middle suburb and that is absolute nonsense. The people who wrote this report must be planners who wear socks with their sandals because no Western Australian would wear socks with his sandals.

If people are crowded closely together there will be a rise in social problems. If the Government decides to house three or four times as many people in Cottesloe and Claremont how many people will be driving on Stirling Highway at 8.00 am every working day? Will it be the same number if there are three times as many people living in the houses that abut the highway?

The proposition states that the Government will make the Perth-Fremantle railway economically viable by providing an electrified railway next to high rise and medium density development. I am sure many members have travelled by train. I had the privilege of travelling by train from Washington to New York two years ago and I have travelled through Britain by train. I noticed in both places that people are crowded together alongside the railway lines in multistorey apartments. Can members tell me that is quality living - living amongst the dust and grit? It is not the sort of thing we should be moving towards.

An interjection was made earlier about the Liberal Party's answer to how it would provide 365 000 lots.

Mr Pearce: Make them live somewhere else.

Mr CLARKO: We do not say that at all. I will come to the Minister for Planning's nonsensical Press release in a minute. The Government wants to force more people into Cottesloe, Claremont, Mosman Park, Carnington and Karrinyup than currently live in those areas.

If the Government wants extra land it should go to the northern and southern parts of the metropolitan region. As soon as the Liberal Party is returned to Government next February it will undertake a study and examine the situation more precisely. We will look at Yanchep, Mandurah and Pinjarra - areas equivalent to the semi circle which equates with the metropolitan region, but not in dimension - as places where people can reside.

The report is talking about the year 2021, but the Liberal Party is looking further down the track. Recently a member from the Government benches tried to rubbish me because the Liberal Party looks, in the long term, at Northam being one of these towns. We are not the first to say it. Many planners have said it. We propose there will be a linking from central Perth to the northern subcentre and the same would apply to the area in the south. Perth is already connected by rail to Northam and all we have to do is decide what type of transit system we should use. There is no doubt that on a train one could travel from Yanchep in three quarters of an hour and that is the average time that it takes most people in every capital city of Australia to travel to the city centre.

The Liberal Party opposes the urban containment policy as set out in the report, especially the proposal to significantly increase the densities in the middle suburbs. We would look at increasing the densities in the inner suburbs but we do not believe they should have the boundaries which already exist. The Liberal Party would redefine what are the inner, middle and outer suburbs.

Dr Alexander: The rich areas.

Mr CLARKO: The member may say, "The rich areas", and perhaps some of his Communist past is coming out.

The proposal to unilaterally rezone to urban the 10 new areas which are now rural is rejected by the Liberal Party. Rezoning localities such as this in the future should require the involvement of the relative local authority and its citizens. Local knowledge would be utilised and it would be done in combination with central planning authorities to determine whether some parts of the areas need to be rezoned.

The Liberal Party, when in Government, will set up a feasibility study to look at the question of creating two additional regions which I have mentioned. We will undertake a transport study to ascertain how the areas will be linked together. This is something which the Minister is already investigating.

I will not expand on the proposal to introduce a single State authority to handle metropolitan parks, but we totally reject it out of hand. We oppose any increase in planning towards the centre. The Minister pledged the following in the *Wanneroo Times* of 15 March -

Planning Minister Bob Pearce has assured local communities that development plans will not be forced on them against their wishes.

As I said recently, if the Government allows a property in one of the wedges to be rezoned, but does not allow a similar property in the same area to be rezoned we will finish up with something that could not be described as planning. It is nonsensical; this does not maintain their integrity as special rural or rural land. It is not possible to mix the zonings because otherwise the wedge will be finished. Mr Pearce is reported as follows in the *Wanneroo Times* and the *Stirling Times* -

Mr Pearce gave categorical assurances that -

. Property would not be rezoned without the owner's compliance, . . .

That is nonsensical bearing in mind the statements in the report. I remind the Minister for Planning that numerous statements have been made which confirm that the people do not wish to be crowded together in this way, and local groups will certainly oppose it. However, the Minister has produced a plan which will overcome that; in other words, the Government will re-educate those people. It will eventually subject them to some type of Pavlov dog experiment to persuade them that they would like to live under those conditions.

Amendment to Motion

The Opposition rejects the urban containment proposal and I move -

That the following words be added to the motion -

But we regret to advise Your Excellency that the report "Planning for the Future of the Perth Metropolitan Region" which was initiated by the Minister for Planning and organised by the State Planning Commission, proposes unacceptable changes to the residential densities of Perth. This recommendation, called "Urban Containment" is planned to be enforced despite the knowledge that it is against the wishes of the residents involved.

Therefore in the opinion of this House, the Government should not accept the recommendations of this report for it not only significantly alters the corridor plan concept but will also destroy the residential amenity of the citizens of Perth. The Government should continue to look for more acceptable solutions which will provide for the future housing needs of the citizens of Perth.

MR LEWIS (East Melville) [3.02 pm]: I second the amendment and in doing so I advise the Government that it has made a series of errors in the way it has put this review in place. The first fundamental error is that it has brought so-called experts from the Eastern States and asked them to study and report on the way the future metropolitan region of Western Australia should evolve. Those people did not have the home grown understanding of the requirements of Western Australians and they have made many errors in their determinations and in the way they have performed their task.

We must realise that Western Australia is unique; over the last 100-odd years the tyranny of distance has been responsible for Western Australia developing quite differently from the Eastern States. The people of this State have an entirely different lifestyle and they prefer to live in detached houses on large parcels of land. Although they do not enjoy paying the costs, they accept the financial penalties of that large urban sprawl; for example, the costs of sewerage, water and electricity supplies. The first mistake the Minister for Planning made was to ask the advice of people from the Eastern States who do not know how Western Australians live. They have failed.

The Minister's second error is that not one Western Australian independent planner is a member of the review committee.

Mr Pearce: That is rubbish.

Mr LEWIS: All the members of the review committee work for the Government.

Mr Pearce: What about Jeremy Dawkins?

Mr LEWIS: Jeremy Dawkins is a planner for the City of Fremantle; he has never worked in the private sector.

Mr Pearce: That is not right.

Mr LEWIS: He has been conditioned by the Government syndrome, and no other member of the committee is an independent planner.

The third mistake made by the Government is that it commissioned the report three years ago and the brief given to the committee did not set a date by which to report. Three years down the line, we are still at the public participation stage. The committee has not made a firm decision; it made a general recommendation and it still has to get the views of the people in Western Australia before doing its homework and thinking again. Three years after the report was commissioned, we do not know where we are heading.

The fourth mistake made was the decision not to continue the planning process while the report was being prepared. The Government said that no more land would be zoned urban deferred and that everything would stop until this new brilliant review was in place. What has happened? No urban deferred land has been set aside and the continuity of the planning system has not been maintained. For three years the State Planning Commission has been moribund. Those are the facts.

The Government's fifth mistake is that it has not monitored the availability of urban land; that is, the number of housing lots available on the market. It forgot to monitor that situation and it has been caught out.

The sixth mistake by the Government was to listen to the boffins in the Terrace rather than to members of the industry, who have been telling the Government for 12 months that if it did not get its act in place there would be a dire and acute shortage of housing lots in the metropolitan area. The Government was told by the boffins in the Terrace not to worry because there was 10 years' supply of land. The land shortage in Western Australia is now critical, with rising prices and no relief in sight. That is the sad part of the whole situation.

When briefing this review committee the Minister for Planning made a final seventh mistake: He accepted the committee's preferred option, which includes urban containment.

Mr Pearce: We have not accepted an option.

Mr LEWIS: That is the option which has firmed up after looking at a dozen options, and it was done with the Minister's imprimatur. That was the Government's seventh and most vital mistake. The report recommends that the rural wedges be filled in.

Mr Pearce: Have you read the report or just looked at the pictures?

Mr LEWIS: Of course I have read the report. It recommends that a "fence" be put around the metropolitan area and that the densities be cranked up. The Minister also plans to give more power to the State Planning Commission so that it can ride roughshod over local authorities and tell them to increase their densities, or else the Government will.

Mr Pearce: Who has been told that?

Mr LEWIS: It is contained in the report. The Minister should not deny the plan to give more power to the commission because it is one of the fundamental elements of his strategy. He has not realised that the strategy is fundamentally flawed because the people of Western Australia will not accept it. If the Minister were to follow Mr Kerry on his visits to local authorities and attend the meetings with him, he would know that the plan will not get off the ground because the people will not accept those strategies.

As the member for Karrinyup said, people in Western Australia are not prepared to accept high density or even medium density housing. It may be more economic for the provision of services to crank up the density, but that can be done only by converting the will of the people. If the Minister were to go into the suburbs - into Melville, South Perth, Nedlands, or Claremont - and ask the people whether they would let him increase densities, he would find he would not have a hope in Hades. The Government's most fatal error was in letting its Department of Planning tell it what to do. The Minister for Planning has made an absolute botch of this review. The Government is now in a very precarious position due to the acute shortage of land; and that problem cannot be solved in the near future. That problem is going to be the Government's Achilles heel and will help to bring it down.

Mr Pearce: I will tell people that you said in this Parliament they should be prepared to pay more for land.

Mr LEWIS: The Minister is like a dragonfly; he skips over the water and touches it here and there. He does not put any thought into what he is doing. He does not think things through. The Minister has absolutely stuffed up our education system, and we see now that a mere

rookie on the backbench has been promoted to try to get us out of the mess. The Minister has stuffed up the planning process in Western Australia, and he is going to be responsible for the greatest land shortage this State has ever seen. We are faced now with this land shortage, and it will be even worse in 12 months time. The current demand for housing is 15 500 lots a year. There is also a speculative demand. People who were getting 16 per cent interest on their money in building societies have taken out their money now that they are getting only 10 per cent, and those who were in the share market have taken out their money and have gone to the traditional hedge against inflation and are buying land or property. So in addition to the 15 500 blocks required for purchase, 5 000 blocks are required for the speculative market, making a total of 20 000 blocks required this year to supply demand.

Mr Pearce: Where did you get your figures from?

Mr LEWIS: My figures indicate there are barely 17 000 lots currently available. The average production of lots over the last six years by Western Australian developers and the Government has been 6 800 lots. The Government is going to need to produce at least 20 000 lots this year to even keep up with demand. The best that was ever done was in 1967 when 13 800 lots were produced. There are only 17 000 lots currently available, and I would say that in 12 months' time there will only be 14 000 lots available because the Government is not going to be able to produce the necessary amount of land.

The Government does not have the land to come onto the market, and that is going to stymie the Government even further because unfortunately the planners at the Metropolitan Water Authority, Telecom, and the State Energy Commission, and the engineering people who are trying to put in place the necessary infrastructure, have been sitting with their pencils in their hands for the last four or five years because the planners have not been able to tell them where the urban front is going to go; so they have not been able to plan sewer outfalls, sewerage treatment works, high level water tanks or water reticulation systems. Telecom has not been able to put in place exchange equipment or the main infrastructure cabling. The tragedy is that because the planning is flawed, the Minister will not be able to achieve results for another 12 months, and for another year engineers will not know what to do. I have done quite a lot of research -

Mr Pearce: If your speech is based on your research, then it is not worth anything.

Mr LEWIS: I have been speaking to eminent town planners. It might be better for this State if the Minister would listen; and rather than saying there is not a problem, he should get off his butt and do something about it. I can assure the Minister there are only 45 000 lots capable of being developed at the present time within the metropolitan scheme.

Mr Pearce: Frothing at the mouth is no substitute for facts.

Mr LEWIS: There are not the 80 000 or 90 000 lots - 10 years' supply - as the planning boffins in the Terrace say, but the facts are that is not so because certain environmental consequences need to be resolved, such as the 3 000 lots at Thompson's Lake which are being held up because of midges. There is also the problem of the main sewers which come down from Maida Vale and the upper reaches of Midland - \$60 million worth of capital cost which has not been put in. The land at Cockburn and Wanneroo has been fragmented to the extent that it is not possible to put in place town planning schemes to bring those subdivisions into use. I have heard, on good authority, that there is a maximum of 45 000 lots that could be developed.

Mr Pearce: Where did that figure come from?

Mr LEWIS: If we look at the average consumption of land in Western Australia over the last six years, it has averaged 12 800 home sites a year. The Minister has only a three and a half years' supply. It is going to take another 12 months to make that land available for sale. The Government is facing a disaster.

Mr Pearce: What do you propose to do about it?

Mr LEWIS: I am not a member of the Government. The Minister is the person who has blown it. Why does he not listen and tell me I am right; everything I have said is true?

Mr Pearce: You are dead wrong. However, if you were right, what would be your answer?

Mr LEWIS: We have plenty of answers. The Minister should get those smart alects in the Terrace to tell him all about it.

Mr Pearce: What do you think of the member for Karrinyup's proposition to make all these people live in Northam or Yanchep?

Mr LEWIS: What the planners have done, under the administration of this Minister, is to cause the planning system to become moribund. They have not been able to bring any new urban deferred land onto the market. The engineers have not done any forward planning. They have not put in place any feasibility studies. They have not put in place the capital works to service the land use requirements. The Metropolitan Water Authority has a policy for sewerage, but it does not have a strategy to implement that policy. The authority knows what it wants to do, but the Government will not give it the answers or the money. There has not been ongoing monitoring of the present land inventory. An acute land shortage has been allowed to develop. That is the terrible situation we now find ourselves in because of the regional scheme review. That review has taken three years to progress and is not now even getting off the ground.

In the short time I have available I would like to turn to another aspect of the planning process and the recent decision of the Minister for Environment to veto a subdivisional development at Reabold Hill. I believe that is an absolute watershed in the planning process in Western Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are discussing an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, moved by the member for Karrinyup, which to the best of my knowledge does not canvass the subject which the member is now addressing. If the member can show me that it does, I will allow him to continue.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I am glad you watch me very closely. Every time I stand to speak you seem to think I am not speaking to the matter. However, with respect, if you read the amendment you will see that it is very critical to the planning for the future of Perth and its metropolitan region. A landmark decision has been made. With respect, Mr Speaker, am I not responding -

Mr Pearce: No, you do not get a separate time to respond. It is part of your speech.

Mr LEWIS: All right, I will go straight into it. The Environmental Protection Act virtually usurps the rights of the planning process.

The SPEAKER: Order! Are you now continuing to talk about the subject which I stopped you talking about, or are you in fact talking to the amendment?

Points of Order

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker - and I would like the clock to be kept where it is - you have suggested to me that I am not talking to the subject.

The SPEAKER: That is quite so.

Mr LEWIS: The subject is, Sir, that "We regret to advise your Excellency that the Report "Planning for the Future of the Perth Metropolitan Region" which was initiated by the Minister for Planning and organised by the State Planning Commission, proposes unacceptable changes to the residential densities of Perth. This recommendation, called "Urban Containment" is planned to be enforced despite the knowledge that it is against the wishes of the residents involved."

What I am suggesting, Sir, is that what I am talking about is the planning process, the Town Planning and Development Act and the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act, which are all tied up with this report, which is the fundamental subject of this amendment. I am suggesting that the planning process will be usurped because of subsequent Acts that, to my mind, usurp the power of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act and the Town Planning and Development Act.

Mr CLARKO: Mr Speaker, I take it that the member is going to talk about Bond Corporation land in Reabold Hill. He started to touch on that. I would humbly suggest to you, Sir, that this report is all about housing lots in Perth - the present ones and the need for future ones, and any schemes of that nature which have not yet happened. The amendment is talking about future housing lots and so on. Here is a group of future housing lots which were provided for but which will now be taken away. I would suggest, Sir, that it is appropriate for the member to talk about it because it is part of the future housing lots

situation and the taking away of them, which affects future housing needs as set out in the last line of the amendment.

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, it is up to you to rule how you like on this but I draw to your attention the fact that the Planning for the Future of the Perth Metropolitan Region report, as a matter of fact, contains no reference to the Bold Park land or the Bond proposals, which were not dealt with on planning grounds at all but under the Environmental Protection Act.

The SPEAKER: It is quite clear to me that if the member for East Melville wants to address the subject that he wants to address, if it were possible before the amendment was moved he should have ensured that the amendment was worded in a far less tight fashion. It is clear to me that the amendment talks specifically about planning for the future of the Perth metropolitan region and was not intended to allow for as wide ranging a debate as the member for East Melville now desires.

However, not being one to thwart the wishes of the House, I would be prepared on this occasion, in view of the fact that there is very little time left to the member for East Melville, for him to canvass those issues briefly; but if anybody else takes that as a precedent to allow the subject to take up the bulk of their speech I will take exception at that time.

Debate Resumed

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What I was saying was that because of the new Environmental Protection Act it is virtually a landmark decision and in fact usurps the rights of the planning process. The Town Planning and Development Act sets aside land for specific use by virtue of a process of public response and opinion being canvassed. It goes through a very lengthy process, as the Minister and other members know, and reaches the stage where the Minister has the authority to approve that land use virtually by a zoning gazetal.

Mr Pearce: Why do that?

Mr LEWIS: What happens now is that people with a third party right can come to the Minister for Environment and say, "I do not agree with that land use; you cannot use that land for that purpose", and that Minister can overthrow a decision of the Minister for Planning and a Statute of this State.

Mr Pearce: Are you in favour of the development of Bold Park?

Mr LEWIS: We could have a situation where a town planning court can hear an appeal and can rule in favour of a specific land use and a development, and by virtue of one person's objecting to the Minister for Environment the Minister, with his powers under that Act, can overrule a court of this land and Statutes of this Parliament. That is the ridiculous situation we have reached with this Environmental Protection Act; not only that, but also the proprietary rights of that person are completely disfranchised because there are no grounds for compensation for any acts that the Minister may or may not do under the jurisdiction of his responsibilities. That is the terrible thing that must be addressed.

I do not care whether Alan Bond owns that land at Reabold Hill; I do not care who owns it. Those people should be compensated for the rights this Government has taken away from them. The Government must stand condemned for taking people's property rights away from them and it is something that the Government should immediately turn its mind to if it has any conscience whatsoever.

MR PEARCE (Armadale - Minister for Planning) [3.26 pm]: The member for Karrinyup has amply demonstrated to the House this afternoon that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and the member for East Melville has demonstrated that no knowledge at all can be quite lethal.

Mr Lewis: I have forgotten more than you ever knew.

Mr PEARCE: The member has certainly forgotten all he ever knew about planning because there was no evidence of any knowledge of planning in the speech that he made. If his assertion is that he once knew something but has since forgotten it I would be prepared to accept that that is the process by which he came to his present abysmal state of knowledge on the matter.

I refer to the amendment, which did not figure prominently in the speech by the member for

East Melville, though it did rate a passing mention in the speech of the member for Karrinyup. I would have to say that the Government is not prepared to support this amendment because to do so would put us in the unfortunate position of lying to the Governor and that is not something that the members of the Government would be prepared to do. We have a respect for the viceregal office which would prevent our sending pork pies down to him attached to the Address-in-Reply which was so competently moved by my brother-in-law, the member for Ascot.

In the proposed amendment this is what the member for Karrinyup would want us to say -

... This recommendation, called "Urban Containment" is planned to be enforced despite the knowledge that it is against the wishes of the residents involved.

I just want to pick that phrase out to demonstrate the falsity of almost everything that has been said in the last hour or so. First, there is no plan to enforce the results of the deliberations of the corridor review group on unwilling residents. I have made that quite plain in a vast number of public statements and, indeed, in advertisements which I asked the State Planning Commission to run in local newspapers throughout the Perth metropolitan area. There is no plan to enforce this review on people against their wishes.

Mr Clarko: It says it will do it by statutory powers.

Mr PEARCE: What we asked the review group to do was to produce proposals to cater for the expansion of numbers in the Perth metropolitan area, because everyone knows that more people will be living here next year than live here this year, in 10 years' time there will be more people again, and in 20 years' time there will be even more people. The job of planning is to take account of the needs of those people who will live in Perth in the future and make sure there will be places for them to live when they are ready to build and occupy houses. That is our job.

There are two ways we can approach this. We can look at the way in which the Perth metropolitan area is currently structured and see how growth might be planned for in the future so that we can continue to have the very attractive environment which we currently have in this city. The alternative approach is that adopted by the member for Karrinyup and a lady who wrote me a letter complaining about the corridor review. In that letter the lady said that she did not see the need for the corridor review at all. She asked me whether I had not heard of the term "full up"; that is, Perth is full up and people who want to live in Perth will just have to be told it is full up and they can go and live somewhere else. The member for Karrinyup has taken that little old lady's suggestion on board and found other places for them to live - there is Northam, Yanchep, and south of Mandurah.

The Liberal proposal is quite fascinating. What they are saying to new home buyers - to those people who are saving for a block and a home now - is, "We will provide you with a cheap block in Pinjarra; we will provide you with a cheap house in Northam and you can travel to Perth by train." At the moment, of course, they would have to do it on the *Prospector* and that does not fit in remarkably well with the desires that people have to work the same kinds of hours as everybody else.

The kind of satellite city proposal which is being put forward by the Opposition - not all of them I must say because the member for East Melville -

Mr Lewis: I supported it strongly.

Mr PEARCE: The member for East Melville was careful to distance himself from that when I gave him the opportunity to support it.

Mr Lewis: I did not have the time.

Mr PEARCE: The member has it now. The member had 20 minutes to talk and he said nothing; he could have fitted a fact or two into that time.

If the Liberal Party's alternative to the corridor review plan is just to leave Perth as it is and find new blocks somewhere else, that is a very interesting proposition, because the figures of the member for East Melville bear on that in a way I will demonstrate. Across the Perth metropolitan area we have a vast range of different population densities, going from the highest density unit development, which can be a very high density indeed -

Mr Lewis: Do you know what that is?

Mr PEARCE: Of course I do. It goes down to densities of the kind one finds in special rural or rural areas - an effective density of perhaps one house per five hectares. It is apparently against the Liberal Party's policy to change any of those densities. The Liberal Party wants to defend the densities not only in Dalkeith, Applecross or Mosman but also in special rural areas such as Canning Vale, Forrestfield or Landsdale in Wanneroo. All of these existing densities are to be protected. That means there cannot be any more people living in Perth unless the boundaries are able to be expanded outward -

Mr Clarko: People are buying homes in Leederville every day.

Mr PEARCE: Every time there is a unit development where there was once one or two houses, the density of residential development is intensified. I will draw something to the attention of the Liberal Party members which might be news to them: In a lot of the areas that figured in the speech of the member for Karrinyup, urban densities - and I am not talking about the zoning for land or houses, but about who actually lives there - are declining. That means that even if the number of people in the Perth metropolitan area did not increase at all, with declining densities in some areas, a static policy must be catered for -

Mr Lewis: That is only a short term phenomenon.

Mr PEARCE: No, it is not.

Mr Clarko: Go to Sydney and have a look.

Mr PEARCE: I am glad the member mentioned Sydney because just yesterday I did. I attended a Planning Ministers' conference there and the House was deprived of the benefit of my contribution to the various amendments moved yesterday. I am sure I was missed by many members of the House. One of the items discussed by the Planning Ministers was one I placed on the agenda to do with planning for increases in the major cities. I was interested to discover that the exercise we have done here in Perth has been reflected in the same planning exercise done for Melbourne and Sydney over roughly the same time scale. In each case, they came to the same sort of conclusion, given the different nature of the cities. When I presented the corridor review report to the Planning Ministers and the professionals, they were very impressed by it because they saw that we were seeking to move in advance of many of the problems that have grown up without that kind of review in Melbourne and Sydney.

One of the things I have often said in my public speeches on these matters is that over the next 30, 40 or 50 years, we must avoid Perth becoming a city the size of Sydney, with all the attendant problems and difficulties, while the rest of Western Australia remains under occupied or, indeed, in many places, unoccupied. We must move toward levels of decentralisation, but not the kind of decentralisation members opposite are talking about, where people still have to work in Perth but must live in Northam. We are talking about people living and working in Northam, and people in Bunbury living and working there.

Mr Clarko: How well has decentralisation worked?

Mr PEARCE: Decentralisation can work extremely well. In fact, the efforts of the Whitlam Government, which was the first Government to move towards decentralisation -

Mr Clarko: There was a panic in the bush. Somewhere in the middle of the country, a sign went up saying there was going to be a new town.

Mr PEARCE: It was called Albury-Wodonga. Despite all the Whitlam Government's efforts, it is true that over three years there was not much growth in Albury-Wodonga. After three or four years people were saying, "That is a dud; that shows that decentralisation does not work and cannot work."

Mr Clarko: Don't you think that proves decentralisation was a failure?

Mr PEARCE: No I do not, because people go to Albury-Wodonga now to find a city which has reached a kind of critical mass and is growing at an explosive rate for an Australian city. It has been a real success. Real decentralisation efforts take time to bite and work and long lead times have to be given for it to work. In the case of Albury-Wodonga it turned out to be in the order of 13 to 15 years for that kind of growth to get going. In 10 years' time in Bunbury, because of the efforts of this Government, we will see the same kind of successful

decentralisation which Albury-Wodonga has seen. That will be reflected in the growth in that area. The real decentralisation policies of this Government will bear fruit, but we cannot afford to repeat the planning mistakes which have been made in larger Australian cities. We must have a proper format and scheme for the way in which we work in the future. That will mean changes in some areas. That is unavoidable, given the fact that there will be more people living in the Perth metropolitan area and those people will need to be accommodated.

In making those changes, we must be sensitive to the needs and wishes of existing residents and communities. We need to give a very long lead time for any proposed changes so that people know where they stand and can make their own economic and social decisions in accordance with that. In some areas that will mean densities will increase. At the moment densities are increasing in effect in an unplanned way. They are increasing not through the provision of a far-sighted scheme like the corridor review, but by ad hoc decisions of individual developers and councils, where a small parcel of land will be put together and an application will then be made to a council to rezone it perhaps from two or three blocks of single residential to a greater density in order to allow a unit development. It is that kind of spot by spot rezoning which has so antagonised many people in the corridor.

Mr Clarko: That is it what you advocated.

Mr PEARCE: No, it is not what I advocated at all.

Mr Clarko: Yes it is, when you said that people could choose whether their land was rezoned in the wedges, you said spot by spot development.

Mr PEARCE: That is not what I said to the people in those areas. I said to them, "Your property will not be rezoned by the Government without your approval" because some of the member for Karrinyup's colleagues, including the member for East Melville, were going around telling people that their properties were going to be rezoned - that is not possible under our planning legislation - or resumed.

Mr Clarko: If you change "rural" to "urban", that is compulsory. If you take a piece of land in the wedges and say it is now urban, surely that is compulsory.

Mr PEARCE: We could not rezone an individual person's property without his approval.

Mr Clarko interjected.

Mr PEARCE: The only truth in that is that it would be possible to change the metropolitan region scheme in that way, but not in fact to rezone an individual's property; that must be done through a local council. As members know, councils jealously hold to the right to initiate or reject rezoning applications. I certainly have not given any undertaking that if some individual in the middle of a special rural zone bowls up with a proposal to turn his block into R50 urban, the application would automatically be approved, because obviously it would not be. We are talking not in terms of individual properties, but an area by area basis.

Mr Clarko: The public think differently. The foothills association came to me and said that you had said to them at a meeting, held on 9 May, that if a person did not want his property rezoned, and the wedge was rezoned, it did not have to be. It would mean that those who did, could have it rezoned.

Mr PEARCE: They had better come back and check with me because I certainly gave them no indication that any individual property owner would automatically have a capacity to upgrade or downgrade the rezoning of his property in accordance with the proposals of the scheme. I told them that we would be looking at every individual's submission on the matter and starting to look at areas on an area by area basis. I still gave them the undertaking that no individual's property would be rezoned around them. It is easy to take the kind of position taken by some members opposite, which is the cop out. The member for Karrinyup has said, "If you make changes to the Perth metropolitan area by planning ahead, you will upset people."

Of course, the corridor review amply demonstrates the way people get upset with any application of the planning process. No significant parcel of land proposed to be brought onto the market to provide the cheap housing for which the Opposition clamours but does nothing about - when efforts are made the Opposition opposes them - is not opposed by some group or another. Very often the groups involved - as is the case with the Friends of Bold Park - are made up of people who have lived next to those areas for many years. They

get used to the land being left in an undeveloped state. They do not mind their block being developed, but they get upset when anybody tries to develop the block next to them. That is a characteristic of human nature and I am not criticising it. However, if we accepted that attitude totally, the net result would be that we would not be allowed to do anything in the Perth metropolitan area. The result of that again would be that land would become scarcer because there would be more people than there were houses or blocks. That is what happened in Sydney where land prices have gone through the roof. In six months, blocks in certain middle suburbs within 15 to 18 kilometres of the Sydney central business district have gone from \$35 000 to \$55 000. That resulted from the scarcity of land.

The prescription that the Opposition proposes should be checked out with what has happened in Sydney, because the same plan proposed by the Opposition led to the huge increases in the price of land in Sydney. It is not just a matter of providing land at the lowest price. I could probably provide a block for \$15 000 in Pinjarra, but nobody living in the Perth metropolitan area would live there. I could probably give away the land in Pinjarra and subsidise it totally by the Government. People will rent somewhere in Perth while they save for a block that they can afford. There would be so many people saving for the blocks in the constrained Perth metropolitan area that prices would go through the roof and we would have to hold rent auctions because the scarcity advocated by the Opposition would also drive up rents.

Mr Clarko: People come from Mandurah every day.

Mr PEARCE: Very few. Sydney's experience is that, at the same time that the price of blocks is going through the roof in those areas that I just mentioned, there are blocks in other areas which cannot be sold. Generally those blocks are so far away, and in areas in which people do not want to live, that they will not buy those blocks. The result, as I said, is to drive up prices in other areas.

The answer to this is to provide the land that can be brought onto the market over a long period. That is precisely what the corridor review proposes to do. In saying that, I am not accepting any one of the recommendations of the review at this point because the public submission period does not end until tomorrow and we will be evaluating the submissions of every individual with much care. We will not seek to trample on the wishes of resident action groups. However, we will find ways of bringing on stream land that is needed by the people in order that they can continue to enjoy the lifestyles that have made Perth a very attractive city in which to live, and without compromising the rights of Perth's existing residents. That is probably the most difficult of all the planning processes. However, this Government has been prepared to tackle the hard areas. It has been prepared to tackle the hard areas in education, planning and in almost all of the areas represented by the Ministry.

There are considerable backlogs. The fact that we have to plan against the end of the old corridor review is an indication of the failure of previous conservative Governments to do anything about it. The Opposition should not be surprised that our planning processes run a little close to the time of implementation because a review of the corridor plan should have been done 10 years ago. Any planner in Perth will verify that.

I was sorry to hear that old hypocrisy rolled out again by the Opposition that it purports to stand for the resident groups that do not want development anywhere around Perth, and, at the same time, it keeps clamouring for cheap land. It cannot have it both ways. Either it is in favour of constraints on urban development, which is indicated in the amendment to the Address-in-Reply, or it is in favour of cheap land. The Opposition cannot seek to constrain and create scarcity and then clamour for cheap land unless it is prepared to have the taxpayer subsidise blocks in the Perth metropolitan area. Anybody worth his salt in the planning industry knows that those two things cannot go hand in hand. That is why the corridor review has been received so well by people involved in the planning and development industry. They recognise the need to mark out large tracts of land which, over the next 20 years, can be brought on stream to provide land for average people. The member for Karrinyup has not been talking or listening to the development industry to say the sorts of things he said today.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [3.46 pm]: This amendment is much more important than the present occupancy of the Chamber indicates. The report potentially effects everybody who has a residence and, to some extent, people who are living in rental accommodation. It therefore effects all of our constituents. In most cases, people's homes are their biggest

assets. In all cases their homes are connected with their lifestyles and are therefore tremendously important to them. Some people select their residences for a lifetime and most of them for their productive lifetime; that is, for the time that they work and bring up their families. Whichever way they select their homes, they select them to suit their lifestyles.

As the member for Karrinyup said, very few people in the metropolitan area of Perth choose to live in high density accommodation. Some people choose to live in a residential unit close to the city because that is where they work. Others choose to live away from the city because their work is away from the city. Some people choose to live in rural settings and others want larger blocks to accommodate their lifestyle. However, whatever motives people have for choosing their homes, it is clear that they want somewhere to live that is reasonably permanent.

The amendment warns us that the Government, by adopting the corridor review report, or part of it, will change the permanency of where we live. Mr Acting Speaker (Dr Gallop), you will have noticed in your short period in this Parliament that any threat to alter a domestic situation upsets people to the extent that they form groups and make representations to you to oppose those changes.

They are not opposed to change for the sake of it, but because they are banking on the fact that they can spend their lives under the same conditions that applied when they acquired their residences. There are a number of examples of this. I bring to the attention of the House a fairly well known case in my electorate. Cromarty Road, between Pearson Street and Empire Avenue, was a very quiet street in which people who liked a quiet lifestyle, some of them retired, chose to live. The once principal architect of the Public Works Department - not many members will remember him - chose to have a residence there. There was bushland opposite and he has built his home to suit the environment. When the then Churchlands Teachers College was established, the situation was entirely changed for the residents. It upset them tremendously. Soon after I became the member for Floreat I received constant representations about the increased traffic volume in the area. Whichever Government was in power, that aspect would not have been considered properly. Not enough consideration was given to the fact that the institution would be visited by several thousand people.

Empire Avenue is also in my electorate. There is no doubt that people who acquired residences there should have suspected that the road might be widened because of the unusually wide reserve there. However, when it is proposed that the road be widened, complaints come from all sides. People often quote the estate agent who sold the property to them and indicated that things would remain as they were.

Bagot Road in Subiaco was a comparatively quiet street, although it had a lot of traffic. It was decided to widen the street in the interests of people who lived beyond Subiaco. That necessitated taking out the trees on the street verge. The then Mayor of Subiaco lost the election because of that. Mr Fernihough lost the election because he supported the move. He was advised by experts and, I suppose, by his office staff in the City of Subiaco. The new mayor was elected because he helped people campaign to retain the verges and the trees. Thus it is quite obvious that it is tremendously important for people to keep what they have acquired. The Government does not seem to have learned the lesson and that is why the member for Karrinyup moved the motion. He moved it to remind the House and the Government that the Government should not create anything new or alter existing conditions - no matter how desirable or commendable they might appear - if it is to the detriment of others.

To act against the interests and to the detriment of existing residents is the same as a Government ignoring its promises and turning 180 degrees away from what it promised to do. How often have members heard people say that they bought land with open space opposite and that the agent who sold them the land assured them that the open space land would remain as it was?

I was not in the Ministry for nine years for nothing, so I can almost visualise officers of the Minister's department confronting the Minister and telling him that as a progressive man he cannot let certain things develop, but must take into account the increased population and so forth. That is precisely what the Minister said in his reply. He said that we have to accommodate more people in fewer places. People come to him and tell him that he must

understand that services are becoming more expensive. If electricity needs to be conducted to a greater area, the SEC would tell the Minister that more transformers needed to be installed. The Main Roads Department would talk about the number of people who use the roads on average and the need for an upgrading or extension of the road system, and the Water Authority of Western Australia would talk about having to extend the reticulation systems and sewerage lines, and about having to install pumps. The Water Authority would talk about the extra people watering gardens and the additional water they would use, thus making it necessary for the authority to use more capital and to borrow money. To service the borrowings the tariffs would go up on both electricity and water. They are all arguments of the bureaucrats. They are not false arguments, but they do not take into consideration the wishes of the people. They are simply scientists who make their recommendations on the basis of the huge drawing boards in front of them. Their plans are theoretical. Despite the fact that their arguments may be feasible, even respectable, they are not acceptable.

When the Minister considers the matter, he should consider that the Government represents people, human beings. The bureaucrats, public servants and advisers are not even supposed to represent people. Their job is different. Only elected representatives like the Minister have to take people into consideration. I am not saying that the Government or the Minister should ignore all practicalities, such as the financial aspects and the efficiency of administration. The Minister should combine such considerations with the wishes of the community.

There are certain legal aspects with respect to planning. Zoning and density regulations, for example, have been changed without regard to the wish of the people. In addition to the perceived acquired rights which people think they have with respect to their residences, there are some legally acquired rights.

I point to a part of my electorate which makes up about one-third of it. I refer to the so-called City of Perth Endowment Land Act which the Parliament, in its wisdom, brought in just after the First World War. It wanted to develop an area which was entirely bushland. That was a commendable desire as it did not hurt anyone at the time. Nobody owned the land; nobody even claimed to have big hopes for it or said that they did not want it developed.

People who bought blocks there bought them under those circumstances. Whenever there was an auction as the Perth City Council sold the lots, the special conditions were read out to the potential buyers. These conditions made it a better suburb, deliberately so because the proceeds from the sale of the blocks, according to the Statute, had to be spent within the endowment land area. It enabled underground power to be installed, the construction of better roads, the enforcement of building bylaws that only brick and tile residences could be built, and a lower density. Not one hotel has been built in that suburb and it contains very few shops, and those that have been built are virtually concealed. That was the aim of the development. Those people have legally acquired rights and they should not be disturbed because it would be almost like reneging on a contract.

There is another aspect which the Government uses and which also changes the status quo: It simply uses Homeswest to upset the situation in many places. It would be stupid and impractical to deny there are social differences in various neighbourhoods, differences in earning capacities, and even intellectual differences - a word the Premier has been fond of using in the last few days. Sometimes there are age differences - people want to live in a certain area where their children will have playmates, and not in an area of retired people, and vice versa.

In the case of Homeswest it can do something entirely different and disrupt the whole area. A recent example occurred in Subiaco with a very nice place accommodating elderly people, who had their own living rooms and joint eating and recreation accommodation - although some had also their own houses if they could live independently, but were looked after by the nuns. Those nuns have become too old to continue and have retired, and there are problems with disposing of this complex because of planning difficulties. I understand the Minister for Planning did not concur with the wishes of the City of Subiaco and he wants to put in a Homeswest rooming house. I wonder how the people living in the vicinity of that complex feel? Most of them are middle class, elderly people and they are used to their own environment and surroundings. They do not want neighbours who are drunkards, or who are changing day after day, or any of the other problems associated with such a rooming house.

It is interesting to note that this Government is sometimes described, even by political writers, as not being a socialist Government. Some people maintain that there is not much difference between the two sides of the House. I submit that the Government's endeavour, which this amendment tries to prevent, is an expressed socialism. It is a typical form of socialism, the old fashioned type, even though it is presented in a concealed form. If an individual's right to make decisions about anything connected with his life is taken away, and he is subjected to the Government's decision on the excuse of community interest, that is socialism. It is just the same when people say that this Government has not nationalised anything; apart from the fact that it cannot do so under our Constitution. What is the difference between creating Government business in favourable conditions in competition against private enterprise, such as the creation of the WADC, and nationalising Metro Industries? It amounts to the same thing. It is the good old fashioned socialism which the Government uses and the people do not recognise.

This amendment is simply to prevent the Government doing things which are against the wishes of the people. The question may be asked, and has been asked of other members, as to what the Opposition would do about it - it could be said that the amendment is only a negative response. Well I will try to give a positive solution. I always wonder why it is that in Western Australia, where land is virtually unlimited, we must have this excessive planning. If it is so, the Government could and should plan much further in advance: It could designate areas for various purposes, bearing in mind the wishes of the people. It could say that a certain new area will be zoned high density, another will have individual homes, another will have industry, another will have commercial development. It could be intelligently planned and people could then choose where they want to live on the basis of that plan. Once people have made that choice, the status quo should be maintained for the people who purchase blocks on which to live. That is the secret of good planning. It happened to some extent going back 30 plus years ago when the Stephenson Plan was accepted. It mainly dealt with transport but it resulted in a situation where people from other capital cities in Australia, and from overseas, agreed that the traffic flow from remoter suburbs to the central business district of Perth was far better in Perth than in Sydney and other places, particularly individual vehicle traffic.

That forward planning has catered for this situation so I cannot see why the problem would not be solved by decentralisation, or allowing the metropolitan area to develop in a way that suits the wishes of the people. I support the amendment.

DR ALEXANDER (Perth) [4.07 pm]: I want to address my remarks against the amendment moved by the member for Karrinyup. We have heard from the Opposition this evening a tirade of abuse against the Minister for Planning, on the one hand, and an attempt to demolish the recent report "Planning for the Future of the Perth Metropolitan Region", on the other hand. Neither of those attacks is justified and the amendment is totally misconceived.

The member for Floreat has just accused the Government of old fashioned socialism - socialism in a concealed form. His interpretation is that somehow socialism means moving people to areas to which they do not want to go, and making decisions without taking into account the wishes of the people. This exercise in planning is neither of those things. It is precisely an attempt to listen to the people. The exercise has been opened up since last October when the report was released for public participation, and I would have expected the Opposition to welcome that, instead of condemning the Government for commissioning a report which was long overdue and giving the people an opportunity to comment on that report. Instead, the Opposition is saying that the Government will press ahead willy-nilly with the recommendations of this report whether or not the people want it.

In fact, the Minister for Planning has made it clear since the release of the report that, through the process of public participation and the meetings to which the Opposition has referred, the Government is listening to the people, and the proposals to which the people are adamantly opposed will be changed or not proceeded with. This is in marked contrast to the approach of the conservative Government of the day when the corridor plan, which this seeks to modify, was first released in the late 1960s. One of the major criticisms at that time from the planning profession and the public was that no account had been taken of public opinion, and that the plan had been devised and an attempt made to implement it without consulting the people. When the Tonkin Government was elected in 1971, that situation was reviewed and a special commission appointed to investigate the plan. Also public objections were

taken account of. In this case the Government has gone through a process of listening to the public and clearly will take those opinions into account in deciding whether or not to adopt the recommendations of this report. It is a fundamental tenet of planning that review should occur periodically. The corridor plan was finally adopted in 1974. Some years later, in 1985, it was decided that a review should be undertaken and, after all, a decade is a suitable length of time to pass before the review of a major planning document that one way or another affects the lives of everybody in the metropolitan region.

Therefore, it was more than reasonable that a review should be commissioned in 1985, yet this amendment implies that any alteration to the corridor plan concept is undesirable. That totally ignores the fact that experience has shown in the implementation of the corridor plan that it has some disadvantages. One of the disadvantages of the plan as it was adopted and is being implemented is that it encourages urban sprawl. Under the Clarko plan, the satellite plan, people would be sent further afield to Mandurah, Pinjarra and perhaps north of Yanchep.

Satellite planning has, in fact, been around for a long time, at least as long as planning, and was popular in the 1940s and 1950s. However, it was shown conclusively elsewhere that it was difficult to implement because the concept of a satellite is that one should somehow have a self-contained part of the city on the edge of that city so that people will not have to commute back and forth from distant residences to the city. Practice shows that the market works this way; that it is quite happy to develop residential lots at a distance from the city, but industry, business and commerce are not nearly as prepared to follow. In other words, people are being put increasingly further from the city and are being forced to commute.

Satellites created around London during the 1950s and 1960s - "new towns" as they were called - were examples of this type of planning. One of the big problems with those new towns was that although they provided people with places to live, little in the way of local amenities and jobs was provided because the land market, in terms of the private sector providing those sorts of services and jobs, was not prepared to follow the Government initiated satellite new town developments. What happened was that the metropolitan area exploded in a way quite unanticipated and people were forced to commute over longer and longer distances.

The Clarko plan totally ignores that concept. In fact, it is rumoured that the corridor plan was originally devised by half a dozen planners sitting around a table scribbling on the back of envelopes. It seems that the Clarko plan was devised in a rougher way by the member for Karrinyup sitting with a few bottles of his favourite red wine and a few colleagues. The result was what we have heard this afternoon, the Clarko satellite plan which shows to me the effect of red wine more than the effect of any rational thinking.

Mr Clarko: Don't talk rubbish.

Dr ALEXANDER: I think we have been hearing rubbish from the member for Karrinyup.

Mr Clarko: The member only chose red because it is his Communist colour.

Dr ALEXANDER: I have never been a Communist. The fact is that my father was a Communist in the 1930s, but by the time I was brought up he was very conservative, a fact totally overlooked by the member for Karrinyup.

Mr Lewis: Does the member for Perth believe that the corridor plan was good or bad?

Dr ALEXANDER: It had advantages and disadvantages. One big disadvantage of the corridor plan was that it forced people to live at increasing distances from the city whereas the concept was, as in the case of satellites, to put jobs and services close to where people were. However, the practice was not the same.

Mr Lewis: Was it a good plan?

Dr ALEXANDER: As it turned out, it was largely a failure.

Mr Lewis: Was it a good plan?

Dr ALEXANDER: I do not think that it was in its implementation. It was a failure, although it may have been a reasonable plan to start with.

Mr Clarko: You wear sandals and socks, don't you?

Dr ALEXANDER: Certainly not. I wear thongs at the weekend, probably just like the member for Karrinyup, but he is part of the barefoot, red wine brigade, so he would not understand that.

This is clearly a plan for public participation and contrary to the wording of the amendment it will take the wishes of the public into account. The member for Karrinyup insists that the plan will seek to force people to live at higher densities. As he has said that, I do not think that he has read the report.

Mr Clarko: The report says that there will be statutory controls and education.

Dr ALEXANDER: There are already statutory controls. I will come to that in a moment. The report suggests several ways of implementation.

Mr Clarko: Has the member not read the report?

Dr ALEXANDER: Unlike the member for Karrinyup, I have read it in great detail, and it suggests several ways to do things. The Opposition has some paranoid dislike of it. One of the ways of implementing containment is to develop areas at low density; that is, R20 and R40 on the fringe of the existing metropolitan area. That is comparable to the low to medium density in most of the existing areas.

Mr Clarko: It proposes to change R20 to R20-R60. It says that clearly.

Dr ALEXANDER: No, it does not. It says that the Planning Commission should come up with a rational plan for rezoning selected areas to medium or high density. At the moment there are large areas in the City of Perth, the City of Stirling and the City of South Perth that are zoned R40-R60 and even R80. They have been developed on a totally random basis with no thought to the regional consequences of that zoning.

All the report is saying is that the Planning Commission will work in conjunction with local authorities to rationalise those areas so that they are in a more concerted pattern as far as the transport and land use patterns of the metropolitan area are concerned.

The member for Karrinyup also implied that people in inner suburbs live on larger lots. What he fails to recognise is that most of the building lots in the City of Perth and in Subiaco are 300 to 400 square metres in size, much smaller than what is proposed under this plan.

Mr Clarko: Under the earlier ones.

Dr ALEXANDER: If the member looks at the pattern of subdivision, he will find that that is the case. Over the years the size of lots has grown larger gradually and in some cases is up to 700 or 800 square metres.

Mr Clarko: They are going backwards.

Dr ALEXANDER: The member for Karrinyup calls it going backwards but experience shows that lot sizes of 550 to 700 square metres, which after all is only 10 per cent higher than the dominant size at the moment, are much more satisfactory from the point of view of the resident and from the point of view of providing services to those lots.

Around the world it is recognised that continuing to develop all of our lots at a very large size, as Perth has tended to do, is uneconomic and unsatisfactory from the point of view of the people living on them.

Mr Lewis: Can I ask the member why developers are developing lots of that size? Is it because the public do not want them?

Dr ALEXANDER: If one looks at the average size of lots developed over the past 20 years, the average size has come down.

Mr Lewis: Do the public want larger lots?

Dr ALEXANDER: Yes, they do, but they respond well to a smaller lot size.

Mr Lewis: Does the member want to enforce this?

Dr ALEXANDER: Far from the Government wanting to enforce this, it says that in certain areas lots should be allowed to be smaller.

Mr Clarko: Will the member name those areas and put it in a pamphlet to be issued before the February election?

Dr ALEXANDER: We are talking about proposals to change the corridor plan, which has no official status at the moment. What Opposition members fail to recognise is two fundamental facts; first, that the journey to work for people in the metropolitan area has increased from 11 kilometres to 14 kilometres in the decade 1976 to 1987.

Mr Clarko: Sometimes it is quicker.

Dr ALEXANDER: That is doubtful. If people were put at Pinjarra or Mandurah, as the member for Karrinyup proposes, the distance that they have to travel to work would increase even further. What the Opposition ignores is that this review document proposes to extend the northern corridor as far as Quinns Rock and provide thousands upon thousands of building lots in that area, as it has already done. To suggest somehow that the development will be switched out of the northern corridor to these other areas is false. Maps in the document show that. They show one of the major proposals is to continue the extension of the northern corridor as far as Quinns Rock, and that would be one of the major areas which would be developed in the future. At the same time proposals have been made which have proved unpopular in certain areas, such as the foothills and other areas adjacent to the city. For precisely that reason the Minister for Planning has said that if people in those areas are opposed to those proposals they will not go ahead.

Mr Clarko: Where do you get the blocks if these people say "No"?

Dr ALEXANDER: There are still large areas of land in the northern corridor and other areas available for development under these proposals.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Gallop): Order! There are many cross conversations going on. I want to hear the member for Perth.

Dr ALEXANDER: The only alternative which the Opposition can propose is this hastily thought up satellite plan which, as I have said, will compound the problems. The member for East Melville suggested that over the last three or four years planning authorities in the water board and other statutory departments had not done any forward planning. Nothing could be further from the truth. While the plan has been under review, the authorities have, as they always have, released lots. Despite the attempt by the Opposition to show that there is a shortage of building lots in the region, the statistics clearly show otherwise. The Government has recently taken action to correct that situation.

Mr Lewis: Will you repeat that? There is no shortage of land?

Dr ALEXANDER: I have said that the Opposition argument about land shortage has clearly been shown to be specious, and that the Government has taken steps to prevent any land shortage from occurring.

Mr Lewis: There is a land shortage?

Dr ALEXANDER: There is no land shortage at the moment. The member for East Melville included in his calculations 5 000 blocks for speculative purposes. If he wants to allow speculative processes to occur, that is up to him. It shows what the Opposition stands for. On this side of the House we stand for rational planning which attempts to minimise speculation rather than encourage it. We do things on a rational basis rather than on a speculative one, whereas the Opposition panders to the needs of the speculators. If that is what the Opposition's calculations are based on it is specious.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker has only four minutes remaining. I ask members to let him develop his argument.

Dr ALEXANDER: The member for Floreat said that people do not like change, and he developed an argument for no change in the existing corridor plan, as I interpreted it.

Mr Clarko: You are wrong again.

Dr ALEXANDER: He is correct when he says that when a proposal comes to alter anybody's residential environment they naturally get upset, and that is precisely what has happened in certain areas of the metropolitan region.

Mr Clarko: That is what this report says.

Dr ALEXANDER: It does not. This report says, "Let us get some public discussion about

these proposals. Let us see what the public thinks and then make up our minds on the basis of public reaction."

Mr Clarko: It does not. I will give you the exact words.

Dr ALEXANDER: I do not want to hear the words. I have read the report. It is quite clear that the Government's intention is to listen to the public and its reaction to this plan. The report provides some sensible ideas for the future planning of the metropolitan region. There are some legitimate objections to specific proposals. Where they are raised they are being listened to. The member for Karrinyup advocated a further review. He said that when the Opposition got into Government - an unlikely event - it would commission another study. If he is criticising the fact that this study took two years -

Mr Clarko: Three years.

Dr ALEXANDER: It took actually two years to complete the report, but allowing for public participation it was nearly three years. The member is criticising the length of time, and then he says, "When we are returned to Government we will do another study." That will lengthen the process which he is now criticising instead of listening to objections to the proposals and going ahead with parts of the plan which meet favourable comment.

The Opposition has no philosophy on this planning question at all, except a blind adherence to the past. It is not prepared to look at any rational arguments on change. It is simply jumping on the bandwagon of legitimate public opposition to some of the proposals in this report. The wording of the amendment belies the efforts of the Government in this direction and therefore it should be opposed.

MR GREIG (Darling Range) [4.26 pm]: I support the amendment moved by the member for Karrinyup and wish to address my remarks to the plan dealing with the Perth metropolitan region. That report purports to alter significantly the corridor plan as we currently know it and the amenity of the citizens of Perth to enjoy their current lifestyle.

On Wednesday, 25 May, in this Chamber, I alluded to difficulties which the State Planning Commission proposals had caused, and in that regard a speech by the member for Perth has some relevance in view of the fact that the process has taken two and a half years. This has caused a planning paralysis. I do not wish to go back over the example I gave on 25 May other than to say that it has contributed to the shortage of urban land, which has been a matter of some debate in this Chamber.

What has happened in the eastern metropolitan region of Perth has been of some significance, and I believe it will cost this Government dearly. In essence the proposal seeks broadly a significant change in the urban profile of the eastern metropolitan region of Perth; in other words the foothills are under threat of creeping urbanisation.

Mr Gordon Hill: That is not true and you know it.

Mr GREIG: I will refer to the sort of things which have been occurring. The discussion document itself, in its broadest sense, has continued in a myopic fashion to pursue one principle, and that is the economic principle associated with the provision of urban land and housing blocks. The report says that it is proposed to take the Perth metropolitan area into the 21st century. As a consequence it suggests the abandonment of the corridor plan by filling in the empty spaces, the wedges as they are called, between the corridors.

If we take that simple proposition to its extreme, we will find Kings Park being subjected to urban development. It is disappointing that the review group missed the opportunity to show the imagination and vision which was available to them and which characterised planning in Perth in recent years, in fact virtually for the life of Perth. There appears to have been little consideration of the sort of technological developments which will occur in transport and communication, physically and electronically, in the next 25 years and beyond.

Mr Troy: What transport study is that?

Mr GREIG: I will come to that. What the member for Perth has just said in dismissing concepts of satellite development was on the basis of the history of satellite development. I do not disagree with his recitation of the history of satellite development. The planning review group failed to come to grips with the fact that here is a moment in time when Perth could have prevented that spreading urbanisation - the infill, the consolidation which has

beset cities like Melbourne, Sydney and London, the last of which was his example. We have an opportunity to take a more imaginative approach towards the structure of our city because it is a moment in time that those other cities did not have. They were constrained by physical and technological factors which occurred in communication, both in the physical form of bodies and in the form of communication between offices.

In essence the proposal relates specifically to the foothills of Perth. I do not think the current member for Mundaring needs to worry about that, because after the next election I will be pleased to represent a large portion of that area. Clearly what has occurred is the essence of what Government and planning should not be about. We have known for two and a half years that this planning process was going on, and that that process has paralysed planning. Added to that, when the report hit the deck - and we have just heard the member for Perth suggest that there was nothing hard and fast in the document, and that the Government was not committed to it in any way; likewise we heard the Minister for Planning distance himself from it - and people became aware of what was in the report, the community became concerned. There were community meetings and the Minister clearly aligned himself with the recommendations for infill. He said that people in special rural and rural lots close to the city would just have to move further out. That was his view. He came back later to say that nobody could be forced into a subdivision or urbanisation against his will, and that we all know the facts.

When it comes to the issue of subdivisions in rural and special rural land, two things occur: First, it is majority rule - which is fair enough - and secondly commercial pressures are brought to bear. Quite simply people who have gone into rural and special rural developments in close proximity to the city may well wish to remain there, but they will be forced out. They will be rated out and voted out by the majority rule because newcomers will have changed the makeup of the community. In those circumstances, it is not good enough to say that no individual will have his property rezoned against his will. It will not happen like that, and this report does not recognise that fact.

This issue is clearly concerning people in Wattle Grove, Forrestfield, High Wycombe and Maida Vale, and that is chronicled in the suburban newspapers of the area. Concern is growing and local people have formed a major action group called the Foothills' Protection Group. They are concerned that their lifestyle is clearly under threat. The worst part about it is that those people were led into that sort of development and they have enjoyed living there. Now they are so concerned about the situation that they completely lack trust in what the Government is intending to do, particularly in respect of the way this report was handled and presented to the electorate at large. The people clearly believe that unless they throw down a blanket objection to everything in this review, there will be urbanisation by stealth. That is their concern. Members of the Government can say that that is unrealistic and these people are in some way being alarmist, but the simple fact is that these people believed the things the Minister for Planning said - that is, that they will inevitably be forced out. This is a running issue throughout the foothills, and it has been for some months now.

In seeking to deal with the flood of inquiries that have come to my office in respect of this issue, I sought to draw some lessons from other Australian cities. In particular there has been a significant number of inquiries about urban developments associated with the City of Melbourne. In that regard authorities such as the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works, the Town and Country Planning Board of Victoria and the Upper Yarra Valley and Dandenong Valley Authority have engaged in quite extensive studies since the 1960s. The earliest report I have come out in 1967, and the most recent came out in 1980. In addition there is a report from Adelaide by the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs relating to the issue of non-urban land. I sought the advice of a senior officer in that planning process. He is the director of the Upper Yarra Valley and Dandenong Valley Authority, Mr George Wright. In my consultations with him, a number of factors became clear. In the late 1960s and 1970s, Melbourne pursued, in every one of its reports, the continuation of corridor development. An essential component of the development of Melbourne has been the policy statements of Government from time to time. That is something this Government should have drawn to its attention. These statements - and they have been reaffirmed from time to time - have been critical to the long term maintenance of open areas in Victoria, such as the Dandenong and Yarra valleys. Those statements by politicians have set expectations in the minds of the public without which the planning process could not achieve its stated objectives.

When there has been vacillation on the part of the political leaders of the day and uncertainty about what was to happen in the developmental process, the sharks in the developmental field have tended to move in and unsatisfactory developments have resulted. Genuine developers who have long term developmental objectives tend to stand back when there is uncertainty. We have witnessed this in Perth over the last couple of years. Such developers wait until there is a clear direction from Government. It has taken this Government two and a half years to go down that track and when this report was released, the Government did not commit itself to it. I heard the member for Welshpool interject a short while ago to say that this is planning by opinion poll. If this is not an example of that, I do not know what is. The Government does not have the guts to stand up and say where it stands on this issue. It has sat on this report and it does not know where to go from here. The Government stuck its toe in the water and was scalded. After the next election it will be shown just how badly scalded this Government was, particularly in respect of the actions of its failed Minister for Planning.

If there are to be changes to urban development and planning, the process by which that planning is achieved is as important as the plans themselves. In that regard this Government has failed. The most critical thing in planning metropolitan Melbourne has been the process whereby politicians proceeded with planning changes. That has been as critical as the quality of the policies.

The wedges of left over land from the corridors also need to be considered. There must be a sensitive and positive process of planning for the development of that land. In fact, that land is never left over. The treatment that it requires in terms of what is desirable for the environment for the people as well as the land is extremely critical and vital to any plan.

Something that has not been adequately addressed when we consider what is before the metropolitan residents of Perth is the climatology - that is, the climate, history and geography of the area. We have a unique physical structure and climate. That applies particularly to the area to which I have been addressing my remarks, the Perth foothills, an area that gets extremely hot in summer. The people living in that area do not get the sea breezes. In fact, they seem to live in a vacuum because all the breezes go over the top of the hill. That situation has led to a commonsense approach to the sort of development that has occurred. There are still plenty of areas available for small cluster development. It should not be precluded, as I said the other day, from the review but should be interspersed with rural and special rural allotments to provide the city with lungs, as it were, and to provide the people living in that small cluster development with a rural environment.

I said I would return to the transport issue. The major roads study on the eastern corridor has provided a number of alternatives in a constrained way. That proposal does not appear to have the vision that I have sought and pleaded for in the urban planning review that is now under way. The area available for study was a narrow area -

Mr Troy: What were the perimeters of the study?

Mr GREIG: It was the area between the Toodyay River south to the Great Eastern Highway.

Mr Troy: It originally ranged from the Avon River to the Helena River. Check your facts.

Mr GREIG: The Minister has not come far enough south. I suggest that that does not have enough vision either. We are seeking from the Government courage and vision in directing the planners. It should not be constrained in its proposals for urban development. It should have enough courage to consider the enormous advances that will occur in communications which will provide real opportunities as we move into the 21st century. It should provide economic incentives and significant satellite developments to attract industry, business and commerce.

[The member's time expired.]

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [4.46 pm]: I support the amendment moved by the shadow Minister for Planning.

Dr Watson: Why would the member for Cottesloe speak in this debate?

Mr HASSELL: I have no worries about special rural purposes. I will talk about urban containment and that other lovely expression, "A new system of urban management." I will explain to the member that they are real concerns in my electorate and they go right to the heart of the review.

Mr Parker: Of course you are not speaking on that basis; you are speaking as the shadow Leader of the Opposition.

Mr HASSELL: The Minister can do better than that and he should try.

The planning situation in Western Australia has changed very dramatically since this Government came to power in 1983. We have seen a process which has had twin results and, I suspect, in parallel with those results, objectives to achieve those results which are now sought to be furthered through the recommendations of the corridor review. The results have been to centralise the planning power in St George's Terrace and to increase the power of the Minister over planning. Those are the two results of the policies pursued by this Government. Of course, the concern that I and people in my area have is that the pursuit of those objectives will impact adversely on suburbs such as those I represent.

Dr Watson: Homeswest developments?

Mr HASSELL: Cottesloe, Claremont, Peppermint Grove, North Fremantle, Swanbourne and Mosman Park are my particular concerns, but I have broader concerns. I remind the House of the situation that pertained at the end of 1982 when we were still in Government. The former Minister for Planning presided over a town planning board which in turn dealt with local authorities. The local authorities had direct access to the Minister. However, very importantly, another body was involved in the broad brush planning of the metropolitan region - the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. I have had my differences with the MRPA over its handling of the Servetus Street issue. I could hardly forget Servetus Street and everything associated with it.

Mr Clarko: You played a brave and bold role in that matter.

Mr HASSELL: We sorted it out eventually, but the MRPA was an independent statutory body. The independent MRPA was not subject to ministerial direction.

Mr Lewis: It was independent in those days.

Mr HASSELL: It was indeed independent.

Under the legislation introduced by the Government and pursuant to its policies, it introduced a planning system which says there shall be a Minister at the top; underneath the Minister there shall be a State Planning Commission; underneath the State Planning Commission there shall be subgroups or committees of the commission; and underneath that there shall be local government authorities. There were two consequences of that structure. First, there was no longer any independent planning body; the MRPA disappeared. Secondly, the Minister gained power of direction, not only in general terms, but also in specific terms, because under the legislation the Minister for Planning can now direct the Planning Commission in detail and specifically as well as generally in relation to any decision.

At the time it was not realised that with the departure of the MRPA the new legislation also effectively introduced a greater measure of centralised planning and Government control over country planning because the functions which had independently been carried out by the MRPA in Perth in relation to the metropolitan region had, while the MRPA existed, been carried out in the country by the local authorities. But the impact of the new system was to bring the control of all that planning - in other words, both regional and local planning - under the Planning Commission and, in turn, under the direction of the Minister.

The Minister now has the power of direction over all planning decisions. Substantially, the planning process has been centralised to the detriment of local authorities. Local authorities still have control in a couple of areas. First, they are the only people who can initiate zoning changes. Secondly, in relation to a town planning scheme, the local authorities have general control, but every town planning scheme has to be approved by the Minister and the Minister can and does impose conditions on that approval. Thus those areas remain under the control of the local authority, subject to conditions imposed by the Minister for Planning.

However, we see increasing attempts by the Minister to influence general policy directions in relation to those matters. The Minister has tried to get the City of Melville to adopt specific zoning conditions in its town planning scheme. It has tried to take over there to increase the densities. The Minister has been more subtle in holding out a carrot to the local authority in Cottesloe, saying to it: "We will protect you from high-rise along the beach front on condition that you give us power and control".

Within the context of that history under this Government, we have now been presented with a review of the corridor plan. When I looked at the review, I found a couple of those lovely Public Service words which the shadow Minister has already used and referred to. On page 2 of the summary document, I found the lovely expression "urban containment". Anyone who did not know what these people were really up to would think that that was some new idea. However, when we study the fine print we soon discover that urban containment means greater density. It has been a long term objective of the Labor Party to get rid of the small local authorities that I represent, to consolidate the Town of Cottesloe, the City of Claremont, the Town of Mosman Park and the Shire of Peppermint Grove and put them under one big local government authority, probably with Nedlands and Subiaco. That is acknowledged Labor Party policy. It is also a long term objective of the professional planners, most of whom have a European background or had European teachers.

Dr Alexander: That's nonsense. Most of the teachers are locally trained.

Mr HASSELL: I hope the member can explain to me why the planners continue to apply to Western Australia solutions that are appropriate for cities like London or other European cities. That is the issue.

In relation to my electorate there is a twin objective: First, to impose greater density; and secondly to get rid of the individual local authorities and to make those local authorities one large local authority. That is the combined policy of the Government and the planners. The fact that that is the policy has never been seriously disputed.

Planners in St Georges Terrace want to get more power and more control over planning so that, contrary to the will of the people who live in the sorts of areas I represent, they can impose greater density on those people. The City of Nedlands, the Town of Cottesloe, the Town of Mosman Park and the Shire of Peppermint Grove are not totally averse to the evolutionary development of a different lifestyle in certain areas of their responsibility. They are opposed to what the planners want to do. This goes back beyond the time of the present Government, because the planners have been pushing away at this for years. On one occasion I even heard an argument that we should have greater density in the western suburbs because we would then be able to justify having an urban rail system. In other words, we were going to organise the people to live in dogboxes piled high on high to suit the transport. Instead of providing transport for people, the planners wanted to impose people for transport, which is an extraordinarily back to front way of looking at the matter. Without wishing to be unkind to planners, many of them seem to approach things on the basis of pushing people around like pawns on a chess board. They might suggest more people for a certain area because they think it is a good idea.

This document, entitled "Planning for the Future of the Perth Metropolitan Region", and its main volume are about power over planning. It is about centralisation of power. I invite the Minister or any of his colleagues to assure the House absolutely and to prove beyond doubt that the document does not involve in its propositions a further increase in the power of the central planners - that is, the State Planning Commission and the Minister - at the expense of local government planning.

There is a dead silence! The point is made! This document is about power, about increasing the power of the central planners at the expense of local government, because that power is needed by central planning authorities as without it they cannot impose their schemes for urban containment and consolidation on unwilling and resisting local authorities.

We find in this document a policy for urban containment coupled with - and I am referring to the summary again on page six - the nice gentle sounding word "coordination". Whenever a Government authority tells one it wants to coordinate something it means that it wants to run it. That is exactly what the State Planning Commission wants to do with metropolitan planning - it wants to run it and to take the power to do so away from local government, especially in the sorts of areas that I represent. The commission has the strange and twisted view that people who live in the western suburbs are privileged and that their privileges should be taken away. Let me tell members opposite that these people are not privileged and their rights should not be taken away. I stand here to defend their right to have local planning.

I think that members opposite are enjoying what I am saying because they are all getting

excited; obviously I am getting through to them. I will conclude by putting on the record the fact that I, like the local authorities and the local people I represent, recognise that a balance needs to be established between local planning, regional planning and State planning.

Dr Alexander: The document is about that balance.

Mr HASSELL: I say to the member for Perth that if he thinks that this document is about balance -

Several members interjected.

Mr HASSELL: The member for Perth knows what he is talking about but the member who just interjected does not, so why does he not dry up? Members opposite are all obviously enjoying my speech, so at least I have got my point through very clearly: This document is about power and centralisation, and about taking away the rights of local people, whether in Esperance, Kununurra, Cottesloe or Claremont, and transferring those rights into ministerial control and discretion. That is why this matter is causing such reaction and excitement among Labor people, because their little scheme to get more power over people's lives is being exposed.

I can tell members opposite that local authorities know full well what members opposite are doing and know what this document is all about. Unless the Government comes out soon and says very clearly that none of the recommendations that go to the central issues will be implemented, it will cop the flak and it will cost this Government politically because the people I represent, and many other people in this State, do not want their planning rights taken away from local authorities and, in particular, do not want those rights taken away because they want to retain the lifestyle that they have paid for or are working to pay off through their mortgages. They are entitled to that lifestyle and should not be forcibly subjected to high rise and high density building to suit planners, the Minister, the Government or the needs of the railways.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (23)

Mr Blaikie	Mr Crane	Mr Lightfoot	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Grayden	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Reg Tubby
Mr Cash	Mr Greig	Mr Mensaros	Mr Watt
Mr Clarko	Mr Hassell	Mr Schell	Mr Wiese
Mr Court	Mr House	Mr Stephens	Mr Maslen (Teller)
Mr Cowan	Mr Lewis	Mr Trenorden	

Noes (29)

Dr Alexander	Mr Evans	Mr Marlborough	Mr Troy
Mrs Beggs	Dr Gallop	Mr Parker	Mrs Watkins
Mr Bertram	Mr Grill	Mr Pearce	Dr Watson
Mr Bridge	Mrs Henderson	Mr Ripper	Mr Wilson
Mr Carr	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr D.L. Smith	Mrs Buchanan (Teller)
Mr Cunningham	Mr Hodge	Mr P.J. Smith	
Mr Donovan	Mr Tom Jones	Mr Taylor	
Mr Peter Dowding	Dr Lawrence	Mr Thomas	

Pair

Aye	No
Mr Thompson	Mr Read

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR WIESE (Narrogin) [5.10 pm]: I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the three new members, the members for Balga, Ascot and Dale. I wish them a happy and satisfying time in their careers in this House. I also extend my congratulations to the Premier

and the Deputy Premier in attaining their respective positions. To be promoted to the position of Premier is an achievement in one's career. I wish them both well at the helm of this great State of Western Australia. I am quite sure they will not hold those positions for long, but they will make the best of them while they have them.

Tonight I wish to address my remarks particularly to the question of transport in Western Australia. Transport in Western Australia is a major service industry which serves and impacts upon every facet of life in Western Australia. The cost of transport affects the price of everything with which we have anything to do. It affects the suburban housewife and what it costs her to purchase goods. It affects the cost of every worker going to his place of work in the city or in the country. But most of all, transport costs affect primary producers, whether in the mining or the farming industry, because these industries sell on an export market all over the world, and they are unable to pass on their costs.

Transport should be a very important portfolio in this Government, because decisions made by Government on transport have a big effect on those primary producing industries. Over the years in Western Australia we have developed a maze of controls and regulations governing almost every aspect of transportation and covering a wide variety of goods. People throughout Western Australia are now questioning the effectiveness of these regulations and whether there is a need for them. The role of the Transport Board is also being questioned by many people in the transport industry. Do we really need this bureaucracy with all its petty rules, regulations, licences and inspectors? How much do the board and its regulations add to our enormous transport bill?

In recent years we have seen some minor deregulation in some areas of transport. First we have seen it in the transport of stock, and now it is beginning to some degree in the transport of wool. We have many promises of more to come some time down the line. Each time we see a decreased cost, we see an improved service and a greater meeting of the user's needs.

Mr Troy: This Government has done that, not the one before.

Mr WIESE: In all cases that I am aware of the end result has been a cost saving to the transport user, either through decreased costs of rail transport or the ability to use road transport as a cheaper alternative to rail. In almost all cases considerable opposition and trauma has been involved in the change, both from the board and from Westrail. In the last six months we have gone through the procedure all over again. This time we are moving slowly towards the deregulation of bulk fuel transport. It is generally agreed that this is long overdue. Everybody knows that the existing situation is full of anomalies and contradictions, but it is a very slow process to move the vested interests involved.

We now have a new report on the bulk fuel transport policy which will probably set the scene for the next few years. The Government is already moving to implement parts of the policy which it finds acceptable. The key element of the report is the so called under recovery of costs which it is alleged road transport should be meeting and is not. On the basis of the report, the first move to deregulate fuel transport in some areas is being made. In some cases Westrail has dropped its charge to a level just sufficient to make road transport uneconomic, where previously it was competing very strongly. In other areas where road transport is being allowed, the operator is still forced to obtain a licence from the board, and he has been charged a licence fee designed to recover part of the so-called under recovery of costs.

It is a de facto road maintenance tax which was thrown out years ago as being unacceptable. The Transport Board and the Government are bringing it back in the guise of a licence fee. It was unacceptable then and it is still unacceptable. The transport industry and all sections of industry which will be affected should resist the imposition as vigorously as they can. The whole basis on which the so called under recovery of costs is founded is very shaky at best and shonky at worst.

Mr Troy: Absolute rubbish!

Mr WIESE: It is not absolute rubbish, and I will explain why. It is almost impossible to believe that anyone in Western Australia could consider that the road user and the transport operator do not meet their share of taxes. Look at what the road user pays in taxes associated directly with transport! He pays to the Commonwealth Government the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Fund tax. He pays into the Australian land transport fund.

He pays Commonwealth fuel excise. He pays sales tax on motor vehicles and parts. He pays customs duty on motor vehicles and parts. To the State Government transport operators pay a fuel franchise fee; they pay motor vehicle registration fees and taxes; they pay drivers' licence fees; they pay road transport taxes and permits, and stamp duty on registration. In addition the same operators pay all the normal taxes and charges and income taxes and company taxes that every person in the country pays. How on earth can anybody say that there is under recovery of costs from any road user or transport operator? The very concept is utterly unsustainable, and for that reason alone the current attempt to rip even more fees from the road transport operator is an absolute disgrace.

Before moving away from the general policy area of road transport, I would like to read to the House a couple of quotes from the review of bulk fuel policy document. These quotes will draw attention to the difficulty of the present policy and the problems which the proposed changes will pose. The first quotation reads -

The fact that existing recovery mechanisms applying to existing road transport are inadequate does not provide any substantive grounds for not ensuring adequate recovery from incremental road transport of fuel.

In other words, after a long debate, there is no agreement on what taxes go back to the roads but rather a great deal of disagreement.

My second quote, which unfortunately I have misplaced, related to the imposition of a road tax on fuel transport operations while not taxing the present road operations. It does not take much imagination to see what problems could be raised by a result of this.

Up to now my comments related basically to the general operations of the transport industry and the Board of Transport's current policy. I will deal now with two specific aspects of transport policy. Firstly, I refer to the transportation of fuel to the Hyden area. The report recognises that Hyden, because of its location - roughly equidistant from the bulk fuel outports of Perth, Albany and Esperance, and equidistant from fuel consolidation points at Narrogin, Merredin and Katanning, to which fuel is transported by rail and then sent on to the users by road - needs to be treated as a special case. The report put Hyden into a section called "regulatory exceptions", and in the conclusion it recommended that the cartage of fuel into the Hyden area should be deregulated. However, it went on to say that road transport from either Albany or Esperance is the only type of deregulation that should be allowed into this area. Why the report says fuel should only be carted in by road from Albany or Esperance is very hard - almost impossible - to find within the report. The statement does not seem to be argued, justified or quantified; it just appears in the recommendations out of the blue.

That particular section from the report reads as follows -

Hyden also presents a particular case in view of its location relative to Perth, Albany and Esperance and its distance from a regularly served fuel consolidation centre. There appears no doubt that Hyden can be more efficiently served by road than by rail and that the adoption of "competitive rates" by rail to consolidation centres, plus the on-delivery costs by road, would leave Hyden consumers at a considerable disadvantage.

That is what the report says about the delivery of fuel into Hyden. Let us look at the reality of the situation that actually applies in the Hyden area. Following the announcement of deregulation, the Hyden branch of the Western Australian Farmers Federation called tenders on behalf of its members for the supply of one million litres of fuel into the Hyden area for the farmers there. When the tenders were received, the cheapest quote for the supply of fuel was from a Narrogin distributor. I cannot reveal what the savings to the farmer would have been because of the Standing Orders we hear so much in this House - that it is for reasons of commercial confidentiality - but that quote was considerably lower than the other tenders offered.

Bearing that in mind, and remembering that the recommendations of the report are that Hyden should be deregulated, the department said, "No, you cannot get your fuel from Narrogin, even though it will be considerably cheaper and even though there will be a major Westrail leg in the transporting of fuel into the Hyden area." I will quote now from a letter written to the secretary of the Australian Farmers Federation committee in Hyden, which did

the negotiations. It was sent by a Mr Kemp, the licensing manager of the Department of Transport, and read as follows -

Whilst I appreciate the necessity for farmers to obtain fuel at the most economical price the overall strategy of the recently introduced fuel distribution policy must be adhered to and ad hoc extensions to the policy will not be sanctioned.

I am glad Mr Kemp appreciated the necessity for farmers obtaining cheaper fuel. If he did not appreciate that necessity, I am not sure how the department would have treated the farmers because it refused them a permit to allow fuel to be carted into Hyden from Narrogin. This was not just something from Mr Kemp or from the department; it was a ministerial directive, which Mr Kemp explained in his letter as follows -

... the matter has been the subject of Ministerial involvement and accordingly a reply prior to the Ministers decision was inappropriate.

That decision was not made by the department; it was a decision by the Minister for Transport and that is the way the department felt about allowing the Hyden farmers access to the cheapest source fuel they could find.

I took this matter up on behalf of the farmers in the Hyden area with the Minister and in reply to my letter, I received a letter from him which read in part as follows -

The decision taken by the Department is in line with recently announced Government policy on bulk fuel distribution.

I ask members to notice in particular the following part of the Minister's reply -

This policy essentially maintains the regulation of bulk fuel to rail and directs that Westrail charges "competitive" rates.

Having said that, the Minister then proceeded to refuse permission for the Hyden farmers to get their fuel via rail with a road leg. Instead he told them, "You may now get your fuel from Esperance, 377 kilometres away. You can use road transport and you can bring your fuel in that way, but you may not use a rail leg which brings fuel into Narrogin and gives Westrail an income roughly \$14 to \$15 a tonne, and then put it on the road for a minor 170 kilometre trip to Hyden." The policy essentially maintains the regulation of bulk fuel to rail. The result of this ministerial decision is that the Narrogin agent will not be allowed to supply fuel and therefore Westrail has been cut out of one million litres of fuel transport. The Hyden farmers are now forced to pay a substantially higher price for that one million litres of fuel, which must come from Esperance by road. The result will be another one million litres of fuel being carted 377 kilometres by road instead of 190 kilometres by road between Narrogin and Hyden.

Rather than protecting Westrail, the department is actually directing business away from it and adding to the wear and tear on the road from Esperance to Hyden.

[Resolved, that leave be granted for the member to continue his speech at a later stage of the sitting.]

Debate thus adjourned.

JURIES AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Grill (Minister for Agriculture), read a first time.

[Questions taken.]

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 pm

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - EIGHTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR WIESE (Narrogin) [7.15 pm]: The Minister and the Department of Transport are using the report which has just been released as justification for actions which are completely

unsupported and absolutely against the recommendations in the report. The argument against using the consolidation centres plus road transport is destroyed by the reality of the prices that have been tendered in the particular case of the Hyden farmers calling tenders for fuel. The Minister and his department should acknowledge immediately the injustice that is being done to those Hyden farmers and to Westrail, its own Government agency, by reconsidering the ministerial decision, which has the effect of not allowing fuel to be carted by road from Narrogin into Hyden. The Minister should immediately reverse his decision because the basis on which the refusal is grounded is patently false.

Likewise, the basis on which the report is founded is also false because it is based on the false premise that road transport is not making a sufficient and fair contribution to the maintenance of these roads. Road transport in this State is contributing 400 per cent more than is being put back into our road system by way of road grants, so there is no way in the world that anyone can say road transport is not meeting its fair share of the costs. This report and its recommendations are open to serious questions. The only part of the report that should be acted upon immediately by the Government is the recommendation to deregulate the transport of fuel.

A situation which again highlights what is happening to road and rail transport is that relating to the calling for tenders to empty some of the grain bins in my electorate. The tenders for the carting of grain from the bins in Williams, Darkan, Bokal, Highbury, Boyup Brook and Wagin have been let to road transport. That destroys completely any justification the Government can have for saying that its transport policies are directed towards enabling Westrail to function more efficiently and profitably. The situation with four of those bins is that they are on a rail outlet. The bins at Darkan and Williams have rail access from Darkan, via Williams, into Narrogin and then on the main rail line through to Perth. The bins at Narrogin, Highbury, and Wagin are on the main rail line, yet I believe the Government has let the contract to empty those bins by road transport to Bunbury.

What is the Government trying to do with road transport in this State? How can it say we should be helping by putting our goods on Westrail when the Government is letting to road transport a contract to empty bins which could be emptied by rail? The Government's transport policy is open to question and leaves a lot to be desired.

Before closing I draw the attention of the House to another area in my electorate which is causing heartburn to some people - admittedly to only a small number of people. The Government should take note of this problem because it has the potential to affect a lot of people throughout the State. At present the Main Roads Department is engaged in comprehensive roadworks, road widening and realignment between Arthur River and Tarwonga. In the process major land resumptions are taking place. On either side of the present survey, 20 metres is being resumed and the road is being widened. Excellent tree planting and rehabilitation work is being carried out alongside these road works. The problem is that in the course of this work the Main Roads Department has to resume property. It negotiates with landholders whose land it is resuming, and eventually compensation is arranged based on current values. The Main Roads Department always seems to try to be as niggardly as possible in arranging compensation. Nevertheless, in the majority of cases compensation is agreed. It is likewise pretty niggardly in making payments because landholders can wait between six and 12 months before receiving a cheque for any land resumed. Nevertheless the majority of landholders receive some compensation.

It sometimes hurts when we look at the basis upon which compensation is made. Some fair sized acreages are being resumed, but no account is taken of the hundreds of dollars that the landholder may have poured into that land over 50, 70, or even 100 years in the case of some land in the Arthur River area. No compensation is paid for the loss of production that the person and his heirs would have had over the years.

In the case of perpetual lease land, the land is being taken back from these people; it is not being resumed. The Government, on Crown Law advice, has been told that it does not have to pay compensation for this land; it is Government land. As a result owners of perpetual lease land find themselves in the situation of receiving absolutely no compensation for this land which is taken from them. That is completely unfair, and the Government should look at this situation.

In one case a landholder had recently purchased the land for \$350 an acre. While his

neighbours and all the other landholders are being paid out \$350 per acre compensation, this farmer is being told, "You shall not get anything because this is perpetual lease land." The Government should look at that situation and take steps to rectify it because I do not believe it is fair. Any other owner of perpetual lease land should take note of this situation, and if he is anywhere where road works are scheduled in the near future he would be well advised to turn that perpetual lease land into freehold as quickly as possible, because if the land is taken from him he will receive absolutely no compensation for it.

I close my remarks at this stage, and I hope the Government will act to alleviate some of the problems I have highlighted tonight.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [7.27 pm]: I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the new members for Dale, Ascot and Balga. I trust their stay in Parliament will be fruitful and that their involvement will benefit not only their electors, but also the people of Western Australia.

The Address-in-Reply debate is one of those occasions on which members have an opportunity to raise a series of matters, and it is my intention to do that tonight. Those members who have been here for some 17 years will have heard me raise this subject at least once or twice a year over those 17 years. I am pleased to say that this debate will possibly be the last time I will raise the subject of the Margaret River Hospital. I congratulate the Minister for Health for going to that community and giving it a long overdue hospital. May I convey to the Minister the appreciation of the total community for the very important facility that he has committed to it; a facility which will cost some \$3 million. It will replace a 64 year old structure, and the community is very grateful for his expeditious action.

While on this debate, one talks about a number of matters, and one of my other subjects concerns the State's licence plates. If ever we have seen a changing series of logos on licence plates, surely Western Australia must take the cake.

Mr Troy: The "State of Excitement"!

Mr BLAIKIE: It used to be. It was "The Wildflower State", then it changed to "State of Excitement".

Mr Troy: The dynamic State!

Mr BLAIKIE: Only a few years ago it was changed to the "Home of the America's Cup". There are very good reasons why that logo is not as popular as it used to be. Today the logo is "The Golden State". No doubt in the member for Kalgoorlie's electorate it will be "The Golden Tax State" and no doubt he has been responsible for bringing it in. It is about time we came of age in the matter of number plates. I believe we should return to the logo for which the State is known internationally; that is, "The Wildflower State". Of the various States of Australia, Queensland has retained the logo of "The Sunshine State", New South Wales "The Premier State", and Victoria "The Garden State", and it is about time we realised that a few gimmicky comments have been made in relation to Western Australia. In my view "The Wildflower State" is the image that Western Australia and no other State in the Commonwealth has.

Mr Hodge: The present logo was chosen after wide public consultation. It was the winner of a public contest.

Mr BLAIKIE: I have no argument with the Minister on that ground, but the previous logo, "Home of the America's Cup", and the one before that, "State of Excitement", were also chosen as a result of an approach to the public. They all happened to be gimmicks at the time but "The Wildflower State" logo will stay with Western Australia for all time and a time will come when we will revert to that logo.

I want to refer to a number of matters in relation to Aboriginal affairs. Some of those matters are of concern not only to the Aboriginal community of Western Australia, but also, more importantly, to the wider community of Western Australia which has an interest in Aboriginal affairs. It is with some concern that I note that Ms Sue Lundberg, the present Commissioner of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority, is to take up a position with the Children's Court.

Mr Bridge: Why would that be of concern? It is a very significant appointment.

Mr BLAIKIE: If the Minister would just keep cool and calm, and wait, I will explain why I am concerned and the Minister can express his point of view afterwards. I have a little concern and I hope that, while the appointment is no doubt significant, it is not a way of promoting Ms Sue Lundberg sideways in the reorganisation of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority. By the same token, we have also seen the Chairman of the Aboriginal Development Commission, Shirley McPherson, whom I regard as a most outstanding Australian, virtually under a state of siege because of the changes that the Federal Minister is bringing about to the Aboriginal Development Commission. The Federal Minister is proposing to abolish it.

Mr Bridge: What you are saying is a horrible slur on Mrs McPherson and Sue Lundberg.

Mr BLAIKIE: I am not putting a slur on Mrs McPherson.

Mr Bridge: Yes you are, you are talking about people being moved sideways.

Mr BLAIKIE: I want to talk about Shirley McPherson. I said that in my view she is a most outstanding Australian. My concern for Shirley McPherson is that the Aboriginal Development Commission, of which she is the chairman, is being abolished. If the Minister wants to say that is not correct, he should say so.

Mr Bridge: There is no intention in that plan to move Mrs McPherson sideways as you are implying.

Mr BLAIKIE: I have not said that.

Mr Bridge: The commission is being restructured. She has been part of the consultation mechanism with the Minister all through, from day one. That is different from what you are implying.

Mr BLAIKIE: Let us see what Shirley McPherson said from day one about the Hawke Government's plans to take over the ADC through the proposed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. This is part of a media release by the Aboriginal Development Commission -

Mrs McPherson, an Aboriginal chartered accountant from Western Australia, said in Canberra last night that ATSIC was to be nothing more than the old Department of Aboriginal Affairs under another name - "nothing more than an upstart crow dressed in parrot's plumes."

Mr Bridge: It will be very different because it will be an Aboriginal administration.

Mr BLAIKIE: Shirley McPherson does not believe it will be, and she is entitled to her point of view.

Mr Pearce: What is your point of view?

Mr BLAIKIE: I believe Shirley McPherson is a most outstanding Australian.

I started by saying that I am concerned with a number of things happening in Aboriginal affairs. I am concerned about Sue Lundberg and her position, and I hope that her movement out of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority will not be to that authority's detriment. I am concerned about Shirley McPherson; and I am also concerned that, obviously by a democratic vote, Ken Colbung lost his place at the head of the Aboriginal Advancement Council of WA (Inc). While that was no doubt conducted under a proper vote, I am entitled to express my concern. Those three people have served the State extremely well and have shown the State that they are outstanding Australians and have represented the interests of Aboriginal people effectively and positively.

Mr Bridge: Are you suggesting that Sue Lundberg will not continue to do that in her new position?

Mr BLAIKIE: The Minister can make his speech; I am making mine. I am saying I am concerned that these people, who are leaders, will no longer be leaders in their particular fields of Aboriginal affairs.

I want to move to another matter that has been raised with me, and the Minister will have an opportunity to respond to this point.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Hansard reporter has to take this down, and it is very difficult.

Mr BLAIKIE: The matter relates to the group known as Middar. Middar has been seeking funding of some \$370 000 from either State or Federal sources. Middar represents the Nyoongah tribe and was formed initially for two objectives: First, to try to save the culture of the Nyoongah people; and secondly, to make all people aware of this culture, its beauty and its age. Middar has performed all over the world - at the Cervantino Festival in Mexico, in Mauritius, at the Houston International Festival, the IATA Conference in the Philippines, and the Australia Day Fair program on the west coast of the United States of America. In the next six months the Middar group will appear in San Diego, at the Berlin Festival in East Germany, the Yugoslavian International Folkloric Festival, and the Pacific Rim Arts Festival. As well, Middar will be performing at a series of other functions in the latter part of 1989. The Middar group has been unable to get funding, for whatever reasons, from either State or Federal sources.

Mr Parker: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr Pearce: In fact, totally false.

Mr BLAIKIE: Have they got their funding? If they have, I will withdraw -

Mr Parker: The group has had very substantial funding over a number of years, certainly from the State Government and, to my recollection, from the Australia Council as well.

Mr BLAIKIE: The last time the Middar group spoke with me, which was about three weeks ago, it expressed concern that it needed some \$370 000 in order for the group to continue.

Mr Parker: It might need more, but that is not the question. It has had very substantial funding.

Mr BLAIKIE: Irrespective of the amount of funding the group has had in the past, it is seeking more.

Mr Parker: I have yet to meet an arts group that did not want more money.

Mr BLAIKIE: The group is seeking funding. If it is additional funding, then it is seeking additional funding. One of the comments the group has made is that, if the Federal and State Governments can pay extravagant sums to companies and individuals such as Dennis Conner, why has Middar not been able to obtain assistance?

Mr Parker: It has had very substantial assistance.

Mr BLAIKIE: If, since the Middar group contacted me, it has subsequently been funded -

Mr Parker: No, not subsequently. I don't know about subsequent funding because I am not the Minister; but what I am telling you is that it has received very substantial funding.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! One at a time.

Mr Pearce: They saw you coming and thought, "He is as thick as two short planks, this one. We'll spin him a yarn."

Mr BLAIKIE: The best part of the story is when they asked whether I could tell them why the State Government could fund Dennis Conner for a fairly large sum of money, yet they could not get any money. I suggest that the Government explain that to the Middar Theatre Group.

Over the past 12 months I have made trips to various parts of the State. In recent weeks I made a trip north, which took me to places like Kununurra, Oombulgurri and others.

Mr Bridge: Very good communities too.

Mr MacKinnon: When did you last go there?

Mr Bridge: A few months ago.

Mr MacKinnon: When?

Mr Bridge: You would like to know, wouldn't you?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bridge: I will not tell you because you are too smart for yourselves.

Mr BLAICKIE: The Minister can give us his own trip sheet and tell us when he was last at Oombulgurri. During my discussions with Aboriginal people and elders -

Mr Wilson: Have you been there more than once?

Mr BLAICKIE: I have been there on more than one occasion. During my discussions with Aboriginal people in areas not only throughout the north but throughout the south as well, a number of matters which were of concern to the Aborigines were raised with me. The principal matter was to do with the welfare money they are receiving. The Aborigines really wanted to have something better than simply welfare handouts. That is a matter to which I believe the whole Parliament should give positive attention.

The second matter they raised - and this was unanimous - was their concern about kava and its effects. They wanted it to be removed from the market. The Government took a long while to make up its mind about what it was going to do about kava, and eventually decided that kava should be difficult to purchase in Western Australia. The Government's decision was announced about four or five days after the Opposition publicly announced it intended to have sales of kava banned, following representations from Aboriginal people.

Another matter raised almost continuously was the great concern Aboriginal people have about the effects of gambling by people in their communities. Their concern was that within their communities the Social Security Department payment invariably was gambled away within two or three days. One person would win all the money, hire an aircraft and go off to town, while the rest of the community had difficulties.

Mr Bridge: What are you suggesting - that we should cut off all funds to Aborigines?

Mr BLAICKIE: I am not suggesting that. Gambling is a matter of real concern to people in those communities. People are also concerned about the problems of chronic alcoholism and its effects on the wider community. Again many people within those communities have adopted a responsible approach and are endeavouring to bring those matters under control.

Another matter also raised in every instance was the Federal Government's foundation for the future. That is a program for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. In every community the problem was the same: The Federal Minister had been to the region, the State Minister had been to the region and they had both given a series of explanations about the proposal, but the people did not fully understand the proposal and they wanted more time to study it properly. In all areas the Aboriginal people wanted more time. They said they wanted a further set of meetings so that the Ministers could fully explain the proposal. That struck me as being very valid because a further set of circumstances regarding the Federal Government's proposal has arisen.

The Federal Government initially proposed to create 28 regions across Australia for Aboriginal people. The Government has since decided that there will be 56 regions. There was an air of confusion and degree of concern about what the initial proposal meant and an even greater degree of concern and confusion over the proposed changes to it. I bring that to the attention of the House and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, hoping that he will get the message. I hope he will not be caught up in the political loyalties of the moment but will liaise with his Federal counterpart and say, "Look, Aboriginal people not only in Western Australia, but also across Australia need more time to understand what is being proposed." My concern is that these proposals, whether one wants to reject them or not, will be seen as being rushed through before the wider community, particularly the Aboriginal community, understands their full implication.

The Government says it wants Aboriginal people to have self-determination. I support that view, but the Government must take heed of the Aboriginal people's need to understand what is being put forward for them. At this moment Aboriginal people do not fully understand what these proposals will mean. Secondly, my understanding is that it is doubtful whether the State Government fully understands what the proposals mean. What I wish to pose to the Minister now - and no doubt he will have the opportunity to answer today, tomorrow or at his pleasure - are these basic questions: What is the State Government's understanding of the effects on the State of the key issues surrounding the Federal

Government's proposal to have a foundation for the future? What does the preamble purport to do? What will be the effects on mining and industry? Are the property rights of individuals or the Crown affected in any way, and if so, how? Are there any contribution and compensatory ramifications of the proposal? These are matters the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs needs to explain to the House. What are the ramifications? Will there be any compensatory requirements should this Federal legislation be passed? What effect will there be on the State of Western Australia? It is believed in the other States that there will be ramifications as a result of this Federal legislation.

Mr Parker: Could you please tell us, in words of one syllable, what you are talking about?

Mr BLAIKIE: I am asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about the ramifications for Western Australia should the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission legislation be passed. Will there be any effect on Western Australia? I ask the Minister to give those questions some thought. Aboriginal people have raised the question of accountability many times with me, and the fact that they were ripped off by bookkeepers. Money intended for Aboriginal people is siphoned off by bookkeepers, highlighting the need for a system of accountability.

In Federal Parliament papers have been tabled in relation to the Marra Worra Worra, Wunkajungka and Noonjuwali communities. Every two to three weeks people from Aboriginal communities come to me with their concerns that funds intended for an Aboriginal community are going to another organisation. The whole question of accountability needs to be addressed. The administration of local government could be used to this end so that when a community requests funding - whether State or Federal - the request goes to the administration of local government, not through the council - in the same way requests are made in the area of youth, sport and recreation. In that way, when funds are being made available the signature of the shire clerk would be required. Local government would need to be funded accordingly to take up the extra administrative role. Local government is responsible and accountable so the suggested method ought to be investigated.

Grave concerns have been expressed about the situation where someone turns up with four or five air tickets for a trip to Perth, and the bookkeeper signs the approval but there is no accountability. If the same approach were made to a shire clerk for approval, he or she would run his eye down the list and say, "That is not on the list; I will not authorise it". That is accountability.

Mr Bridge: The same procedure applies in this State.

Mr BLAIKIE: Accountability needs to be improved to enhance the standing of Aboriginal people in the community and for the benefit of taxpayers who are sick and tired of stories about rip-offs.

Mr Pearce: We applaud the member for saying that Aboriginal people want to be accountable; Hon Norman Moore makes outrageous assertions in another place.

Mr BLAIKIE: Time and time again, Aboriginal people have raised with me their concern about the policies of the present Government.

Mr Pearce: What is the attitude of Hon Norman Moore?

Mr BLAIKIE: The policy of this Government is quite confusing as it talks about self determination for Aboriginal people but the policy is not put into practice. Statements are made against uranium mining but the Aborigines know that the Government is doing its best to get the Rudall River project off the ground. Aboriginal people have concerns about what is happening in the community.

Mr Parker: What is your attitude to that?

Mr BLAIKIE: I support uranium mining.

Mr Parker: What is your attitude to Rudall River?

Mr BLAIKIE: I have no hang-ups about it.

Amendment to Motion

I move -

That the following words be added to the motion -

And we are pleased to advise Your Excellency that this House supports the statement by the Deputy Premier in relation to the mining and export of uranium on the Diana Warnock program on 31 May 1988; when he stated

"that we have a highly illogical policy at the moment which is neither one thing nor the other and which is in fact quite nonsensical - and I have been arguing for a change"

and endorses the Deputy Premier's efforts to bring about a change in Labor policy to allow Western Australia to develop its uranium mines and export uranium.

MR COURT (Nedlands - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.56 pm]: We do not often have an amendment moved where the Opposition supports the actions of the Government. The Opposition fully supports the comments made by the Deputy Premier on Labor Party policy on uranium mining. We have the crazy situation in Australia where uranium can be mined and exported in the Northern Territory and South Australia but not elsewhere. Uranium cannot be mined and exported from Western Australia due to the three mine policy.

On the radio recently the Deputy Premier referred to the Government's highly illogical policy and said that it was neither one thing nor the other and that he has been asking for a change. The Opposition supports those comments. Senator Vallentine made comments on the same program and even she seems to have mellowed in her opinions on the subject. She said that she would prefer to have no mines but that she accepts it is not practical to close mines such as Ranger and Roxby Downs because they have long term benefits.

A more rational policy is needed because Western Australia is the big loser. The subject of uranium has been debated over many years in this House; we were very keen for the Yeelirrie project to get off the ground; all the necessary work had been carried out for the pilot plant and different studies had been done. As the Deputy Premier agrees, if the Government wanted to it could bring this mine into production quickly.

Mr Parker: I said also that I doubted whether it would.

Mr COURT: Arrangements have been made by the company to mine in South Australia; it would be more likely the CRA deposits on the Rudall River would go into production first. It would not be a major exercise to develop that mine.

Mr Hassell: They have just had 18 applications for pairs.

Mr COURT: I am sure they will support the policy of the Premier and Deputy Premier.

Mr Hassell: The Deputy Premier qualified the statement; it was not quite as clear cut as the Premier.

Mr COURT: Last week Senator Button referred to a proposal for developing a uranium enrichment process whereby raw uranium is further processed and sold, perhaps as fuel rods which could be used for nuclear power stations. Many estimates have been made on the export income we are losing by not mining and exporting uranium. The export of uranium would add hundreds of millions of dollars a year to our export income. If it were to proceed further there would be a tremendous increase in that income.

The Opposition supports the arguments put forward by the Deputy Premier and others that it is easier to control the end use of uranium if we supply the fuel rods. For example, if we withdrew supply from a country that was using the fuel rods for purposes other than power generation, that country would find it extremely difficult to get uranium from elsewhere.

It is crazy that there is a growing demand for uranium and that demand is not being met by Australia. Other countries have been allowed to slip in and develop those markets. We have good and proven uranium reserves in Western Australia and, because of the Labor Party's policy, we are not allowed to do anything about them. It goes without saying that we have to make sure that all of the safeguards are in place in any further expansion of our uranium industry or any expansion into the uranium enrichment process. The people we sell to must be signatories to the nuclear proliferation treaties and it is essential that these treaties are properly policed. We do not want to find ourselves being accused of supplying a product for a non peaceful purpose.

I visited Japan two years ago and spoke with people in the power utilities there. It was interesting listening to their explanations of why that country decided to place more

emphasis on nuclear power generation. The Deputy Premier would have been there more recently and may confirm what I was advised. The Japanese have cut back on coal and oil generation of electricity. They were concerned that they would get caught again with oil as they had been caught when the price went through the roof. They were extremely dependent on oil and that price rise had a serious effect on industry. That is the reason the Japanese transferred many of their heavy energy using industries out of the country.

They experienced a pollution problem with coal. The burning of fossil fuels in countries like Japan with areas of very high densities of population causes many problems. Similar problems occur in Europe and in parts of the United States. For those reasons they made a conscious effort to expand their nuclear power generation and to expand generation using gas. We certainly will be one of the big suppliers of gas.

They were also proud of the fact that they had developed the technology to further improve safety standards. They were delighted that they had made major breakthroughs in relation to the productivity levels of the different nuclear power stations and the fact that they were able to speed up the maintenance down time of the stations.

I travelled to Korea before I went to Japan. I visited a plant that was being constructed. The Koreans told me that they had made many breakthroughs in relation to safety and efficiency and were producing power generation at more competitive prices.

Some countries will not require nuclear power generation, and Australia is one. I laughed when I travelled to Brazil and found the Germans had sold the Brazilians a package of nuclear power stations which they did not need because they have adequate hydroelectric power generation. The first was just being completed. Other countries such as Japan and France have a high dependence on nuclear power generation and are turning more and more to that source.

Mr Parker: There is a general view, even among the strongest proponents of the nuclear industry, that France has too high a dependence on nuclear power.

Mr COURT: I agree. I think 75 per cent of their generation is now nuclear powered. I believe the Japanese have the right idea. They have a balance between the different forms available.

I have been trying to point out that there has been an increase in the demand for the product. Many of those countries have to plan their power generation years ahead because it takes years to construct the plants and bring them on stream. It is important that Australia gets rid of its crazy, nonsensical policy of producing uranium in one part of Australia, but not in another. It is reminiscent of the times that we were not allowed to export iron ore. The time has come for change. We understand the frustration of members opposite. We also understand that it is important for the Labor Party to alter its policies at its national conference. It so happens that the Labor Party controls the export of this product.

Senator Graham Richardson, the leader of the right wing faction in the Labor Party, has said that that faction has decided not to become involved in a debate on uranium at the conference. The National Secretary of the ALP and the South Australian Premier, Mr Bannon, who is also the National President of the party, have said also that there should be no debate. What chance do we have? The Deputy Premier has been very bold in suggesting that this Government wants that policy changed and that uranium should be mined and exported from Western Australia provided the necessary safeguards are in place. It is about time the Federal Labor Party got its act together and stopped acting in this crazy way. Does the Premier of South Australia have any credibility at all in this debate? He was the one who fiddled with ALP policy and managed to get the Roxby Downs project off the ground. He was quick on his feet and made sure that, after that was approved, the door was shut against any other mining of uranium. He is now saying, as the National President, that South Australians are okay and that the rest of the States can go and jump. That sort of thing should not be accepted by the people of Western Australia.

It is not very often that the Opposition supports members opposite, but in this case we do have a ridiculous policy. Western Australians are the losers and the Opposition would like to see the policy freed up and provided the necessary safeguards are in place we can obtain markets, open new mines, export uranium and become involved in further processing of that product. I support the amendment.

MR LIGHTFOOT (Murchison-Eyre) [8.11 pm]: Strange as it may seem, I am delighted to support the previous speaker and the comments made on the Diana Warnock program by the Deputy Premier. It is not often that someone like me who is thought of as sometimes being somewhat right of the centre -

Mr Parker: You make the member for Floreat look like a Communist.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member has not been on his feet for a minute.

Mr LIGHTFOOT: As I was saying it is not often that someone like me who is thought of as sometimes being somewhat right of centre should concur with the comments by someone who is thought of as the antithesis of the stance I take. I refer, of course, to a person who I am told was a former Communist, now the Deputy Premier.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr PARKER: I do not know what the member for Murchison-Eyre has been told, but it is simply not true that I am a former Communist. I regard his comment as highly improper and I ask him to withdraw.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! When a withdrawal of remark is taken I would very much appreciate being given the opportunity to hear the member who is requesting it so that I can listen very carefully to what he has to say and make a decision. It is not very orderly for members, especially Government members, to carry on in the way they did. The member for Albany is endeavouring to assist me with the withdrawal of remark and I appreciate the opportunity to hear it.

Mr Watt: Mr Speaker, I will leave it to your discretion.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! In that case I ask for the assistance of the member for Murchison-Eyre. Did he, in fact, say that?

Mr LIGHTFOOT: Yes, I did say that the Deputy Premier was a former Communist.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it was highly improper and I ask the member to withdraw it. Over the last couple of weeks every member has heard a number of things that have been said in this Chamber that are not strictly true. It does not, on most occasions, seem to have a great deal of relevance to the debate whether a comment is true. On checking the records I find that the use of the term "Communist sympathisers" has been ruled out of order in the past and has had to be withdrawn. That term is nowhere near as disorderly as the words used by the member for Murchison-Eyre.

Mr Pearce: Withdraw.

Mr LIGHTFOOT: It was most improper for the Leader of the House to parrot "Withdraw, withdraw" particularly when you, Mr Speaker, were speaking. However, that could be the subject of another Point of Order. I am quite happy to withdraw the term I used when I referred to the Deputy Premier and the fact that I was told that he was a former Communist. I withdraw it if the term causes some distress to the Deputy Premier.

Mr Court: That means he could still be a Communist.

Mr Clarko: Does that mean he could be a Communist right now.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that was very funny.

Mr COURT: I withdraw the words I used.

A member: And the member for Karrinyup?

The SPEAKER: I do not think he was involved in that.

Debate Resumed

Mr LIGHTFOOT: I was talking about the difference between the Deputy Premier and myself and I described it, in philosophical terms, as an antithesis. Perhaps I could amplify that by saying as an extreme socialist it is a wonder we could ever agree on anything. Agreeing to the fact that we should mine and sell uranium is something I welcome in this place. A bipartisan decision like that is something every member should welcome, especially as it is for the benefit of Western Australia.

As some members would know Western Australia has approximately three per cent of the world's known uranium and it could be fairly described, in uranium terms, as the Saudi Arabia of the world.

Yeelirrie is one of 20 deposits in this subnation that could be possible to mine. Over its short life, although a rather long exploration life, Yeelirrie has had over \$100 million spent on it in today's dollar terms. The infrastructure at Yeelirrie has, unfortunately, been dismantled in recent months and sold by tender and that does not haringer well for the prospects of Yeelirrie, the biggest carnotite uranium deposit in the world. In dollar terms it means that this State would lose something around \$300 million annually because in 1983 a political decision was made in Canberra, supported by certain Labor Party members in this State, not to let Yeelirrie mine its uranium. It was at a time when we were on the doorstep of signing long term contracts with France.

Yeelirrie lies in an arid and almost unpopulated area of Western Australia and is approximately 500 kilometres north of Kalgoorlie. It is one of the areas that would have stood the decentralisation as a result of a major deposit. It is owned 90 per cent by Western Mining Corp Ltd and Urangesellschaft, a private company funded by the West German Government, has a 10 per cent interest. In 1983 trial mining of the Yeelirrie carnotite deposit began and there is in excess of 32 000 tonnes of U-308. U-308 is almost pure uranium and I believe it is about 97 per cent uranium. The development at Yeelirrie would have involved about 2 500 tonnes of U-308 being shipped out of Western Australia annually.

As I said, in 1983 contracts were virtually signed by Western Mining to sell uranium to France until the Hawke Government stepped in and pandered to its extreme left and stopped the contract. But no doubt with the assistance and the agreement that uranium mining should continue in Western Australia and, I presume, other parts of Australia - although only Western Australia concerns me - and with the concurrence of the Deputy Premier that may be reversed. It was rather tragic that Western Mining Corporation had the political thumbscrews applied to it. It was a case of giving up Yeelirrie in return for the Federal Government giving the go-ahead for Roxby. It was blackmail and it, along with the impost he will put on Western Australia in 1991 in the form of a gold tax, makes the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, perhaps the most hated man in Western Australia. He was encouraged by the member for Kalgoorlie, who sought that most unjust of all taxes, colloquially and irreverently called the "Taylor tax".

Mr Taylor interjected.

Mr LIGHTFOOT: People like the member for Kalgoorlie support prostitution, brothels and gambling. Does the member also support the opening of the Western Mining Corporation uranium treatment plant in Kalgoorlie?

It was a tragedy that Western Mining Corporation was forced because of the political thumbscrews to opt for Roxby Downs, which was far bigger in dollar terms and cash flow to the company, than Yeelirrie, simply because the Bannon Government needed to be re-elected in South Australia. I do not believe that political strength should be misused in that way, particularly to the detriment of people in Western Australia.

We can see what they think in the Eastern States. They think there should be no uranium mines, even though in excess of \$1 billion a year would come to Western Australia through uranium exports. In addition, there is now to be the impost of the gold tax. That is absolutely disgraceful. It is a wonder there is not a rebellion here.

Mr Taylor: Why don't you come and run for Kalgoorlie if you have any courage?

Mr LIGHTFOOT: I have courage to talk about the brothels, the prostitution, and the illegal gambling under your nose. I have a lot more coming out about that.

Mr Taylor: They wouldn't even have you.

Mr LIGHTFOOT: You just get your beady eyes back to your document and we will talk about that later on.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LIGHTFOOT: As I said, 20 potential mines in Western Australia could have been opened. In 1981-82, 5 400 tonnes of uranium were exported from this nation. After the

Hawke Government came into power and in 1985-86, something like 2 200 tonnes were exported, less than half. If we multiply that it comes out to big dollars. The loser is quite clearly Western Australia. Pressure can be put on by Canberra where we field the least politicians. Labor Federal politicians from Western Australia are most ineffective. There are probably more Federal members of Parliament in the western suburbs of Sydney than there are in the entire State of Western Australia - yet we talk about one-vote-one-value.

Very little information is coming from the Department of Trade now as a result of the veil of secrecy that is dropped down with respect to the export of uranium. France consumes about 8 000 tonnes of uranium annually and some of that comes from Western Australia. It is interesting to note that although we condemn France for its explosions at Mururoa Atoll, as we should, we are still prepared at a very high Government level to negotiate with France to purchase our uranium. It is quite possible our uranium goes to France, is enriched there, and is then sent back to Mururoa Atoll as an atomic bomb. I find that quite incredible.

The former Minister for Minerals and Energy not only supports the export and mining of uranium - it is a pragmatic thing to do and I am not condemning the man for it; I endorse that sort of thing - but also endorses quite unambiguously the exploration for uranium.

Mr Parker: There is nothing in our policy against the exploration for uranium.

Mr LIGHTFOOT: That is fine. I just wanted the Minister to concur with what I am about to say. In 1986 the Minister stated his position quite clearly, if a little more elaborately. A newspaper article stated -

Minerals and Energy Minister David Parker thinks the search for uranium "should be encouraged."

In a letter to a Labor MP, Mr Parker says the Labor Party's policy restricts the mining and exporting of uranium.

"There is nothing in the party's policy which suggests any restrictions on uranium exploration," he said in the letter last month.

He went on to say -

"Uranium exploration is just part of the extra-ordinarily broad spectrum of mineral exploration and should be encouraged in order to provide the widest possible information on this State's minerals resources," . . .

Once again, I congratulate most sincerely the Deputy Premier for that particular stance. I do not know how he will sell it to his left wing, the middle wing, the old guard, the new guard, the mudguard, or the right wing, but I guess that is something that he will have to face up to.

I could talk on the subject for quite some time. I am very pro uranium mining. I believe that all uranium in Australia should be exported subject to the safeguards in our policy. We recognise the existing and substantial use of nuclear power by many countries for electricity generation and believe we should supply uranium for peaceful purposes under strict safeguards including: First, the monitoring of materials; secondly, the control of secondary sales; and thirdly, the safe disposal of radioactive wastes. We would cooperate with the industry in its assessment of the feasibility of establishing a commercial uranium enrichment industry in Western Australia and we would maintain an active role in promoting nuclear weapon nonproliferation and the maintenance of high international standards of safety in the industry and the Australian Code of Practice of Radiation and Protection in the Mining and Milling of Radioactive Ores for the protection of miners and the public.

Nuclear power exists in 26 countries in the world. It accounts for 16 per cent of all power generated in the world.

Mr Tom Jones: A lot of countries have nuclear stations not operating, don't they?

Mr LIGHTFOOT: It is second only to coal. I say that for the benefit of the member for Collie. Coal is still supreme as the commodity for generating the most electricity.

Mr Tom Jones: But aren't a number of nuclear stations throughout the world not being utilised?

Mr LIGHTFOOT: No. In fact, nine countries bought and installed 23 nuclear power stations in 1987. I know that Chernobyl was a disaster. Three Mile Island was less of a disaster, but

it was a disaster in terms of its potential effects. However, that did not inhibit nine countries, Communist and Western, from installing 23 power stations last year. As I said, nuclear power accounts for 16 per cent of the total electricity produced in the world.

Some countries use uranium or the atom to produce up to 70 per cent of their power. It is a commodity that Western Australians lost out on. We missed out on selling our uranium to the tune of \$1 billion annually. It had no effect whatsoever on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. All it did was make Rossing uranium mine - which I visited - between Windhoek and Walvis Bay in Namibia in South West Africa the biggest single uranium mine in the world. It earned millions of dollars for the South African Government and Western Australians largely paid for it.

I am not condemning the Deputy Premier. All I am saying is that his Federal counterparts stand condemned for banning uranium exports and proposing the imposition of the gold tax. The impost associated with banning uranium exports fell largely at the feet of Western Australians. We were the ones who paid. I am glad to see that the Deputy Premier endorses the exploration, mining and export of uranium.

MR PARKER (Fremantle - Deputy Premier) [8.28 pm]: I make only one comment in relation to the debate and another in relation to the procedure that the Opposition has chosen to follow. I am told that in the history of the House on only two occasions has an amendment to the Address-in-Reply been accepted and both were amendments which were moved by the Premier of the day. Both occasions were more than 30 years ago. For some considerable time it has been the position of the Labor Party, both in Opposition and in Government - a position which was endorsed by the National Party - to have no objection to the moving of amendments to the Address-in-Reply as an appropriate way of raising matters for debate in the House. However, we do not believe that passing amendments to the Address-in-Reply is appropriate, given that the subject matter of the Address-in-Reply is, in a sense, an address of thanks to the Governor for his role and his position in opening the Parliament.

If the Opposition at some stage wishes to move a substantive motion in private members' time to allow for debate on this subject, the Government would be happy to agree to that and to discuss the issue. However, this Government, Governments for the last 30 years and, with two exceptions, Governments throughout the history of the State, have not accepted or allowed amendments to the Address-in-Reply even when moved by Government members, let alone members of the Opposition. As a result the Government does not propose to support this amendment to the Address-in-Reply.

Mr Court: You could make history.

Mr PARKER: When we make history, we shall really make history, but we do not want to make history about this. This House is not an appropriate venue, although I am certainly happy to discuss the issue of uranium.

Mr Lewis: If this is not the appropriate place, where is the appropriate place?

Mr Lightfoot: The Fremantle Trades and Labor Hall.

Mr PARKER: This House is certainly an appropriate place in which to discuss uranium mining or uranium policy, but not to discuss the Australian Labor Party or the policy development of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr Lewis: Why not?

Mr PARKER: For the same reason that it is not the place in which to discuss the development of Liberal or National Party policy.

Mr MacKinnon: How many debates have we had on privatisation?

Mr PARKER: That has nothing to do with our policy, it has to do with the issue of debating the policy of the State. That is why the Government has no objection whatsoever to debating the issue of uranium mining and if an appropriate occasion arises, it will do so.

Mr MacKinnon: This is an appropriate occasion.

Mr PARKER: The Government has no objection to debating that issue and what the State's position should be, but it does object to an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. Such

amendments have never been supported by Governments of any political complexion; it has been this Government's firm position that amendments should not be allowed to the Address-in-Reply and it has been the National Party's position that that should be the case, and we do not propose to change.

It is also the position of the Government and, of course, was the position of the Liberal Government, that private members' day is the day for that business, and on the next private members' day the Government will be happy to debate this issue if the Opposition moves a motion on the matter.

In response to one issue raised by the member for Murchison-Eyre - the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not make any substantial points - I have been careful to make one important point in public debate on the matter - that I do not agree that Western Australia has been the major sufferer from the national policy of the Federal Government and I do not believe that, in fact, Western Australia would be the major beneficiary if that policy were changed. I have said on a number of occasions that it would not be the major beneficiary; the Northern Territory would be the principal beneficiary.

Mr Lightfoot: There are already two mines in the Northern Territory; why would they build another?

Mr PARKER: In terms of those mines and developments, the Northern Territory is far more likely to proceed immediately. We do not have any developments that could proceed immediately.

Mr Lightfoot: What about Yeelirrie?

Mr PARKER: Even the Deputy Leader of the Opposition conceded that that was unlikely to be the case. At an appropriate time, on an appropriate motion, the Government and I would be prepared to debate this matter. I thank members opposite for their good intent, to the extent that there is good intent, but the Government declines to support the amendment.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch - Leader of the Opposition) [8.34 pm]: The Deputy Premier's contribution to this debate was almost as bad as the Premier's contribution in question time tonight. The excuse given by the Deputy Premier in fact is no excuse. In his contribution he admitted that it is not against the Standing Orders for an amendment to be made to the Address-in-Reply. In fact, there are precedents both in this House and in another place. The Deputy Premier also indicated that he would be prepared to accept this motion at another time. The problem appears to be that the Deputy Premier, like the rest of the ALP across this country, is desperately trying to save face ahead of the ALP National Conference to be held next week. What sort of a national conference cannot debate one of the most essential issues to the future of this nation in a proper and sensible forum? The Labor Party wants to have a conference that is stage managed to give everybody around Australia the impression - be it ever so false - of a party united on all issues.

Mr Lightfoot: Deserting Western Australia?

Mr MacKINNON: Exactly. Let us cast our minds back to the alternative conference held a short time ago in Melbourne: The Liberal Party faced the difficult issue of a consumer tax. We had a very good debate in the national forum in front of the whole of Australia. We debated that issue out and at the end of the day -

Mr Pearce: Behind closed doors and there were no Press present.

Mr MacKINNON: It was in the public forum. The Leader of the House was not there, and I saw the reports on television. My quotes from that debate were in the national newspapers, as were those made by the member for Cottesloe, and those of many Liberal leaders around Australia. In full view of Australia we discussed a major and difficult issue and eventually our party arrived at a point of view nationally on the issue, as it should. What do we have in this Parliament? A Deputy Premier giving us a lame duck excuse that it is not appropriate to debate this matter in the Address-in-Reply debate. When else is it appropriate? The Address-in-Reply debate is a time when we can appropriately debate all manner of issues; it is also a time when appropriate amendments are moved to the Address-in-Reply. Why would we move amendments if we did not think that one day we would succeed? The Legislative Council moved an amendment to the Address-in-Reply yesterday, yet the Government is saying today it is not appropriate. That is plain ludicrous.

Let us consider the comment by the Deputy Premier that this is not the appropriate place in which to debate such a policy. Where is the appropriate place? We heard the Premier tonight waxing lyrical during question time about everything except the question he was asked. I can recall sitting in this Chamber prior to the last election listening to the parroting of Government members about privatisation. That is another issue the Labor Party cannot face. It is a party of wimps; every time they hit a tough issue, they run like rabbits as fast as they can for cover. Of course this is an appropriate place to debate the policy; this is an appropriate time and the method we have proposed tonight is totally appropriate.

Let us consider how divided the Labor Party is on the issue: It is desperately trying to save face with many members of the loony left who would refuse point blank to support an amendment such as this. Even the Premier and Deputy Premier in this Parliament are not united on the issue. In an article in *The West Australian* on 30 May 1988, the Deputy Premier is reported as follows -

Mr Parker said: "I am prepared to move the relevant motion from the floor of the conference. But we will first be working out during the next nine days the best way to achieve the changes we want."

He said that he was prepared to go to the conference and move that motion.

Mr Lewis: He has just gone to get a pair; he's gone missing.

Mr MacKINNON: What did the Premier say the very next day? He was reported as follows -

The Premier, Mr Dowding, said Labor's uranium policy was illogical and disadvantaged WA. But he reserved judgment on whether next week was the right time to seek a change.

So the Deputy Premier was saying that he was going to the conference to move the motion as the Premier's proxy and the Premier was saying he was not sure it was the right time to be moving that motion. A rather large split, I would say.

Mr Court: Why isn't he at the conference?

Mr MacKINNON: Why is the Premier not at the conference? That is a good question.

Mr Pearce: The Premier will be at the conference.

Mr MacKINNON: I will lay London to a brick on that he does not allow the Deputy Premier to move the motion that he said he would move.

Mr Pearce: There will not be a discussion on uranium at the national conference.

Mr MacKINNON: It seems that everybody across Australia believes there will be: *The Daily News*, *The Australian*, *The West Australian*, and the Deputy Premier. Does the Leader of the House think that the uranium policy is right or wrong?

Mr Pearce: I do not think that there will be discussions on it at the national conference.

Mr MacKINNON: Is the Leader of the House in favour of a change in the uranium policy?

Mr Pearce: No.

Mr MacKINNON: Another major split in the ALP. In the seats opposite we have a "Yes", a "Maybe" and a "No". What does the Minister think about the uranium policy? Does he think it should be changed?

Mr Pearce: Why doesn't the Leader of the Opposition have a chat to the member for Murchison-Eyre about a uranium tax?

Mr MacKINNON: I think we have come to a "No", "Yes", "Maybe", and a "No". What about the member for Kalgoorlie, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services? He says "No". We have three "Nos" at the moment. No wonder this is not an appropriate place to have a debate on this matter because we have three "Nos", a "Yes" and a "Maybe", and that is just on the front bench. What about the member for Perth, who has been pretty vocal about corruption in high places; what about in the ALP?

Dr Alexander: My position is well known on this issue.

Mr MacKINNON: Which is what?

Dr Alexander: This is a highly inappropriate inquisition, but if the Leader of the Opposition wants to know, I oppose any change in the policy.

Mr MacKINNON: Another "No". We now have four "Nos", a "Yes", and a "Maybe".

Mr Hassell: The Deputy Premier's numbers are looking pretty sick.

Mr MacKINNON: Yes, I think the Deputy Premier is pretty lonely.

Mr Hassell: No wonder the Premier was equivocal.

Mr MacKINNON: It is no wonder, either, that the ALP does not want to face this at the national conference, a party that cannot face up to an issue because it knows it is completely divided on it.

Yet what is their policy? It is a policy of hypocrisy that says it is all right to have a uranium mine here and there but nowhere else. The supreme hypocrisy is the president of the ALP, John Bannon, saying, "We do not want to debate the policy, because we have our uranium mine, thank you very much. We will look after South Australia, but Western Australia can go and jump in the lake."

The Opposition has held a point of view on this issue which, like most others, is consistent; we have said all along that that policy is wrong. We supported the mining of uranium in this State even when it was not popular to do so and, unlike the member for Kalgoorlie, have supported Yeelirrie through and through. We have nothing to worry about. We do not have to hide behind excuses about why we cannot debate this issue.

This is an important public issue that we stand proudly and are counted on, as should our opponents opposite, but they have again demonstrated that they are not a party for the tough issues; they will continue to hide, and run away.

Mr Mensaros: The Deputy Premier was very much against the uranium project.

Mr MacKINNON: Exactly. We will see tonight the ultimate hypocrisy of the Deputy Premier, who trumpets so proudly on the front pages of the papers of this State, voting against his own motion. Why will he do that? Because clearly, as we have found out tonight, he has very little support from his own party, a party that is trying to show a facade of support for uranium mining but which, deep down, has not changed one iota. The member for Perth has not changed his point of view, so what about the member for Balga - does he support the change?

Mr Cunningham: No.

Mr MacKINNON: He does not support the change, either. What about the member for Cockburn?

Mr Marlborough: I have two things to say to the Leader of the Opposition: First, I am not accountable to him; secondly, I will do him a deal; if he tells me what he said and did about supporting the member for Mt Lawley for the seat of Floreat -

Mr Hassell: There is no uranium in Floreat.

Mr Marlborough: Because everybody else in the Liberal Party knows what is the position of the Leader of the Opposition, and if he answers two questions, I will do him a deal -

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MacKINNON: We have just heard the longest speech this year from the member for Cockburn.

Mr Cash: Which didn't make sense!

Mr MacKINNON: That is why he does not make many speeches. However, there are more "Noes" from the members for Cockburn, Balga, Canning and Perth.

I wonder whether there are any "Yeses" over there, other than the Premier. What about the former Minister for Police and Emergency Services?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MacKINNON: Does the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs support the change in the uranium mining policy?

Mr Pearce: There will not be a discussion at the national conference, and that has already been said.

Mr Gordon Hill: There will not necessarily be any changes.

Mr MacKINNON: I think that is another "Maybe".

This is a serious motion that clearly has the Government in not two minds but one; they do not support any change to the uranium policy, as they will demonstrate tonight by voting against this motion with the weakest of excuses and speeches provided by the Deputy Premier, the only person I can find here tonight who is prepared to stand up and be counted in favour of the change in that policy, and I give him credit for that, the man I have constantly said should have been the Premier, and I bet my bottom dollar members opposite are ruing the day that they voted him out.

MR PEARCE (Armadale - Leader of the House) [8.48 pm]: I think that members on this side appreciated the final statement made by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the Deputy Premier because he is held in very high regard on this side of the House. There is no doubt at all that the Deputy Premier is perfectly capable of being Premier of this State and in my view, and the view of many of my colleagues, he will be Premier of this State one day. That is not something that I would say of the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, I would think that the tenure of the Leader of the Opposition in that position is likely to be relatively short.

Point of Order

Mr LEWIS: I rise to direct your attention, Mr Speaker, to the subject matter of the speech of the Leader of the House. I would like to remind you, Sir, that earlier this afternoon you drew to my attention the fact that I was not talking to the amendment before the Chair and I suggest to you, Sir, that perhaps the Leader of the House has not been speaking to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr PEARCE: To the same point of order, I was replying quite precisely and deliberately to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Clarko: That is irrelevant.

Mr PEARCE: If replying to the comments is irrelevant, the comments themselves were irrelevant, and if that is the case the member for East Melville should have been on his feet five minutes earlier.

The SPEAKER: Before I rule on that point of order I ask the Leader of the House whether he has already spoken on this amendment.

Mr Pearce: No; I have just started to speak.

The SPEAKER: I find the point of order highly frivolous and do not intend to rule on it.

Debate Resumed

Mr PEARCE: The Deputy Premier does not lack support on this side of the House. Every member of the Government is strongly in support of the Deputy Premier, both as a person and with regard to this issue.

The Opposition, in seeking to amend the Address-in-Reply, is doing two things. First, it is asking us to do something in terms of the forms of the House to which the Government as a matter of principle is not prepared to accede. Secondly, the Opposition seeks to trammel the terms of the debate because it will be well known by members that the Address-in-Reply is effectively the one motion put before the House that cannot be amended.

Mr MacKinnon: The Deputy Premier said there is precedent for it; the Address-in-Reply has been amended previously on two occasions.

Mr PEARCE: The Government is not going to agree to amend the Address-in-Reply, but we are happy to face up to discussion of the kind wanted by the Opposition. The advice we have given to the Opposition is to put the matter on the Notice Paper as a normal motion, which would give us the capacity to move amendments which might more fairly reflect the remarks of the Deputy Premier and put the discussion in a proper perspective. The Leader of the Opposition is seeking to use a ground that he can define and is expecting us to answer yes or no; and the charade by the Leader of the Opposition was a demonstration of that.

Mr Court: Do you oppose the wording of this amendment?

Mr PEARCE: I will demonstrate how the wording can be turned around. The Leader of the Opposition is well known for his failure to support a consumption tax. This puts him on a ground different from that of John Elliott, the Federal President of the Liberal Party, who is well known for his support of a consumption tax. John Elliott is a recipient of mail from the member for Murchison-Eyre with regard to a consumption tax. If I were now to ask members of the Opposition what is their position on a consumption tax, we would see them burrowing down behind their seats; we would see them squirming; we would see the member for Cottesloe being reluctant to say what is his position. We would see the member for Cottesloe being reluctant to explain his attitude to the position taken by the member for Murchison-Eyre. We would see wrists flapping in the breeze - in the member for Murchison-Eyre's terms - and we would see hollow chests galore, puffing in and out.

If members opposite want a debate on this nation's uranium policy, they should put a notice of motion on the Notice Paper, and they would then not lack for a debate from us, and we would have a decision made by the House on the merits of the case. The Government is not intending to support this or any other amendment to the Address-in-Reply. That is a position which is echoed by the National Party, and it is supported only by the Liberal Party in Opposition, not by the Liberal Party when it is in Government.

The public statements made by the Deputy Premier are supported by the Government and will continue to be supported by the Government.

Mr MacKinnon: But not by you.

Mr PEARCE: The Leader of the Opposition asked other members what they thought about the Labor Party's policy on uranium. The Labor Party has a policy on uranium, which it is not proposing to discuss or change at the national conference.

Mr Hassell: You said you did not support a change.

Mr PEARCE: There is not a change to be supported. I was going on to say I would not support the proposition that the matter for discussion ought to be discussed at the national conference. That decision has already been made.

Mr Court: Who made that decision?

Mr PEARCE: That decision was made when the agenda for the conference was drawn up.

Mr Court: The Deputy Premier said he was putting it on the agenda.

Mr PEARCE: My understanding is it is not a matter that is going to be discussed at the national conference, and under those circumstances if members opposite want to have a debate about uranium all they need do is move a substantive motion, not an amendment to the Address-in-Reply.

Mr Hassell: How can we tonight move a substantive motion, before your conference?

Mr PEARCE: I will give the member some free advice: He stands up tomorrow, when the Speaker calls for notices, and says, "Mr Speaker, I give notice that at the next sitting of the House I shall seek leave to move" - and he outlines his motion. That is the technique which should be followed, and the House will then have the capacity to judge that motion on a word by word basis and make any amendments that are necessary to properly reflect the opinion of the House. That option is not open to us with regard to a proposed amendment to the Address-in-Reply. That is why members opposite are running scared. Members opposite have put before us an amendment and said, "You have to have it on a take it or leave it basis; you take that amendment in its entirety or you leave it." We will buy that - we will be prepared to leave it. However, we would have no difficulty in accommodating that discussion if members opposite want to put the motion on the Notice Paper in the proper way.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [8.57 pm]: This is a serious matter, despite the degree of levity that necessarily arises because the Government finds itself in a dilemma. What has happened in the past three days is that the Deputy Premier, in the name of the Government of this State and on behalf of the interests of Western Australia, has come out and attacked a policy which discriminates against Western Australia, and has announced he is to take positive action to change that policy for the sake of Western Australia.

An amendment is before the House which seeks to support the action of the Deputy Premier, because we on this side of the House believe that what he did was right. What has now happened is that the interests of Western Australia are not even to be presented at the national conference of the Labor Party, and the Deputy Premier has been humiliated by the action of his own party in refusing to discuss the issue.

I do not often have the opportunity to listen to all the public affairs radio broadcasts, but on Monday afternoon I was travelling to Mt Barker, and on Tuesday morning I was returning from Mt Barker, and I was able to hear the whole of *PM* and the whole of *AM* on the ABC on those days. I did not hear the Deputy Premier speaking on the Diana Warnock program but I heard him speaking on the *PM* and *AM* programs, and the comments that were made in response.

At the public meeting that I attended in Mt Barker on Monday night, I expressed public support for what the Deputy Premier had said. I pointed out that the Deputy Premier had said that the lifting of the embargo on the mining and export of uranium was worth between \$600 million and \$700 million per annum to Australia. We are running a massive monthly deficit on our balance of trade. We are exporting uranium from South Australia and from the Northern Territory, yet uranium is lying in the ground in Western Australia; it has been discovered, explored and evaluated, as pointed out by the member for Murchison-Eyre, at a very high level, yet this State is denied the opportunity to export that uranium and thereby benefit Australia and this State to the tune of, to use the figures of the Deputy Premier of this State, \$600 million to \$700 million per annum. The figure may be higher, but I am taking the figures of the Deputy Premier and accepting them as a minimum.

On the grounds of pure ideology and absolute stupidity, it is all right, so it is said by the ALP, to mine uranium in South Australia but not all right to mine it in Western Australia. That is gross discrimination against the interests of this State, and it results in Western Australia, and indeed Australia, being substantially disadvantaged.

Of course we bring forward a motion which puts the Government on the spot because we have asked the Government to support its second most senior Minister. How absurd is it? What kind of a disgrace is it that the Deputy Premier, who rightly has gone out on behalf of this State and said, "I am going to do something about it", hears it announced from Canberra from Senator Richardson that he will not even get the chance? Would the Leader of the House like to say that the Government of this State, and in particular the Deputy Premier, was consulted about the decision not to debate the issue?

Mr Pearce: There are ways in which he can put matters on the agenda for a party conference, in the same way as your party does.

Mr HASSELL: Let me tell the Leader of the House how matters are put on the agenda at our party conferences. A number of members who constitute a branch put forward a motion -

Mr Court: Before the conference.

Mr HASSELL: - and the members of the parliamentary party may also put motions on the agenda at the conference.

Mr Bertram: Who is allowed to vote?

Mr HASSELL: It is absolutely disgraceful that the Deputy Premier of Western Australia has now been denied the opportunity to pursue, not private interests of his own - I do not think he has any shares in any uranium mines - but the interests of this State. He has been denied it in the most humiliating and degrading way.

Mr Pearce: Absolute rubbish!

Mr HASSELL: He has been denied that opportunity without the Government which represents this State even being consulted, and without the Premier being permitted to say a word.

We have before the House a motion which simply seeks to have this Parliament endorse what is a proper action of the Deputy Premier of this State.

Mr Pearce: No, it does not.

Mr HASSELL: Seldom is there an issue on which we can so wholeheartedly support the

action of a Government Minister, but we believe that he has acted properly. Before we got anywhere near this debate I acknowledged that at a public meeting at Mt Barker on Monday night.

Mr Pearce: Congratulations!

Mr HASSELL: I want to congratulate him in this House.

Mr Pearce: You have done it.

Mr HASSELL: I reiterate: The basis upon which we do this provides no offence whatsoever to the Sovereign, and would be perfectly acceptable to the Governor of this State.

Mr Pearce: Come on!

Mr HASSELL: It is not an attack on the Government, it is not an attack on the Sovereign, it in no way offends the Standing Orders, and it is in no way out of order.

Mr Pearce: Move it as a substantive motion and see how you go; you might be surprised.

Mr HASSELL: Could the Leader of the House give us this assurance - that if we seek the leave of the House to move this as a substantive motion first thing tomorrow he will allow us to debate it as a substantive motion first thing tomorrow?

Mr Pearce: No. It is Government business tomorrow. You can put it on first thing for discussion on private members' day.

Mr HASSELL: The point is that the national conference of the ALP is next week.

Mr Pearce: This matter is not going to be discussed at the national conference of the ALP.

Mr HASSELL: That, of course, is the very issue. What the Leader of the House has just said is the very issue. The Deputy Premier of a State as important as Western Australia, where 10 per cent of the population produces 22 per cent of the export income of Australia, cannot even through its Deputy Premier get debated at the national conference of the ALP an issue worth \$700 million to Australia. That is the extent of the shame and the disgrace of what is going on, and that is why the Leader of the House should not be ducking this issue and saying, "You give notice", because after that conference is over it will be at least two years before the ALP can discuss it again.

Mr Court: It is every three years.

Mr HASSELL: Hopefully there will be changes of Government in Australia before then which will allow, on a proper basis with proper standards and proper guarantees and in compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the export of uranium from Western Australia.

The fact remains that this is a vital issue to Western Australia. It is an issue we have taken up in this House over and over again since 1983. At last we see the Deputy Premier of the State taking political courage in his hands and saying, "I am going to fight for Western Australia, and indeed for Australia." He has been cut off at the knees. He has been humiliated.

Mr Pearce: He has not.

Mr HASSELL: Worse than that, the interests of Western Australia and of Australia are to be so denied that the issue will not even be discussed. That is exactly why this motion is necessary. If the Leader of the House is so sensitive on the issue of an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, why does he not allow us to debate it as a substantive motion first thing tomorrow?

Mr Pearce: You can debate it as a substantive motion when you have private members' time. Do not seek to use Government time; we have a lot to get through.

Mr HASSELL: This issue is to be dealt with next week in Hobart.

Mr Pearce: It is not to be dealt with next week in Hobart, so there is no urgency.

Mr HASSELL: I trust that the national shame and outrage which accompanies this humiliation of the Deputy Premier of this State will lead to the matter being debated, because nothing is more certain than that on this occasion we have a Deputy Premier who has courageously and correctly taken up an issue and said he will fight for this State, and he

should be given the opportunity to do so. That is what this motion is about. That is the substance of the issue. Unusual as it may seem, and in all respects as amusing as it may be, we are here backing up the Deputy Premier. The fact is that the issue is important to this State, and the Deputy Premier deserves the support of both sides of the House. It is a tragedy that the ideology of Government members will prevent that support from being expressed.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (20)			
Mr Blaikie	Mr Cowan	Mr Lewis	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Grayden	Mr Lightfoot	Mr Reg Tubby
Mr Cash	Mr Greig	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Watt
Mr Clarko	Mr Hassell	Mr Mensaros	Mr Wiese
Mr Court	Mr House	Mr Schell	Mr Maslen (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (26)			
Dr Alexander	Mr Evans	Mr Marlborough	Mr Troy
Mrs Beggs	Dr Gallop	Mr Parker	Mrs Watkins
Mr Bertram	Mr Grill	Mr Pearce	Dr Watson
Mr Bridge	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Ripper	Mr Wilson
Mr Burkett	Mr Hodge	Mr D.L. Smith	Mrs Buchanan (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr Carr	Mr Tom Jones	Mr P.J. Smith	
Mr Cunningham	Dr Lawrence	Mr Taylor	

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Thompson	Mr Read
Mr Williams	Mr Donovan
Mr Crane	Mrs Henderson
Mr Stephens	Mr Thomas
Mr Trenorden	Mr Peter Dowding

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

House adjourned at 9.13 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LANDS, DEPARTMENT OF *Guilderton Townsite*

150. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) How many subdivided lots is the Department of Lands holding in the Guilderton townsite?
- (2) Will she provide a schedule of lots that are currently available for purchase by the public, and the purchase price and any conditions of the purchase?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) There are approximately 50 subdivided Crown lots in the Guilderton townsite. Of these only one medium density lot is presently available for release. A general release will not be made until the environmental problems of the Moore River are resolved and replanning of existing subdivided lots concluded.
- (2) Yes, she will.

LANDS, DEPARTMENT OF *Guilderton Townsite*

151. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Lands:

Further to his question 1120 of Tuesday, 2 June 1987 in which he conceded that the Shire of Gingin supports, in principle, land being made available for a caravan park and holiday accommodation units at the Guilderton townsite, will he consider the release of lots 221 - 222 Ralph Street, lots 223 - 226 Wedge Street, and lots 227 - 228 Mullins Street in Guilderton as a site for holiday accommodation units?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

See answer to question 150.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE GYMNASIUM *Wellness Club*

175. Mr MacKINNON, to the Speaker:

- (1) Was there any involvement or advice received from an employee or employees from the Wellness Club in the selection of equipment or furnishings for the Parliament House gymnasium?
- (2) If so, what was the nature of the advice and what payments, if any, were made for that advice?

The SPEAKER (Mr Barnett) replied:

(1)-(2)

I made basic inquiries about staff levels and availability of staff and equipment, of various personnel within the health fitness industry. No payments, other than those already indicated to Alan Marshall and Associates, have, to the best of my knowledge, been made.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE GYMNASIUM *Marshall, Mr Alan*

179. Mr MacKINNON, to the Speaker:

- (1) When was Mr Alan Marshall commissioned by the Speaker to design and advise him on the construction of a gymnasium facility at Parliament House?
- (2) Who authorised the work carried out by Mr Marshall?
- (3) What was the fee charged and paid for the advice?
- (4) Who paid for the work and from what Budget item was the payment allocated?

The SPEAKER (Mr Barnett) replied:

(1)-(4)

As I have stated publicly late last year, I sought information and quotes for exercise equipment from Mr Alan Marshall. The information I sought was provided and I understand an appropriate fee has been paid from those funds allocated for the project.

RETAIL TRADING HOURS ACT

Proclamation of Legislation

254. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) When is it expected that the Government trading hours legislation will be promulgated?
- (2) What is the reason for the delay in its promulgation?

Mr TROY replied:

(1)-(2)

Proclamation of the Retail Trading Hours Act is dependent upon the completion of regulations relevant to that legislation. An advisory committee of retailers, consumers, representatives of employees and the tourism industry has formulated a draft of the regulations which are now with Parliamentary Counsel. Proclamation of the Act will occur once the necessary administrative arrangements have been carried out.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Hazardous Wastes

387. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does his department maintain records of all toxic wastes that are disposed of at rubbish tips in the metropolitan area?
- (2) If not, is his department aware of the toxic wastes that are disposed of at rubbish tips throughout the metropolitan area?
- (3) If no to (2), is it possible that dangerous toxic wastes could be being dumped in the metropolitan area and be a hazard to the public?
- (4) Is there any possibility that a lack of knowledge of the toxic wastes being dumped could create a situation where a mixture of toxic wastes and/or chemicals could be dumped in a common rubbish tip and create a volatile situation?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) No, but the department is informed by tip operators of unusual wastes which may be toxic or hazardous, and appropriate advice or direct supervision is provided as required.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Tip operators exercise close control but the possibility of unauthorised dumping which could be a hazard to the public cannot be excluded.
- (4) Yes, but the possibility is considered to be remote.

CATTLE

Cadmium Contamination

399. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it true that cattle produced in Western Australia have been found to be contaminated with cadmium?
- (2) If yes to (1), have any cattle been found to have levels of cadmium that exceed the maximum permissible allowable levels and maximum residue limits?
- (3) If yes to (2), were these cattle sold for domestic consumption or exported?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes. Cadmium accumulates in the kidney and to a lesser extent in the liver of cattle. The cadmium may be derived from cadmium naturally present in the soil and/or cadmium present in superphosphate applied to the soil. The cadmium concentration increases with the age of the animal.
- (2) Yes. Samples of offal tissue have been found to exceed the maximum residue limits for cadmium which are 2.5 mg/kg for kidney and 1.25 mg/kg for liver. However, no samples of muscle tissue have been found to exceed the maximum residue limit which is 0.2 mg/kg.
- (3) The samples form part of a national residue survey conducted by the Commonwealth on carcasses passing through abattoirs. In accordance with normal survey arrangements the carcasses have gone on to be sold for both domestic and export consumption. The Health Department considers these carcasses pose no immediate risk to human health. However, as the maximum residue limits have been exceeded, the department is introducing new requirements for offal of cattle two years of age and upwards to ensure the maximum residue limits are fully complied with. Western Australia is taking this action ahead of the Commonwealth or any other State.

WA INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

Commissioners

426. Mr GREIG, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is the Press report in *The West Australian* newspaper of Thursday, 19 May 1988, stating the Government was considering expanding the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission by appointing an extra commissioner making a total of 10, correct?
- (2) Why was this not announced in the Governor's Speech on 17 May 1988?
- (3) Has Mr Young been approached to accept this new appointment?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) The Government has been considering the appointment of an additional commissioner(s) following my discussions with the chief commissioner regarding his concerns over the workload of the commission.
- (2) Not all possible Government initiatives or proposals may be announced in the Governor's Speech.
- (3) Not applicable, as no determination to offer appointments has yet been made.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING, DEPARTMENT OF

Trainees - Training Sectors

428. Mr GREIG, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Further to the answer provided to question 347 of 1988, is he aware of a category of joint public-private additional to the categories of public and private used by the Department of Employment and Training to identify traineeship participation rates?
- (2) Will he confirm the correctness of the answer provided?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The answer provided to question 347 of 1988 is correct. Under joint public-private programs, trainees are trained in either sector, not both. The numbers listed previously reflect the appropriate sector.

EDUCATION

Literacy

431. Mr GREIG, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is she aware of Mr George White's claim in *The West Australian* of 2 May 1988 concerning literacy standards?

- (2) Is the newspaper article substantially correct?
- (3) Is the impact of this reduction likely to be a further erosion of grammar and spelling standards in schools?
- (4) Will she take steps to restore the literacy skills teaching times in WACAE?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) I am unaware of any claim made by Mr George White concerning anything at all in *The West Australian* of 2 May 1988; I have searched it to no avail. I am, however, well aware of an article in which Mr White's name is mentioned in *The West Australian* of 21 May 1988.
- (2) The article of 21 May 1988 confuses two very different issues -
 - (a) the personal literacy standards of student teachers; and
 - (b) the preparation of student teachers to teach literacy in schools.

Srenuous efforts are made at the Western Australian College of Advanced Education - WACAE - to ensure that no student qualifies as a teacher who has not achieved an acceptable standard of personal literacy. All students sit for a standardised test developed by the Australian Council of Educational Research at the beginning of their first year of study; those whose performance is unsatisfactory take a remedial course for one semester which they repeat if necessary until a satisfactory standard of literacy is achieved. No student who has not achieved such a standard is admitted to the third and final year of the Diploma of Teaching. No changes have been made recently in this procedure nor are any contemplated at present.

The Diploma of Teaching program at WACAE is currently being restructured for primary and early childhood education in response to changes in the basis of Commonwealth funding across Australia. The course content is to be divided into 24 units over three years rather than 30 units as at present. There will be no reduction in learning requirements; on the contrary, increased emphasis will be placed on independent research and learning by students.

- (3) WACAE believes that students under the new award will be no less well prepared to teach literacy skills. It should be remembered that the Diploma of Teaching is simply the initial qualification for the profession of teaching; the general expectation of Diploma of Teaching graduates now is that they will eventually complete a Bachelor of Education program which offers the option of six additional units of language education study.
- (4) I will watch with keen interest the development and introduction of the new Diploma of Teaching program, which will be reviewed by a panel of senior educators in the State. Decisions made by WACAE so far have my full support.

IRON ORE EXPORTS

Japan

434. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Economic Development and Trade:

- (1) Is he aware that the Australian - meaning in all practicality Western Australian - percentage of total Japanese iron ore imports went down considerably during the last three years?
- (2) If so, what has the Government done in support of iron ore producers to prevent that downside?
- (3) If the Government has tried to arrest the decreasing export quantities and proportions, why did it not succeed?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Australia's share of the Japanese iron ore market bottomed in 1986 at about 40 per cent - 97 per cent of this ore was from Western Australia. Most of this reflected a slide in Hamersley's share.

On 20 May last year I advised this Parliament of my discussions with the Japanese buyers, who accepted that significant improvements had been made in the Western Australian iron ore industry, and they assured me that Australia's share would increase but this readjustment would take time.

In subsequent discussions, particularly those held during the Australia-Japan Iron Ore Conference in October 1987 and during my visit to Tokyo in April this year, further very strong assurances were given that Australia's share would return to the 48 per cent level within a few years.

In December 1987 Hamersley Iron and Mt Newman Mining reached tonnage settlements with Japanese buyers which confirmed these assurances. Hamersley Iron's tonnage agreement alone will boost Australia's share in 1988 by more than three per cent.

The Australian market share in the 1987 iron ore year - which ended 31 March 1988 - was 42.8 per cent, which indicates that the recovery to which I referred on 20 May 1987 is well under way. Industry spokesmen in both Australia and Japan now predict that the 1988 - iron ore year - share will be between 46 and 47 per cent.

- (2) The Government has taken every available opportunity to convey to the buyers the renewed competitiveness of the Western Australian iron ore industry flowing from a range of initiatives, one of which was the formation of the Western Australian Iron Ore Industry Consultative Council which both this Government and the Federal Government strongly support.
- (3) Contrary to the answer which the question begs, the Western Australian Government is happy with the December 1987 tonnage agreements in Japan and is very confident that the 1988 market will be on target for a return to the 48 per cent level in 1989.

RETAIL TRADING HOURS ACT

Proclamation of Legislation

442. Mr TRENORDEN, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Why has the Retail Trading Hours Act 1987 not been proclaimed?
- (2) Is it the Government's intention to have the Act proclaimed and, if so, when?

Mr TROY replied:

I refer the member to question on notice 254 on Wednesday, 25 May 1988.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Rhone Poulenc Silicon Plant

447. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Economic Development and Trade:

- (1) Has the Government yet decided on a site for the disposal of the waste which will come from the Rhone Poulenc plant to be established in Pinjarra?
- (2) If so, what is the location of that site?
- (3) If not, what are the alternative sites which are being considered?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) An isolated site on the Yilgarn block in reasonable proximity to rail is being sought. The Coolgardie and Yilgarn Shires are cooperating with Government and the community to locate an acceptable site. Any decision will be subject to EPA approval.

POLICE

Product Innovation Centre - Alternative Licencing/Paper Methods

449. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) How does he reconcile his answer to question 19 of 18 May with the comments made by a research and development officer at the Western Australian Product Innovation Centre, who stated in correspondence to one of my constituents that "in consultation with Mr Peter Ward (Secretary, Minister for Police) it was found that the Police Department is some time away from commencing studies on alternative licensing/paper methods"?
- (2) When will the Police Department be commencing studies on alternative licensing/paper methods?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) I have no knowledge of the correspondence referred to in this question or what the Western Australian Product Innovation Centre officer is attributing to Mr Peter Ward.
- (2) The Police Department is constantly reviewing advances in technology in relation to the development of new systems.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Government Personnel - Guidelines

453. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Works and Services:

- (1) What are the guidelines contained in a Cabinet minute dictating the rules governing the awarding of contracts to Government employees?
- (2) Could these guidelines please be tabled?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) Could he please explain why these guidelines were not applied in the case of former BMA architect John Rasile, who was awarded the \$10 million Parliament House extensions in January?
- (5) Could he explain why the Treasury raised a \$100 000 advance payment in a highly irregular move as payment for Mr Rasile?
- (6) Has State Cabinet ever authorised an advance payment of this nature before?
- (7) If so, how many, when and for whom?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) There are no guidelines contained in a Cabinet minute dictating the rules governing the awarding of contracts to Government employees.
- (2)-(4) Not applicable.
- (5) No advance payment has been made.
- (6)-(7) Not applicable.

SECONDARY EDUCATION

Armadale Senior High School - Repair and Reconstruction

455. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What plans, if any, does the Government have to upgrade facilities at the Armadale Senior High School?
- (2) What work has been carried out at the high school in each of the last five financial years?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) The school is listed for an upgrade from a future capital works budget.

- (2) 1983 - Alterations, additions and upgrading, including cyclical repair and renovation. The areas involved included -

Administration
Music
Library
Staff facilities
Photography
Home Economics
Art-Craft
Science
Business Education
Manual Arts
Boys and girls gymnasiums

1984-88 - Necessary maintenance and repairs.

WATER SUPPLY
Canning Vale

456. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is he aware of problems being experienced by residents of Canning Vale in relation to frequent interruptions to their water supply?
- (2) What is the reason for this problem?
- (3) What is the Water Authority doing to overcome the problem?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.

(2)-(3)

There is a single water main from the Canning Vale area which supplies properties in Bannister Road and a semi-rural area south of the standard gauge railway line. In cases like this, where a single main is involved, supply to properties may be interrupted when the main is shut down for maintenance or when new connections for properties have to be made. The land in this area is developing at a rapid rate and regular requests are being received for the larger size water connections for industrial and commercial properties. To make these connections it is necessary to shut down the main for a short period. Every effort is made to keep shut downs to a minimum. As the area grows, additional water mains will be installed and the necessity to shut down areas fed from the existing single water main for maintenance or new connections will reduce.

URANIUM
Government Policy

466. Mr COWAN, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) Has he, on behalf of the State Government, stated his support for the lifting of Commonwealth Government restrictions on the uranium industry?
- (2) Is it State Government policy to support the enlargement of the uranium industry to include enrichment and reprocessing in Western Australia.

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) I have stated my support for a change to the ALP's "three mines policy".
- (2) The State Government has not stated a policy on this matter.

CRAYFISH
Licensing - Japanese Interests

473. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Is he aware that a Western Australian rock lobster processing licence was recently sold to Japanese interests?

- (2) Did his department discuss the transfer of this licence with him and, if so, did he support the transfer of this rock lobster processing licence to Japanese interests?
- (3) Can he say why the Fisheries Department did not discuss the transfer of this licence with the Rock Lobster and Prawning Association of Australia Inc, in view of the spirit of cooperation that has existed between these two organisations for some considerable time, and given the sensitivity of the issue of processing licences within the rock lobster industry?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) The question of approval for a transfer of a processor's licence did not arise. In January 1986, the Australian owners of International Fisheries Pty Ltd transferred their rock lobster processor's licence to Zaldon Limited. During June 1986, Zaldon Limited became INF Limited, by a change in company name.
Subsequently there was a change in shareholding of the company which resulted in the rock lobster processing business being controlled by Japanese interests.

PETITION

Fishing - Professional Fishermen

480. Mr HOUSE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In light of the Minister for Local Government's interjection during my Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech on Thursday, 26 May - daily *Hansard* page 5 - what action has he taken with regard to the petition that I presented in this House on 18 May with regard to professional fishermen having access to rivers and streams in the south west land division?

Mr GRILL replied:

I am currently in the process of preparing a reply to all 506 petitioners. I will forward a copy of my reply to the member.

SILICON SMELTERS

Kemerton

488. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Economic Development and Trade:

- (1) Is the Government aware of any industrial problems arising in relation to the construction of the new silicon smelter at Kemerton?
- (2) If yes, is the Government involved in any negotiations to ensure the construction is not delayed, with resulting costs to the taxpayers of Western Australia?

Mr PARKER replied:

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

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT

Government Guarantees - Perth Technical College Site

489. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Economic Development and Trade:

- (1) Are any new major property developments in Perth having their viability affected by the Government guaranteeing to rent such a large amount of office accommodation in the Packer-Anderson redevelopment of the old Perth Technical College site?
- (2) Have any property developers expressed such concern to the Government?
- (3) Is the Government aware of any new developments which will not proceed because of the Government's commitments?

Mr PARKER replied:

(1)-(3)

Not to my knowledge.

INTERNATIONAL FOREIGN TOURISTS

Western Australia - Statistics

498. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Tourism:

(1) How many international tourists visited Western Australia on a monthly basis from July 1986 to May 1988?

(2) How many of these tourists were from Japan?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

(1)-(2)

The monthly short term international visitor arrivals to Western Australia as supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics are as follows -

<u>1986</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Japan</u>
July	8 707	390
August	8 617	645
September	9 555	593
October	11 427	407
November	14 693	650
December	22 671	670
 <u>1987</u>		
January	18 162	807
February	12 921	1 085
March	13 251	1 111
April	11 405	687
May	9 068	543
June	10 041	597
July	10 837	1 145
August	11 051	1 180
September	11 176	862
October	12 823	1 103
November	15 410	667
December	22 489	778

Note: The above short term visitor arrivals are those persons who list Western Australia as their intended address while staying in Australia on the Commonwealth Immigration Department's arrival card and as such do not include those international visitors who do not list Western Australia as their intended address but who visit the State whilst staying in Australia.

Figures for the period January through May 1988 are not yet available.

COAL PRICES

Western Collieries - Griffin

499. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Economic Development and Trade:

(1) Do the coal contracts with Western Collieries and Griffin allow for variations in the price of coal?

(2) If yes, what controls those variations in prices?

Mr PARKER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Price variations can be the result of either -

(a) "automatic" price adjustments, reflecting changes in labour rates, CPI and distillate prices, under agreed indexation formulae; or

(b) changes in coal production levels.

POLICE STATIONS

Northampton Police Station - Personnel

505. Mr REG TUBBY, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Has there been a reduction in office staff from the Northampton Police Station?
- (2) If yes, what were the reasons for the staff reductions?
- (3) Has there been a community reaction to the reductions?
- (4) If yes to (3), would he take action to endeavour to have staff reinstated?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) There has been no reduction of Police Department personnel at the Northampton Police Station.

(2)-(4)

Answered by (1).

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

YOUNG, MR GRAHAM

Appointment

66. Mr GREIG, to the Minister for Labour:

Further to the answer provided today to question 426, I ask -

- (1) Is it correct, as reported in *The West Australian*, that the Government is contemplating or has decided upon the appointment of Mr Graham Young, an official of the CMEU, to the Industrial Relations Commission?
- (2) Does this follow the withdrawal of Mr Young's application for endorsement by the Australian Labor Party for the Pilbara seat.
- (3) Has Mr Young's appointment been contemplated or been decided upon because of an agreement made by him to withdraw his application for endorsement for the Pilbara seat?

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: Order! I have a strong suspicion that that question is out of order. If the member wants to pursue it, he should pass it to me for me to check.

After examining the question and referring to page 46 of the Standing Orders, I rule the question out of order as it contains inferences and imputations.

Questions without Notice Resumed

COST OF LIVING

Rates and Charges - Western Australian Families

67. Mr DONOVAN, to the Premier:

- (1) How does today's announcement on principal rates and charges compare with the Government's approach in other years since it was elected in 1983.
- (2) How does it compare with the record of the Opposition parties when they were last in control of such matters?
- (3) What will be their impact on the living standards of Western Australian families?

Mr Lightfoot: Question time is not the time to make statements.

Mr PETER DOWDING replied:

(1)-(3)

I will try to be brief, although it is an important question. I assume that, unlike the member for Murchison Eyre, members of this House want to know the position.

The Government today announced that there will be no increase in the principal rates and charges affecting Western Australian households. That continues a very proud tradition of ensuring that those who have made the greatest sacrifice in this nation's period of economic adjustment should be compensated by a reduction in basic living costs. This is the fifth successive occasion on which we have reduced the real cost of the average weekly family bill for basic services supplied by Government agencies and utilities.

From 1983-84 to 1988-89, the average increase in the consumer price index was 6.9 per cent. The average increase in principal State Government charges has been 5.7 per cent, which is nearly 20 per cent lower. This year, those principal charges will not increase at the rate of inflation or even at any figure below that rate which is a real reduction.

I remind members, so that they get a balance, that the Government in which the member for Cortesloe and the Leader of the Opposition served had a quite different record. That record included an average increase in principal rates and charges of a staggering 20.7 per cent. Inflation during that time was, on average, a staggering 10.1 per cent per annum.

As a result of our decision, the average family will be just under \$3 a week better off than it was previously. That is a remarkable contribution by this State Government to sound economic management with a particular focus on the needs of average Western Australian families and those about whom we care, as opposed to members opposite.

ROTHWELLS

Government Agencies - Deposits

68. Mr MacKINNON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is the Treasurer aware that the former Treasurer, when questioned in question 2493 of 18 November concerning Government agency deposits in Rothwells Ltd, answered the question by indicating that no funds were lodged with Rothwells by the Western Australian Development Corporation, the Exim Corporation, the State Government Insurance Corporation, or the Lotteries Commission?
- (2) Given that, why does the Treasurer now refuse to provide the same information when questioned about deposits with Rothwells from the WADC, the SGIC or the State Superannuation Board?
- (3) Will he deny that it is because an agency of Government has deposited with Rothwells in excess of \$40 million since October?

Mr PETER DOWDING replied:

(1)-(3)

I have not seen the question addressed to the former Treasurer. The Leader of the Opposition yesterday behaved in such a way that I find it a bit difficult to trust his word, with due respect to him. He will remember that he actually suggested that I had answered the question as to whether a particular agency had funds in an investment course. He suggested later in the evening that I answered that question in the affirmative. When I read *Hansard* today, it staggered me to find that the Leader of the Opposition was so inaccurate. I would like to read the question before I conclude what the Leader of the Opposition has concluded from it. It is an illustrative point. There is no way in the world that he can ask a confidential question which might affect the commercial activities of an organisation and expect an answer.

Mr MacKinnon: When the former Treasurer was asked specifically whether the WADC had made deposits, he said no.

Mr PETER DOWDING: Of course he said no.

Mr MacKinnon: Why don't you say no.

Mr PETER DOWDING: Let me answer the question. Is the Leader of the Opposition feeling bettered in this Chamber? Is that why he has to shout. If I answer no it is not the case, and if that is correct, that is just the beginning of the questions.

Then the Opposition wants to know, if it is not here, where it is. What we have traditionally said in this House and what the Leader of the Opposition has said in this House -

Mr MacKinnon: Commercially confidential.

Mr PETER DOWDING: The Leader of the Opposition said the same words in this Chamber when he was a Minister and I have reminded him about that.

Mr Hassell: That is about commercial decisions. The decision to deposit in Rothwells is a political decision. It was a bankrupt company.

Mr PETER DOWDING: The Leader of the Opposition may not share the view expressed just now by the member for Cottesloe. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to reflect on where his member is potentially taking any company. If a member refers to a company in this place as bankrupt or has the potential to be bankrupt, what does it do to its commerciality?

What we have said repeatedly to the Opposition is that it cannot be that any institution which is endeavouring to maximise its return on funds can carry -

Mr MacKinnon: Why don't you answer the question.

Mr PETER DOWDING: Does the Leader of the Opposition want me to tell him the reason? The reason is that any institution -

Mr MacKinnon: You are a joke.

Mr PETER DOWDING: Does the Leader of the Opposition want the answer?

Mr MacKinnon: I would like you to give an answer, but you will not despite the fact that your former leader did. He had the gumption to stand up and tell us.

Mr PETER DOWDING: I heard the Leader of the Opposition say awful things to the former Treasurer.

The answer in plain English is that in regard to institutions which are charged with the job of making commercial decisions and making an appropriate commercial return it is impossible for the Opposition to start asking -

Mr Hassell: It is taxpayers' money, not yours.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETER DOWDING: It is absolutely impossible -

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will come to order when I call order. It is fair to say that most members in this House would think I have been fairly tolerant in the way I have handled interjections and allowed them to proceed so far this session. I said last night - nearly every member is in this House tonight and I will say it again for the last time - that if I am to be faced with the sorts of interjections that have been going on for the last 30 or 40 seconds and with complete disregard for my calls for order, I will take one of two courses. One is to name the people who disregard my authority and the other is to cancel question time. If members want either course taken they should just carry on.

Mr PETER DOWDING: The reason the Opposition is behaving in this undisciplined way is that it is frustrated. What leads to its frustration is that the Opposition wants to cause harm in the commercial community and when it achieves its aim it will say, "Look at what the Labor Government has done".

What I have said to the Opposition repeatedly is what the previous Treasurer said, what Treasurers before him said and what the Leader of the Opposition said when he was a Minister; that is, there is no way in the world that commercial operations can operate in a commercial environment if the Opposition wants to know day by day what is happening. The proof of the pudding is in the eating and the eating will be when they report to this House as they should.

MINING TENEMENTS

Local Government Rates

69. Mr D.L. SMITH, to the Minister for Local Government :

With reference to a Supreme Court decision in 1986 which cast doubts on the ability of local governments to rate mining tenements, what action has the Government taken to clarify the position?

Mr CARR replied:

A Bill was introduced into this Parliament last year to put beyond doubt the right of local governments to levy rates on mining tenements. That Bill also included powers for local governments to appoint honorary parking inspectors to enforce parking, particularly for disabled persons, and it covered four other noncontroversial matters which were supported by local governments. It also contained one controversial matter, namely to amend the provisions by which local government boundaries could be changed.

The Bill completed its passage through this Chamber last year and had reached the second reading adjourned debate stage in the Legislative Council when Parliament closed. When Parliament opened for the current session the normal procedural motion was moved to reinstate the Bill at the same stage reached last year so that debate could be resumed. The Opposition in the Legislative Council then took the extraordinary step of defeating the motion, thereby rejecting the whole Bill.

While I could understand the Council objecting to the boundary measure, and maybe deleting that provision if its members could be persuaded to agree to that position, I find the rejection of the other measures to be extraordinary, in particular the measures concerning the rateability of mining tenements and the enforcement of parking provided for disabled persons. Both have been eagerly awaited for a considerable time and this rejection is quite indefensible.

It was particularly annoying to have it alleged during that debate that local governments had not been consulted on the Bill. The Bill had been public for six months and had been widely considered among local governments with widespread support for all but one item. It would have been quite proper action, if the Legislative Council felt so strongly about that one measure to delete it, but to simply refuse to debate the Bill and thereby reject six noncontroversial and popular measures is indefensible.

It is a clear indication of the Opposition's attitude to local government that it treats important legislation in such a cavalier manner. It obviously has not thought its position through and it has clearly offended local government and also disabled persons.

I will discuss with Cabinet whether the Government will reintroduce the Bill this session.

ROTHWELLS
Guarantee

70. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Has the Treasurer observed that the Opposition's questions about business activities have been directed to Government business activities and not to private business activities?
- (2) When did he last receive a written report on the risks involved and the status of the Rothwells' guarantee?
- (3) If he has received such a report, who prepared it?
- (4) Did it reassure the Treasurer that the Rothwells' guarantee by the taxpayers was not now subject to greater risk than when it was put in place last year?

Mr PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1)-(4) No, I have not noticed that the Opposition has limited its inquiry in this House to the conduct of Government business. Not only that, but also and unequivocally, the member for Cottesloe has attacked business people. He has attacked the integrity of people on the board of organisations like the WADC, the State Superannuation Board and the State Government Insurance Commission, and he has attacked people who have done commercial transactions with those bodies. Indeed, the member for Cottesloe has gone even further than that and has actively taken steps to try to challenge and affect people who are operating exclusively in the corporate sector.

Mr Hassell: It is false and you know it.

Mr PETER DOWDING: I sometimes wonder whether the member knows what he is doing.

Mr Hassell: I know very well.

Mr PETER DOWDING: Take, for example, the Burswood group. The member for Cottesloe and other members of his party, supported by a man who the Liberal Party has told the Parliament and the public has a longstanding criminal record and has participated in two court actions which could be described only as attempts to exploit a situation to gain money -

Mr MacKinnon: Avoid the question.

Mr PETER DOWDING: He has actually taken steps in Tasmania under false pretences, pretending to be an engineer, which he is not, with some brand new idea of affecting the paper pulp industry. He has attacked the casino, the Government and the Casino Control Commission, and he came to Western Australia immediately a casino was mooted to do the same thing in this State and to try to extort money from that commercial organisation.

Mr MacKinnon: Repeat all that outside.

Mr PETER DOWDING: The Leader of the Opposition does not want me to say it outside because it is so embarrassing. Does he know that members of his party are saying that it is?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MacKinnon: Repeat all that outside.

The SPEAKER: Order! If it were not unfair for me to sit the Premier down in the middle of his answer and walk out of this Chamber, I would do so. I heard the Leader of the Opposition repeat the same interjection four times, twice after I called for order. The Leader of the Opposition knew that I had called for order and that sort of behaviour after my earlier request is not acceptable. After all, we are members of Parliament. Some members in the House should remember that more often.

Mr PETER DOWDING: Members of the Leader of the Opposition's own party have been repeatedly expressing a great deal of disquiet about that situation, which is an attack on a corporate group in Western Australia that has nothing to do with the Government. It is a direct attack on that corporation, and if the member for Cottesloe thinks that it is easy for a group such as that to operate when he is on a crusade like the second coming, I can tell him that it is not.

The Leader of the Opposition recognised that on Sunday when he said how difficult it was for the parties involved in this situation to have this hanging over their heads for such a period.

Mr MacKinnon: You put them there.

Mr PETER DOWDING: The Leader of the Opposition may say that, but it is a different thing. I am giving him Brownie points and he is so stupid that he does not understand when I am paying him a compliment. He has recognised how dangerous it is for commercial people to be subjected to the sort of attack under which he and the member for Cottesloe have consistently put groups in this community. The Leader of the Opposition has done it repeatedly and I am reminded of the bloke who wanted to set up a brick operation in Western Australia. I have never seen a person who wanted to set up an enterprise in this State subjected to so much vicious harassment.

I would like members opposite to tell the House what political donations motivated them to take such an interest in the brickyard. When we have on the Table details of political donations from that side of the House, details will be provided by this side of the House. Let me wind up by saying to the member for Cottesloe, whom I have known for many years -

Mr Hassell: Are you talking about criminal records?

Mr PETER DOWDING: Does the member for Cottesloe want me to finish? The first part of the member for Cottesloe's question was not correct, but he cannot help himself. If the man sitting across the benches from me were a strong leader, he would do something about the member for Cottesloe; if he does not, one of these days he will suffer the consequences.

CASH, MR
Police - Port Hedland

71. Mrs BUCHANAN, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the destructive and irresponsible comments made by the member for Mt Lawley about the decision of the Commissioner of Police to locate additional police in Hedland?
- (2) If yes, would he please comment on the statement?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes, I am aware of the comments and I am more than pleased to respond.
- (2) I should express the concern conveyed to me by both the police and the residents of the Hedland area in relation to the comments made a day or so ago by the member for Mt Lawley in terms of the policing situation in the Hedland area. He made a statement that the three extra permanent police officers deployed to that area were deployed by me as Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Obviously, the member for Mt Lawley still does not have the message that those decisions are quite rightly and properly made by the Commissioner of Police and certainly not by the Minister. I would have expected the member for Mt Lawley to applaud the rapid response by the police to the concerns raised in that area. I went to Hedland one Thursday night and by the next Monday morning an assistant commissioner had returned to Hedland with six additional police officers. They were rapid response officers who are able to deal with local

problems immediately, and three additional permanent officers have been appointed to Hedland to assist these local officers. They include a community policing officer who will be prepared to assist the residents of those areas to look after and help themselves in association with the police.

I understand the residents of Hedland are very concerned indeed about the scandalous and outrageous comments by the member for Mt Lawley; he has given them no credit whatsoever for the fact that they were prepared to help themselves - something I and the Government as a whole have encouraged throughout the State, whether with Neighbourhood Watch or the general approach to community policing. This should be applauded and the Commissioner of Police should be congratulated on his rapid response to the situation.

However, the member for Mt Lawley concluded by imposing his death wish upon that town when he said that it may require a death in the town to bring a greater response from the police.

Mr Peter Dowding: He also absolutely affronted a number of Aboriginal people in the community by focusing on that issue without giving any credit to the very good work done by many members of the community.

Mr TAYLOR: In fact, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has supported the Bloodtree group in its efforts to get Aboriginal people involved in some of the problems their people have, particularly with alcohol abuse.

The greatest concern to me, the police and the residents of the Hedland area is the death wish imposed on the people by the member for Mt Lawley when he said that it might require a death in the town to get more police. I think that is absolutely disgraceful and I am certain that the residents of the area agree with me.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Rural Areas - Report

72. Mr SCHELL, to the Minister for Small Business:

Further to the Minister's answer to question on notice 309 by the Leader of the National Party relating to last year's report on rural small business -

- (1) Why has the previous Minister's offer to make the report public been delayed for 12 months and now withdrawn?
- (2) Does the report contain information or recommendations that embarrass the Government over its neglect of the rural small business sector?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) An indication was given by the previous Minister that he would follow a certain course of action with this report. That matter is now before me and I am examining all aspects of the report. The issues have been examined in the context of the overall situation and when I am ready to publish the report I will do so.
- (2) I am not aware of anything in the report that causes the Government any concern, so the suggestion that the Government has something to hide is not called for. I will look at it as the new Minister in the portfolio and when I am in a position to make a proper evaluation it will be given to the member for Mt Marshall and other members of the National Party.

Mr Stephens: Can you give us a guarantee that you will make the decision before you are moved to another portfolio, as the previous Minister was?

Mr BRIDGE: That is not the way I behave and the member for Stirling knows that. The suggestion that the Government has something to hide is not on and I make that abundantly clear to the House.