

# Legislative Council

Thursday, 26 June 1986

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

## SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

### *Luncheon Suspension*

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon. Clive Griffiths): I wish to notify all honourable members that as we are now to sit in the morning on Thursdays, it will be my intention to suspend the workings of the House at 12.45 p.m. and the bells will be rung in order to resume at 2.30 p.m., unless the House at any time otherwise directs me. This will apply to all days on which the House sits before lunchtime.

## MIDLAND SALEYARDS: SELECT COMMITTEE

### *Order of the Day: Motion*

**HON. NEIL OLIVER** (West) [11.07 a.m.]: I move—

That on the sitting day on which this motion is passed, the order of the day for the resumption of the debate on the question for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into and report on the disposal of the Midland Saleyards be made the order of the day immediately following that for the Address in Reply, or, in the event that the Address in Reply has been adopted, the said order of the day be made the first such order for that day's sitting and the question thereon be resolved at that sitting.

It is unfortunate that it is necessary for me to move this motion which seeks to ensure that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the sale of the Midland saleyards. Notice of the motion was given last Tuesday week to give the Government adequate time to examine the terms of reference of that motion, and it was debated on Thursday. I would have thought that having been given two days' notice and in view of the fact that it would be a Select Committee of this House, which everybody talks of as being a House of Review, the Government would have allowed debate on Thursday to proceed to its conclusion.

This motion seeks to ensure that this motion for a Select Committee is not buried at the bottom of the Notice Paper as it has been since the motion was adjourned by the Government.

In moving this motion, I am moving that after the Address-in-Reply debate today—that is, after the members have had the opportunity to speak to it and to give to His Excellency the Governor the respect which is his due—item No. 7 on the Notice Paper, dealing with the establishment of a Select Committee on the Midland saleyards, be moved to item No. 2 on the Notice Paper.

There have been previous examples of this; it is not unusual. In fact, I once moved in this House to refer various matters to the Standing Committee on Government Agencies. I understand that I am the only member who has ever moved that we refer to the Standing Committee on Government Agencies certain matters that needed investigation. I thought that that was a start in the direction of establishing the committee system that I have heard expounded by almost every member in this House and specifically by members of the Government, in particular by Hon. Robert Hetherington. In another place, there have even been significant debates on it. Hon. Arthur Tonkin, in particular, has spoken at great length on the need to establish committees and how the House would function so much better with a committee system.

When I moved that particular motion, after 2½ years it was relegated to the bottom of the Notice Paper. At the end of 2½ years, Parliament was almost due to go into recess. I must thank Mr Dans, because on that occasion the message was passed across to the Whip that if I would speak for only a few minutes on that subject he would allow it to be brought onto the Notice Paper.

This is an unfortunate situation when we have just discussed the requirements to let people have their say. Last November, a motion similar to this one, which called for a Select Committee, was moved. We expected to come back to the Parliament the following day. There were then many more items on the Notice Paper than there are now. We arrived here on a Wednesday to find a notice pinned on the door of this House to say that the Parliament had been prorogued. That means that no matter what this House wants to examine at any time, it goes to the bottom of the Notice Paper, stays there, and eventually drops off at the end of the session of the Parliament. That is not the way to run good government.

There are not many items on the Notice Paper and I do not wish to talk at great length to this motion. I warned the Government when I spoke to this motion last Thursday that the

public would not allow it to go away. I see an advertisement in this morning's paper. I have not had a chance to read it properly, but I would like to get a copy of it and probably use it later today. The Government cannot bury this Select Committee motion at the bottom of the Notice Paper.

If the Government attempts to hush up this matter by burying this motion again, or if it seeks to adjourn this debate, I shall oppose the adjournment. That is my right as a member. If the Government wishes to hush this matter up there must be something to hide.

What is wrong with the Select Committee? A lot of confusing statements have been made, and much speculation. The sooner this matter is laid to rest and the public becomes aware of it, the better. If there is nothing to hide, then we should get on with it. Any decision not to proceed with the inquiry will be seen not only as an evasion by the Government, but also as a failure of the Opposition to do what most people see as their public duty of this House of Review.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: It is a party political House.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: What a stupid comment to make!

Hon. Kay Hallahan: I am not a stupid woman.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: As I said, I do not wish to prolong the debate and therefore I reiterate that I will oppose the adjournment of this motion which purely seeks leave to enable the motion to become No. 2 on the Notice Paper after the Address-in-Reply. I do not believe the debate should be prolonged, even after it becomes No. 2 on the Notice Paper.

I commend the motion to members.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [11.17 a.m.]: I am somewhat like a reluctant bride seconding this motion. I firmly believe that when the original motion was moved—and I seconded and supported it then—that a period of one week at least would be given to the Government to bring it up the ladder. The Minister handling this issue is not in the House today, even to go on with the issue or to talk about it.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: He is not in the State.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: There you are! He is not in the State. I know he is not in the House.

I have to admit that when I heard about this motion coming forward I tried to use my little bit of influence to ask that it be brought up on

Tuesday, so that in all fairness we would have been able to debate the issue then with the Minister in this place.

I am seconding this motion, as I seconded the original one. Certainly the proviso in Hon. Neil Oliver's motion is that it be brought on immediately the Address-in-Reply is finished. I suppose that can be engineered also. I know that Hon. Neil Oliver wants this as much as I do, except that I want that Minister in the House when the motion is debated. Just at present I do not know exactly where he is. Evidently he is out of the State.

The National Party could not afford to oppose Hon. Neil Oliver's motion because our people are demanding that the issue be cleaned up by a committee being set up.

On the other hand I believe, in all fairness to the Minister, that he should be here to at least reply and bring it forward, and be in the House so that we can eyeball him, as it were, in order to hear his explanation. However, I agree with Hon. Neil Oliver. We cannot afford to let this matter go right down the Notice Paper, but I think, and others agree with me, that we should have brought it up on Tuesday, not today.

I second the motion, but I do so very reluctantly.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [11.21 a.m.]: As members will be aware, in the normal course of events a Government member would now move for the adjournment of this debate, and I certainly would not participate in it at this stage.

However, Hon. Neil Oliver has indicated that, contrary to normal practice, he will be proposing to oppose the adjournment, and the Leader of the Opposition was good enough to indicate to me informally that that was indeed the position of the Liberal Party in this Chamber. For that reason, I enter the debate and I do so in order to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the nature of the motion, leaving aside altogether the object at which it is aimed.

This is not a motion about a Select Committee or about a particular subject matter. This is a motion about taking control of the business of this part of Parliament out of the hands of the Government. If one thing has to be understood, it is that it is for the Government to control the business of the Parliament; and after four years I would have thought Liberal Party members had come to understand that the Government of this State does not con-

sist of members of the Liberal Party of the Legislative Council.

That is the issue. Hon. Neil Oliver is inviting the House to set out on a collision course with well-established practices and to do so for no good purpose at all. That is the issue here.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: And a lot of concern.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: What is the urgency about this issue which demands that we must cut across the well-established practices of Parliament, indeed of all Parliaments, and not only give a particular order of priority to an item of Opposition business but to do it today?

I have never even seen the Opposition attempt that on other occasions—at least on other occasions it has given notice today that it wants priority tomorrow. That is not the nature of this motion at all. This motion is designed to take the control of our business out of the hands of the Government and to do so immediately, to pass this motion immediately, to move on to the motion for the Select Committee immediately, and to establish the committee immediately, irrespective of what other business is before the House and what other priorities the Government offers to the House.

Where is the urgency, and where is the justification for these extraordinary measures? It is not as though the Midland abattoir land will disappear if we do not concede to Hon. Neil Oliver's obsessions today. It will still be there next week and the week after that. It is not as though any of the negotiations, contracts, or any other arrangements associated with this land will disappear by next week, or the week after. It will all be there and one only needs to have the most preliminary look at the terms of Hon. Neil Oliver's own substantive motion—not the present one, but the one he wants to bring on—to realise that there is no urgency about this business at all.

What does he want? He wants an investigation for—

- (1) The likely effects of the closure on the Midland Regional Centre and, generally, the Western Australian rural community;

Does that have to be decided today? His motion continues—

- (2) The extent of consultation with business and rural organisations as to the effect on their members who derive income from, or utilise the services of the Saleyards;

Is that going to change between now and next week or between now and next month? Is the question whether tenders were called going to change between now and next week? That is all history, and history does not change. There is no urgency about it. It is a simple matter of obsession and a view by Opposition members that really, when all is said and done, they should not be where they are now but over here, on the Government benches. However since they are not over here, they carry on as though they were.

That is what this motion is all about, and I ask the members on the other side not to be led astray by Hon. Neil Oliver's obsessions. We can accommodate him quite well in due course. There is no question of burying the issue; the Government is not interested in burying it, or hushing it up. There is no question in any event that a delay of a week, two weeks, or a month would allow something to be buried or hushed up.

In due course, the House will decide whether it wants a Select Committee. It will then decide on the substantive question whether we ought to pursue it by way of Select Committee, or pursue it in some other way. As if the basic principle were not rotten enough, in general, we have today the particular circumstances to make it, if possible, even worse and I am obliged to Hon. Mick Gayfer for drawing to the attention of the House the fact that the Minister, Hon. Des Dans, who represents the responsible Minister in this House, is known by the Opposition to be interstate on ministerial business. The Opposition knows he has been away since yesterday and is therefore not available to represent the responsible Minister were this debate to ensue.

I tell Opposition members something else: Mr Dans has not had the opportunity to consult our Caucus as to the general party view on the committee, or as to whether, even if this committee were to be established, it would participate in it, or if the Government did decide to establish the committee and participate, which of our members would be prepared to nominate for membership of it. None of that is known and yet Hon. Neil Oliver, over there on the back benches, says we ought to proceed in any event.

That procedure would be highly objectionable and it would be improper and unjustified, and would make no sense at all. There is no reason, either arising from urgency or special circumstances, or any other reason,

to justify the House taking these extraordinary measures which Hon. Neil Oliver suggests.

Finally I refer to Hon. Neil Oliver's allegation of undue delay. I have never heard it said that one week from the date a debate was adjourned constitutes undue delay in bringing it forward again. We tend to get novel propositions from Hon. Neil Oliver and I would not mind that if they were at least commendable, novel propositions. This motion has all the worst elements of intruding into well-established procedures and doing so without justification.

On the general principle, putting aside the question of the abattoir altogether, I ask members opposite, as well as those on this side of the House, to reject this motion and to allow our normal procedures to go ahead.

**HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [11.29 a.m.]:** We have just witnessed a brilliant piece of acting by the Attorney General.

If the Attorney General really wants to know why Hon. Neil Oliver is worried, it is because he has a complete lack of trust—

**Hon. T. G. Butler:** Of Hon. Neil Oliver.

**Hon. A. A. LEWIS:** No, the entire Opposition has no trust in the Attorney General and the Leader of the House. Where can one find a little thread to hang any trust on this Government's word?

We find it hard to trust the Government, especially after the way it prorogued Parliament last year, which it did because it was gutless and would not face up to two Select Committees. All members know that. Government members ran for cover like rabbits by proroguing Parliament. The Government only got here with 30 seconds to spare in order to stick the notice on the door; it nearly mucked it up.

I will not support Mr Oliver's motion if I can get an assurance from the Attorney that this matter will be dealt with first thing on Tuesday. If I can get that assurance—but of course the Attorney General is too busy discussing other things to give me that assurance!

**Hon. S. M. Piantadosi:** A blatant misuse of power.

**Hon. A. A. LEWIS:** I will use all the power I have to bring some sense to the Parliament.

As for the Attorney's excuse for not proceeding because Mr Dans is not here, the point needs to be made that it is not the Opposition that calls the House together. This Government

has an absolutely shocking record for the attendance in Parliament of its Ministers.

**Hon. J. M. Berinson:** Rubbish! I thought you were improving with age.

**Hon. A. A. LEWIS:** Mr Berinson does not like being told the truth.

**Hon. J. M. Berinson:** It is not the truth.

**Hon. A. A. LEWIS:** The attendance record of Labor Ministers in the House is the worst I have seen since I have been here, which is a lot longer than Mr Berinson has been here.

**Hon. S. M. Piantadosi:** We liked you better when you were a Liberal.

**Hon. A. A. LEWIS:** The Government may need my vote. I am trying to reach a compromise and to have an assurance given that the debate will come on next Tuesday. If I could only get that assurance I would be willing to defeat this motion.

**Hon. J. M. Berinson:** That is the same as passing the motion. The question is, who manages the business of the House?

**Hon. A. A. LEWIS:** The House is the master of its own destiny and it is evenly spread with decision-makers.

After his performance last night the Attorney should not give us any nonsense about the business of the House being taken out of the Government's hands. That was an example of the complete discourtesy displayed by the Labor Government. I was given a list of Bills to be dealt with this week yet the Government went on with a heap of other matters. The Attorney and his advisers displayed a complete lack of courtesy to me, and it is not the first time it has happened. He can smile wistfully and be pleasant if he likes and talk about our taking the business out of the hands of the Government, but—

**Hon. Fred McKenzie:** I apologised to you about that. It was my fault.

**Hon. A. A. LEWIS:** The courtesy should have been paid to me to start off with. Mr Berinson has a hide to talk about our taking the business of the House out of the hands of the Government.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! It is a brand new era in the operations of the House that we are sitting on Thursday morning. I was rather hoping that it would bring with it a brand new approach to how we speak to each other. Yesterday I said that one of the requirements in this place is that when addressing another member, members should use the prefix "honourable". Whether members like it or not

is not the point. The point is, that is the procedure. Until that procedure is changed, it will be insisted upon. I overlook it from time to time because in debate a member can inadvertently overlook the use of the prefix, but when the oversight goes on consistently it is my responsibility to draw the member's attention to it. I take this opportunity to draw Hon. A. A. Lewis' attention to it because I was going to suggest to him that if he occasionally could make some reference to the motion it would be better for the debate.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Thank you for your guidance, Mr President. I am a little at a loss about what to say when I am dealing with comments made by the Attorney when he was allowed to make comments on certain matters, but I am not allowed to follow up his comments by commenting on those other comments, if you follow me, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: The old saying is, two wrongs do not make a right.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Well, that was put in another form at one stage of the game, and it might have to be again.

The Government's arguments and its lack of an assurance that we could debate Mr Oliver's motion for his Select Committee next Tuesday are running parallel to what the Government did last year. I do not think it would be silly enough to prorogue Parliament again, but having seen the false starts to this session, when we were given about three dates for when we would be called together, and with Mr Dans' absence—which is noticeable to people who watch this House—it seems the Government obviously does not know what it is doing. We could have adjourned last night and come back next Tuesday. How long will it take for Caucus to decide whether the Government will support Mr Oliver's motion?

The Notice Paper indicates that a Bill was introduced last night, one which the Attorney General wants to rush through today. He expects courtesies to be shown to him but he is not prepared to show similar courtesies to a back-bencher. I do not think Mr Oliver really wants to deal with his motion today, but he would like to have a firm commitment on when the Government is prepared to deal with it. Hon. Joe Berinson wants his own way; he wants courtesies to be extended to him while not being prepared to tell a member when his motion will come up for debate.

Hon. T. G. Butler: Where is the urgency?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am talking about courtesies, something Hon. Tom Butler may not understand because he has not been here very long. It is normal courtesy for a member to be told when his motion is to come on for debate. I am sure Hon. Tom Butler would agree that is a nice way of doing things.

Hon. T. G. Butler: Where is the urgency?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am not talking about the urgency but about trying to learn from a rudderless Government when a certain motion is to be discussed. This rudderless Government cannot even make a decision without going to Caucus about when a motion is to be discussed. That is what Hon. Joe Berinson has told us.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I did not.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Joe Berinson said that; he said it had to go to Caucus, and that Caucus had not made a decision. He offered every excuse under the sun.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Those members are behaving improperly and are out of order. If they want me to, I will raise my voice.

Hon. Joe Berinson said that Caucus had to deal with this matter. Did he say that? Of course he did. Is that not correct? He said Caucus had not decided who would be on the committee. How long is that going to take? We are not told. So Hon. Neil Oliver has to wait and wait on the so-called courtesy of the Government.

My party meetings are open, free and frank, which is more than either side of this House can say.

Hon. Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It goes in one ear and out the other, and I do not have to listen to too much nonsense from other people.

Is there a chance that somebody under Hon. Joe Berinson's instructions can give an assurance as to when this matter will come on and when the Government will pick up the ball and say, "Mr Oliver, you can deal with your motion on Tuesday or Wednesday." If the Government can tell us that I do not think that I or most members of the Opposition would support Mr Oliver's motion. But if the Government cannot tell us that, it will force everybody into the situation of supporting his motion.

Do not give us the nonsense that we are taking the business out of the Government's hands; do not try that one on, because we know what happens to business when it is in the Government's hands—the Government runs

away and prorogues Parliament. It does everything it can to get out of dealing with business on the Notice Paper. It is that distrust of the Government and its performance that causes this sort of motion to be brought up. The Government has made its bed, and now it must lie in it. It is useless Hon. Joe Berinson saying that we are taking the business out of the Government's hands. What are members meant to do—just be kicked to death?

Hon. Mark Nevill: How long has it been on the Notice Paper?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It does not matter. It is the distrust of the Government that has caused the problem.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: You have trouble trusting anybody.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, I do not. I trust Mr McKenzie implacably, and always have, and I trust a few other people around the place. There are three blokes sitting in front of me whom I trust!

If we can get an assurance from the Government that this matter will be dealt with on Tuesday or Wednesday next week it will give the Government time to get to its Caucus and make a decision about whether it will accept or oppose this suggestion, and I think this matter can then be dealt with very quickly, and trust again will come back into this place. I believe it is only a lack of trust that has caused the problem.

#### *Personal Explanation*

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [11.44 a.m.]—by leave: Hon. Sandy Lewis has invited me to give an undertaking that the substantive motion on the Select Committee will be brought on next Tuesday if the motion now before the House is adjourned. I want to make it clear that I cannot give that assurance. To do so would be inconsistent with the Government's basic objection to the procedures which Mr Oliver is attempting to intrude into our agenda.

I can say that immediately upon the return of Hon. Des Dans, as the Minister responsible for representing Mr Grill in this House, I will draw all relevant discussions and motions to his attention—in particular the expressions of concern by various members that the procedures of the House should be expedited in order to enable the substantive motion on the Select Committee to be debated. That is as far as I can go;

the rest would be a matter for the discretion of Hon. Des Dans.

#### *Debate Resumed*

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [11.46 a.m.]: When one hears Hon. Joe Berinson shouting loudly one knows he is on the back foot and that he feels he is in the wrong. We heard calls last year from the Government that it needed to get on with Government business. I ask members to look at today's Notice Paper, and they will see there is virtually no Government business listed. No solid suggestion can be made and supported that we are holding up Government business. Of course we are not, and Hon. Sandy Lewis quite rightly pointed out that this House surely is master of its own destiny when this sort of decision has to be made. There is no Government business on the Notice Paper.

The Government said last year that it had to proceed with its business, and the Opposition agreed when there were issues of vital importance on the Notice Paper. When we agreed to the Government's proceeding with its legislation we assumed that once the legislation had been completed we would go on with the motions which were listed on the paper. The Government abused the system by saying it had finished its business and it was not coming back. It closed the doors on the Opposition. The Government set the rules and then it broke them. It said, "We are not going to take any more; it is our business or nothing." Members should remember that for ever and a day, and realise that the Government had no intention on that day last year to progress to the Opposition motions which were before the House—motions of vital importance.

I suggest that from Hon. Joe Berinson's comments now it is obvious the Government has absolutely no intention whatever of proceeding to support this Select Committee. He has refused to give any undertaking that the motion will be dealt with by the Government at a later stage. I suggest that next week there will be six, a dozen, or 18 Bills coming into this House and the Government will say that it cannot deal with this motion because there is too much Government business and the Opposition cannot interfere with that.

Let us not be fooled by the Attorney's statement. Let us remember what happened last year. We will always be aware of what this Government is prepared to do. Come hell or high water it will prevent or oppose the Select Committee motion we are putting forward.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: We are the Government; that is precisely the point.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am saying the Government is intent on preventing this motion from proceeding. Its excuse will always be that there is too much Government business. The point I am making is there is no Government business to be dealt with immediately. There is only the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill, and we have given an undertaking to deal with that today. The Opposition will make sure the Bill goes through, but it is the only one of any urgency on the Notice Paper.

There is no argument about it at all. The people who reside in the areas I represent are deeply concerned about this issue. In addition, deep concern has been expressed by the business and farming communities. This House should at least be in a position to make a decision. All the Opposition suggests is that a Select Committee of this House be set up to investigate the sale of the Midland abattoir and saleyards and ascertain what has happened.

A suggestion has been made that there has been ministerial bias and political patronage regarding this matter and that public property was sold off cheaply, maybe as a favour. Those suggestions may be right or wrong and all I am suggesting is that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to ascertain whether the Government has anything to hide. The committee may report that what the Government did was right and proper and that all it was proposing to do was fair and reasonable, not only to the farming community, but also to the business community in the Midland district.

All the calls about the Opposition taking work out of the Government's hands is so much garbage, especially after the actions of this Government last year. For that reason we should proceed with the motion and appoint a Select Committee in order that the farming and business communities and everyone concerned will know whether the Government's actions have been proper.

I can give a guarantee that next week the Government will try to frustrate any motion which is introduced into this House and which suggests a Select Committee be appointed to investigate its dealings concerning the Midland abattoir. It is obvious, from statements which have been made, that the Government will not give a guarantee to debate this motion next week and that it believes the work of this Parliament is in the hands of the Government.

The Attorney General has indicated from his statement that debate on this motion will not progress. If a statement were made to the effect the debate on this motion would proceed the Opposition would consider that fair enough. However, that sort of guarantee has not been given because the Government has no intention of progressing to the stage of appointing a Select Committee.

I support the motion.

HON. E. J. CHARLTON (Central) [11.52 a.m.]: It is disappointing that debate on this motion has progressed in the way it has. Members should approach this motion in a more commonsense and logical way to avoid the debate becoming bogged down.

We are faced with two problems and these have already been mentioned by Hon. Sandy Lewis. First, Hon. Neil Oliver has erred in trying to force the issue today. Secondly, it appears that Hon. Joe Berinson is not prepared to make a commitment that the Government will bring forward this motion for debate as soon as Hon. Des Dans returns from the Eastern States.

We have two extremes and instead of common sense prevailing in order to work out this problem in a businesslike manner, we appear to be having a bun fight about it.

The Address-in-Reply debate has not been completed, yet Hon. Neil Oliver is trying to force an issue because he believes that debate on his motion will be held over and, perhaps, it will not be debated at all.

Knowing the intention of Hon. Neil Oliver, Hon. Joe Berinson should inform the House that the Address-in-Reply debate has not been completed and that as soon as it is he will give a guarantee that debate on the motion which is now being discussed will be brought forward.

We have two extremes; we are making accusations against one another and bringing up past issues. If commonsense does not prevail today there is nothing to prevent any member in this place next week moving a similar motion to that moved by Hon. Neil Oliver. I would be happy to see the debate adjourned because I believe it would allow commonsense to prevail.

The National Party supports any motion to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the sale of the Midland saleyards. It is a red hot issue and it is of extreme concern to the people who are affected by the sale. It has been publicised that the sale has taken place, yet the people employed at the yards have not been told from when it will be effective. They do not

know whether it will be two, five, or eight years or whether, in fact, they will have to move. The Minister for Agriculture has held discussions with the people concerned, but he has not been able to give them an indication of what will take place. No-one is sure whether the saleyards will remain or whether they will be resited.

The motion moved by Hon. Neil Oliver is correct, but I wish it had not been moved today because it has not achieved anything. All it has done is forced an issue and created another debacle in this House.

I do not believe that the Government would bring forward Government business next week and place motions like this one at the bottom of the Notice Paper. If it did, it would take only a majority of members to move that the motion be debated. This cannot go on for ever.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are getting a bit weak-kneed.

Hon. E. J. CHARLTON: Hon. David Wordsworth can say that, but I make the point that the motion could still sit on the Notice Paper after debate on the Address-in-Reply has been completed. What is the point in our having an argument about it?

Hon. G. E. Masters: Parliament could be prorogued!

Hon. E. J. CHARLTON: Anything could happen. No-one wants to see this issue settled more than I and my National Party colleagues. Hon. David Wordsworth has been in this House longer than I have and he knows that it does not matter which party is in Government; it will do what it wants to do.

I happen to be a member of the National Party and it was announced prior to the commencement of Parliament that members of the National Party would take a responsible position concerning debate in this House. When Hon. Mick Gayfer seconded the motion he said that he was taking that action reluctantly and the National Party members are united on the point he made.

I am making these comments in the hope—not to be accused of being weak-kneed—that when a decision is made we will not be weak-kneed about it. I hope also that we will not be weak-kneed when it comes to considering the findings of the Select Committee inquiry. However, the important point at the moment is that we get the Select Committee up and running.

I think it is essential that members take a deep breath and consider this matter carefully. I am disappointed that Hon. Joe Berinson was not prepared to say that the debate would proceed on the return of Hon. Des Dans. He still has the opportunity to do that. If Hon. Des Dans does not return on Tuesday or Wednesday next week I am sure the motion will be debated because the Government would have demonstrated that it was not prepared to proceed with it.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You do agree that a lot of Bills will be introduced into this House next week and it is likely that this motion will be buried again.

Hon. E. J. CHARLTON: It will not be buried again. The Government now has the message and under the system which operates in this Parliament I assure the House that the motion will be debated.

I reiterate that members are defeating the purpose by handling debate on this motion in the way they are.

#### *Adjournment of Debate*

HON. FRED MCKENZIE (North-East Metropolitan) [12.01 p.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes 16

Hon. J. M. Berinson	Hon. Robert
Hon. J. M. Brown	Hetherington
Hon. T. G. Butler	Hon. Garry Kelly
Hon. E. J. Charlton	Hon. B. L. Jones
Hon. Graham	Hon. A. A. Lewis
Edwards	Hon. Mark Nevill
Hon. John Halden	Hon. S. M. Piantadosi
Hon. Kay Hallahan	Hon. D. W. Wenn
Hon. T. R. Helm	Hon. Fred McKenzie

(Teller)

#### Noes 13

Hon. C. J. Bell	Hon. Neil Oliver
Hon. J. N. Caldwell	Hon. P. G. Pandal
Hon. G. M. Evans	Hon. John Williams
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. D. J.
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Wordsworth
Hon. P. H. Lockyer	Hon. Margaret
Hon. G. E. Masters	McAlcer
Hon. N. F. Moore	

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. W. N. Stretch
Hon. Tom Stephens	Hon. Tom McNeil

Question thus passed.

Debate thus adjourned.



**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY***Motion, as Amended*

Debate resumed from 25 June.

**HON. P. H. LOCKYER** (Lower North) [12.05 p.m.]: I wish to comment on the continued attack by this Government and previous Governments of all political persuasions on the hotel industry. On Tuesday the Premier made a statement to Parliament concerning the financial predicament of the State under the Burke socialist Government, and once again part of the attack was centred on the entertainment industry. In particular, the Government raised charges for the hotel industry including Licensing Court charges, notwithstanding that this industry will be required to carry the costs of the fringe benefits tax and increased charges across the board.

The industry is a huge employer of people. I wonder when the time will come when people in the industry and Governments will say, "That is enough." People in the industry are rapidly going broke and I wonder when it will finally be recognised that they will be unable to employ people if they have to absorb more increases in charges.

I heard the Premier on a talkback radio programme yesterday say that people have the option of whether or not they spend their money on entertainment, especially in hotels. That option will soon pass by. As fewer people frequent hotels, more hotels will close and there will be less employment for people who find it extremely difficult to find employment elsewhere.

There has been some publicity in the Press recently about two hotels, one in Kalgoorlie and the other in Victoria Park. Some controversy has surrounded the Main Reef Tavern in Boulder because the barmaid wears no clothes. In the Broken Hill Hotel at Victoria Park, a 17-year-old girl has been employed as an entertainer and she was recently in court as a result of her act. The Minister for Health has called for action to be taken against the proprietor of the Main Reef Tavern in Boulder because he employs a naked barmaid.

I do not necessarily approve of the activities in these hotels but they are an indication of the steps hotel owners must take to attract people to the hotels. It is a sad situation when hotels have to resort to these sorts of activities to get people through the doors.

The Premier made it quite clear that nobody forces people to drink but why is it that whenever it is necessary to raise extra funds the

Government always homes in on the entertainment industry?

I make no secret of the fact that I have great regard for the Western Australian Hotels Association Inc. I can assure members that the association is very concerned about the future of its industry. At the moment expectations for the America's Cup period are very high, but let us remember that by this time next year the America's Cup event will have been and gone. We shall then know whether or not those expectations were fulfilled, whether the goals were reached, and what sort of situation the entertainment industry is in. I hope that the America's Cup is a huge success and that afterwards business will continue at a satisfactory level. However, it will not continue if we keep imposing excessive charges on the entertainment industry. It has reached the point at which it cannot take any more.

Members of the entertainment industry are like motorists, they cop it each time additional funds need to be raised. I know that at times Governments need to cut costs and I welcome that endeavour. It would be accepted far better by the public in general if on this occasion we could get rid of those hordes of unelected advisers.

**Hon. T. G. Butler:** Hey!

**Hon. P. H. LOCKYER:** It is all right for Hon. Tom Butler. He would have turned white if I had said that six months ago, because he was one such adviser. He saw the writing on the wall and, for the first time in his life, had to do some hard work and become a member of Parliament!

I welcome Hon. Tom Butler into this Chamber, and all the other members who were elected for the first time, as well as those who were re-elected. I also congratulate Hon. Kay Hallahan upon her elevation to the frontbench, even though at times she and I have spirited conversations both in and out of the Chamber. I have a very high regard for her abilities and my early dealings with her as a Minister have been most fruitful and professional; and I look forward to a continuing association with her and with other Ministers.

I also congratulate you, Mr Deputy President, and the President, for successfully retaining your respective offices. While the National Party had the opportunity to upset tradition it chose not to, and that is certainly to its benefit.

**Hon. H. W. Gayfer** interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Yes, I am well aware of the honourable member who, incidentally, does not have the opportunity these days to hit me over the head with a *Hansard* book when I annoy him, because my position in the Chamber has changed.

Another point I wish to raise is my great concern for the fishing industry, which I have brought to the attention of the House before. Successive Governments—the Court-O'Connor Liberal Government and then the first Burke Government—saw fit to study the wet fish industry in the Shark Bay fishery. It is accepted that the continued pressure on the fishing industry throughout the world simply cannot be maintained. There are several reasons for this, the first and foremost being the more professional and scientific methods used to take both wet fish and shellfish. These methods are placing more pressure on fisheries, and there is no greater pressure than that placed on the wet fish fishery at Shark Bay.

I commend the Fisheries Department for the decision, which was passed on to the Government and has since become law, to restrict the number of boats allowed to fish in the snapper fishery in Shark Bay. While this decision was not totally welcomed by all in the industry, it was not made without considerable consultation by the industry itself and by the department; and finally a decision was made by the Minister concerned.

I must admit I do not feel that anybody else but he should have made the decision because it was not an easy one and I did not envy him. However, the decision has been made that a certain number of boats only should operate in the fishery, and restrictions have been laid down as to the taking of fish.

That is a sign of the times, and I understand that there are already proposals for a reduction in the number of pots allowed to take rock lobster. From time to time members will have pressure applied to them by lobby groups from the fishing industries asking for support in not having these measures brought in, but I advise honourable members to think very carefully about this type of decision. While the decisions will affect some people involved in the industry, it is my view that these measures are a step firmly in the right direction. The fishery simply cannot stand the pressure being applied to it by the better fishing methods, faster boats, and more efficient handling and marketing of fish. Only one thing can be done, and that is to impose limitations.

It is a shame that more regard is not given to the fishing industry as a primary production industry, which really it is. It is no different from farming or other industries which produce food in our food chain.

I am happy to say that two or three years ago some restrictions were placed on prawn fishing at Exmouth Gulf. Huge ructions were heard at that time from the people involved in the fishing industry. However, members will be pleased to know that this year has been the best prawn season in the gulf for many years and I have no doubt that that is a result of the careful planning by scientists and the people involved in the Fisheries Department who made hard decisions. We are now reaping the benefits.

The prawning has been consistently good from the beginning of the season, and it is good to this day. The price of the product and the catch are both good and consequently the people who objected so strongly to the restrictions must now look a little sheepish.

Hon. Mark Nevill: They were short-sighted.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Yes, they were, but it was hard not to feel some sympathy for them because their income was restricted at that time. However, they are now making up for that and to my knowledge all survived those temporary cutbacks. If carefully farmed the industry will be in good hands.

I conclude my remarks with those comments. I support the motion.

HON. J. N. CALDWELL (South) [12.16 p.m.]: Thank you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), for giving me the opportunity to address this House today. I too would like to congratulate every member in the House who has been elected or re-elected, and I offer special congratulations to the honourable members entrusted with ministerial duties.

It has been brought to our notice that "Albany Tomorrow" has arrived in Albany with great force. Many people are thinking and talking about it, especially in the other place; and I believe one of my colleagues spoke at length on the subject last night.

The area of Albany is well-known to most people in Western Australia because of its great beauty, and the present Government has come up with the wonderful idea of the "Albany Tomorrow" project. This project has been brought forward because of a lack of confidence in Albany due to the low employment prospects for young people in the town. Those young people whom I met during my election campaign were most attentive and anxiously

hoped that this situation would improve. However, it has not improved to date.

Currently a new industry in Albany is striving and struggling to start, with no apparent help from the Government. Many letters have been written to various Ministers over the last few months, and I am happy to say that last Monday a reply was received which indicated that some consideration would be given to helping the industry.

The industry concerned is The Able Star Air Handpiece. For those who do not know of it, the industry has a very troubled history. It has been in and out of production twice before; and it is regrettable that some of the decisions which forced it out of production were parliamentary decisions.

The Able Star Air Handpiece does not heat up because it is cooled by air and by oil flowing over the cutters. It has come to my notice that in New Zealand the workers' union is going to strive for an award of \$250 to shear goats. I mention these goats, although they have no relationship to Hon. Eric Charlton's goat, or his horse, which he mentioned last week in his speech.

These goats apparently struggle and strain. They become rather fidgety and agitated with the hot handpiece running over them and make a great effort to get away. Therefore they are hard to shear. These shearers are going for an award of \$250. That is more than a 100 per cent increase on what our sheep are shorn for here. If this new handpiece is introduced the shearers will not have grounds for continuing with that unrealistic award. Of course, if they do get this award we can be assured that it will come into Australia. Attempts will be made to raise the award here.

This handpiece could be a wonderful thing for Australia because it would keep the costs down for the farmers. I am sure that is exactly what people in the country want nowadays. The Industrial Development Department, has said private enterprise would help in this venture. That is probably wishful thinking. Investment in country areas has not been encouraged by taxes which are hitting country people right, left and centre. As soon as this venture got underway, the fringe benefits tax would need to be considered. It would be another noose around its neck.

The centralisation of wool handling in Fremantle is of concern to me because recently attempts have been made to have wool handling centralised in Fremantle. I urge the

Government to resist all measures of centralisation. We already have the Port of Albany and the Albany wool stores. They are wonderful wool stores; they are well built and maintained. Centralising of wool at Fremantle would overload the facilities and necessitate more buildings in Fremantle. Moreover, woolgrowing is on the increase in the surrounding districts owing to the demise of the wheat industry. This wool industry is of great benefit to Albany, and the farming communities provide the people with immense support with jobs and services. Many other industries, large and small, are under stress in Albany. I urge the Government to do all in its power to maintain them or help them to increase in size and productivity. Let us all support the "Albany Tomorrow" programme, especially if it includes the whole of the great southern region. It would have been more apt to have called the programme "Albany Today". However, that was not the name given to it.

I have already touched on the beauty of the south coast and its tourism potential. The tourism potential in Albany and along the south coast itself could be a wonderful boon for the area. Tourism is now the biggest industry in the world. A newspaper report headed "Tourism is growing in WA" states—

In the latest edition of its publication "Touristics," the division says that \$2000 billion was generated in 1983 by tourism which is growing at an average rate of four per cent a year.

It has outstripped international defence spending, estimated at \$1160 billion in 1983.

Projections indicate that world tourism will generate \$2750 billion in 1990.

In Western Australia, tourism ranks third behind mining and agriculture and is growing rapidly.

Touristics says that international traffic at Perth Airport has increased by 22 per cent in the past year, reflecting one of the biggest growth factors in the world.

Some two or three years ago my family and I were lucky enough to tour America. We got to know some fine Americans. When travelling on a tourist bus on that trip we happened to be sitting next to an American couple and we discussed where we came from. When they found out we came from Perth they said, "We didn't really know that that was an important place. We thought there were only two important places in Australia: Melbourne and Sydney. We

had heard that Australia was a beautiful place but we were told by our tourist agent that there was no airport in Perth. We thought that small planes could possibly land but that there was no international airport". It just goes to show how ill-informed these people are about the potential of Western Australia. Here is hoping the America's Cup will bring Perth to the notice of the world and prove that we really do exist.

In previous speeches my National Party colleagues have dealt at length with the horrendous problems facing the farming community. I will speak briefly on small business, of which farming is an integral part. Today, the success of the small business depends not only on hard work, managerial expertise and a bit of luck. Its survival depends on coping with a myriad forms and red tape that Governments present it with. Filling in forms has fast become a disincentive for small business, with forms for business registrations, payroll tax, certificates, Government by-laws, antipollution, questionnaires and statistical information about every detail in our farms and shops. To top it off, we now have to cope with the fringe benefits tax. No wonder small business people are giving up or selling out or have gone broke. No longer do we hear the cry, "Get big or get out". It is now, "If you don't want to fall, stay small". The family and associated small businesses are the hub of our society. Let us give them a chance and all possible support.

Mining has been hailed as a saviour of the agricultural areas. I agree that it may be a short-term help but in the long term it could be economically and environmentally damaging and mean complete and utter suicide. The great southern regional economic studies suggest that the right of the private landholders' veto be abolished for the good of the State. I totally and unequivocally reject that under the present regulations of the Mining Act and I will explain why.

I am not saying that I am against mining altogether in the great southern region, however there have to be some constraints. At the moment the power of veto seems to be the only one. Take gold for example; that seems to be in the limelight at the present time. I wish to quote from a report titled "Conservation and Rehabilitation in the Gold-mining Industry" of November 1985, page 13 and 15, as follows—

The act provides very wide powers to the landholder to control and regulate or prevent exploration or mining on his land. It also establishes compensation pro-

cedures and enables conditions to be applied including rehabilitation requirements.

The gold-mining industry in Western Australia is generally acknowledged to have had a poor record of environmental management.

Along with the price rises of the 1970's there have been some major changes in technology which are having significant effects on the gold industry. Whereas in the past most non-alluvial ore bodies were worked by underground mining, most are now being mined by open-pit methods, often embracing previous underground workings. This change means that much greater areas of land are being disturbed by the gold-mining operations, and the environmental problems of large waste dumps and worked out pits must be faced.

The carbon-in-pulp (CIP) process, now widely used, has led to extremely efficient gold recovery, and this has meant that lower-grade ores can be economically treated.

With this very diverse industry it is not possible to generalise on the overall level of current environmental management. However, with a few exceptions, levels of environmental awareness and management are well below those of other sectors of the mining industry.

I recently attended a mining seminar at Mt Barker at which I asked questions about rehabilitation of the goldmining areas. I was told that rarely were those areas refilled because the cost was too great. Waste dumps and overburdens were generally contoured but were considered useless for agriculture. Many experts say that mining is so minimal in the great southern that there should be no concern about it. I assure members that there is great concern about it and that Mines Department figures substantiate that concern. The prospecting licences that have been taken out in the great southern region cover an area of 8 668 hectares. Exploration licences cover a total of 208 859 hectares, and mining licences an area 5 428 hectares. Those figures cannot be taken lightly when they are related to this farming area. In the Katanning area, the mining companies are pegging claims all over the place and they are of genuine concern to us all.

Given the amount of gold deposits in the great southern and the ease of recovery nowadays, that wonderful farming country could

look like the surface of the moon in 50 years' time. Is it any wonder that I support the private landholders' right to veto?

There is also the problem of compensation to be agreed between the two parties. Since the Government's new amendments to the Mining Act, the parties have no common ground on which to agree. The problem is the unrealistic expectation of the legislation which somehow expects a mining company to be able to negotiate for the farmers' consent under section 29 (2), given the constraints contained in section 123. One of those constraints is social disruption compensation. I defy any person to accurately put a monetary figure on social disruption given any set of circumstances. The amount of compensation that is expected to be paid by the mining company now is practically non-negotiable. The fairest way, of course, is a percentage of the mineral extracted from the ground. It is very simple. For example, the more land mined and the more land disturbed, the higher the compensation. However, that is illegal here; it is not in America or England, but it is here. Why? I suppose it is too simple.

The only way out for both parties is the Warden's Court. There will be plenty of action there under this present Act. Once again, the private landholder is at a great disadvantage. He possibly has very little money to fight the case so he will more than likely give in or accept compensation that he thinks is inadequate.

There we have it. The private landholder does not really want his land destroyed or, if he has signed an exploration licence, he would like adequate compensation for it, which compensation, under the present circumstances, he is not likely to get.

Gold, and most other minerals for that matter, are once-in-a-lifetime commodities for the agricultural area, but a juicy steak will go on reproducing itself forever. Is it any wonder the right to veto must remain?

My attention has been drawn to the acute shortage of nurses, especially in country towns. The retraining of former nurses would be only a short-term solution to the problem. More young people need to be enrolled immediately. I know of one girl in the Lake Grace area who has been attempting to enrol in a nursing course for 15 months, yet her attempts have been thwarted. I recommend to the Minister for Health, Hon. Ian Taylor, that immediate steps be taken to remedy this problem and to make more facilities available for nurse train-

ing, particularly for school leavers who are finding it difficult to obtain jobs.

My colleague, Hon. Mick Gayfer, made some comments about financial institutions. I would like to lend my support to his words of condemnation of them. In 1980 everyone was full of confidence. The "get big or get out" comments were ringing in everyone's ears. Agricultural advice was for the farmer to grow more grain and to expand. Hire-purchase agreements abounded. There was an endless stream of mail and literature recommending credit cards and taxation perks. Nobody thought anything about paying \$25 000 for a ram. How many times, when we attended sales, did we hear the words, "Don't worry about what it costs, just buy it. We will sort out the money tomorrow"? Bank managers in country areas were canvassing loans in the streets and in the clubs telling people that there was plenty of money to be had. By "plenty" I mean "millions". Everybody was astounded. I labelled those financial institutions "money pushers" and we know what this community thinks of pushers. Is it any wonder that farmers and business people were enticed into accepting what appeared to be attractive offers? Borrowings were made at 14 per cent or less, and within 12 months in most cases, were at 24 per cent. Can members imagine what an extra \$100 000 on top of an existing loan of \$1 million meant for those people?

In an article in *The West Australian* of 11 June, Mr Ray Finlayson, the President of the Country Shire Councils Association of Western Australia, said—

The banks have become our rich masters and not our servants. Money has become a god to the mining institutions, which are overprotected and have built up huge reserves.

He continued—

I have supported private enterprise all my life, but I believe that the banks are now influenced too much by greed rather than by humanitarian motives.

So now the doors have closed on those unfortunate residents in the country areas. Farms and businesses are being forced to go out of production or are being sold up. The pity of it all is that these people are mostly pioneers and were well respected in the community. They built up their assets around their families' togetherness with long hours of hard work. All is now lost. My opinion is that the lenders, as well as the borrowers, should be responsible for the debts incurred by this community. If this is not

halted soon it will have a snowballing effect and we will all be gone.

As a first-year member of Parliament I am privileged to be selected to serve on the Standing Orders Committee. I assure honourable members that I will do my utmost to see that we, as a committee, do not destroy its traditions. I regard tradition and the environment as integral parts of our lives. We must continue to cherish them and never tamper with them unduly. However, there are times when change can be of benefit to all, as has been recently demonstrated in this House.

As you, Mr President, and other long-standing members look around, it would be evident to you that some of your ex-colleagues are not present. One such person is Mr Tom Knight, my predecessor. On behalf of all South Province electors, I thank him for the dedicated work he did for all. I sincerely thank all honourable members and staff for the cordial way in which I have been received. They have made my introduction to Parliament a pleasure.

Finally, I give heartfelt thanks to my wife and my family and every person who has supported me. I will do all possible to bring well-being to the people in this wonderful State of Western Australia. Thank you.

[Applause.]

*Sitting suspended from 12.42 to 2.30 p.m.*

**HON. TOM HELM** (North) [2.32 p.m.]: Thank you, Mr President, for the opportunity to support the motion. I thank you and the staff of this Chamber, plus my fellow members, for all the help and advice they have given me since I first arrived here.

I would also like to express my thanks to the people of North Province for their confidence in the ALP, and I assure them that neither the ALP nor I will let them down.

I especially would like to thank all those people, both party members and others, who worked so hard during the election campaign, and in the hot conditions on 8 February to achieve our victory. I wonder how much support we would have to hold elections for the north in the winter?

I am very proud to be an integral part of the Labor team and would like to record my thanks to Peter Dowding, whose talents will be missed in this place, but who feels that he can make an effective contribution in the other Chamber. The work that he did in not only winning back the North Province for Labor but also in

representing the people of that area, will never be forgotten, and must have played a leading role in our election victory. That good work was then built on by the member for Pilbara, Pam Buchanan—our own quiet achiever—whose own work-rate and dedication were reflected in her election success.

The member for Kimberley has once again done us proud by his elevation, and the people of North Province would not take kindly to any moves to stop Ernie Bridge from becoming a Minister of the Crown. We are not surprised that his talents have at last been officially recognised—we have known about them for a long time. I congratulate him.

Hon. Tom Stephens is well-known to this House and it is right to say that actions speak louder than words. Tom was campaign manager for three candidates and all were successful. He knows we are all grateful and will not forget the work he did, not only during the campaign but also as an elected member.

The North Province has a dedicated and hard working team, both elected and unelected, and I am very proud to be one of them.

I would like to follow the lead given by my colleague for North Province, Hon. Tom Stephens, and adopt a conciliatory approach in my remarks and also comment upon statements made by some of the previous speakers. I do realise how lucky I am to speak at the end of this debate, and I would like to speak on Labor philosophy and the need for consultation rather than confrontation.

Having been a rigger for Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd in the Pilbara, perhaps I can speak with some authority on the rewards of consultation and the rewards which have resulted from people working together. If we look at the areas where the widest consultation has taken place—for instance, in the iron ore industry in the Pilbara—we see the effects of using consensus in its most effective form. Days lost through industrial action have been reduced drastically; export tonnages are reaching record levels; and unpalatable decisions are being made jointly by everyone who is directly affected. Sometimes those who are indirectly affected are consulted and given consideration. This is a prime example of cooperation between unions and management, and this has been promoted by State and Federal Governments. It is time we recognised the contributions that can be made by all sections of our society, regardless of our differences, if we are concerned

about the future of our State, instead of trying to score points from each other.

Perhaps I should say at this stage, Mr President, that the word has gone around that I have been a pommie shop steward. Well, the first part is true; I suppose I will always be a pommie, but at least I can now say I am an Australian and I am proud of it. However, I have never been a shop steward, a convenor, or a full-time union organiser in Australia. I have been an active trade unionist during all my working life and I indicate at this stage that the result of my being involved in the union and being aware of what it does has helped me to understand better both the Australian and English systems and also to make a contribution in that area. It is the contributions which are made by unions, particularly in the Pilbara, which affect everybody in the community.

Let us try to look at things in a positive, rather than a negative way. For instance, one speaker suggests that we are governed by the ACTU. While as a trade unionist I may not find that idea altogether bad, I would recognise that one of the causes of our present predicament is our failure to consult all interested parties when we are planning the directions our nation should take.

Surely the ACTU has a legitimate role to play in this nation's future. It seems that there is general agreement that wages have an important place in the nation's economy, so should not the peak council of the unionised wage and salary earners be consulted with the available facts, to enable that council to make decisions that are better for them and the industry in which they are involved?

Although workers may not have a big capital investment in industry, there is the total investment of their future; and, in many cases, the future of their children is invested in industry. A consultative method of conducting our affairs is more productive than our age-old system of confrontation, which has been tried, tested, and found to be wanting.

Perhaps that is the message I bring from the north. For instance, there is great concern over the effects of the fringe benefits tax and Government regulations on small business. For the most part, however, that is treated as an integral part of everyone's lifestyle in the north and, like the weather, it can be coped with.

There is a greater threat to these small, local businesses, particularly in the north, and that is the power of the big businesses which have the

ability to shut down many of the smaller enterprises which have been operating in our towns with marginal profits. For example, the North-West Shelf project has resulted in the establishment of big businesses in the area and the smaller enterprises cannot compete. Now that the big name competition has taken over, the small enterprises find that they cannot afford to compete in respect of the prices for which they sell their goods and also, when there is a shortage of shopping areas or space to rent, they cannot afford the exorbitant rents that are being asked. I just wonder in our society whether that is called fair or unfair competition.

Some members may be surprised to hear how many times small businesses have been helped by union organisers who have had to approach major contractors to pay the correct rate for a job that has been given to subcontractors. This problem of pyramid contracting has been referred to by a previous speaker, but I wonder how they would fare under proposed job deregulation. There was some talk of job deregulation before the election and we already have some effects of that in the subcontracting field.

Many tenants have been assisted by the union movement when they are victims of unscrupulous landlords trying to take advantage of the extreme housing shortages in the north.

Honourable members opposite have been most eloquent in their descriptions of the plight of the rural sector, and we in the north are aware of their problems and are sympathetic. But we are no strangers to hardship either. Mining communities are made up of people who know about suffering, but we also live in an area where many Aboriginal communities consider economic hardship a way of life, and it is not one bit easier to accept because of it. We still have communities without adequate water, power, or health facilities. It is generally accepted that more work has to be done to help our first Australians. I am pleased to hear that aid to these communities will not be affected by the economic crisis we face; and that decision is to be applauded and will be appreciated by the people concerned.

We have been asked which stance on electoral reform is being pursued by the Government. The only answer I can give is that it seems to me to be the one that is most acceptable to the Opposition in this place. Many proposals have been debated in many forums, but if we are serious about reform, then it is up to the Government to propose the one that is closest to the one-vote-one-value which has

always been part of the ALP's platform. But of course, we accept that there has to be room for compromise.

I was interested to hear a member comment that his son was learning to bake scones, when he felt he would have been better off learning maths or English or some other skill that would help him in the job market. I suppose that is true to some extent. I have been involved in P & C activities for quite a long time, and it has been my experience that for the most part the direction taken by the Education Department has met with a great deal of community support.

I was a delegate to the annual conference of WACSSO—the peak council of P & C's, and the debate on our standard of education did not take up much of the agenda, except on how best we could implement the Beazley report recommendations regarding community involvement in schools. That is how the P & C's felt. That is my information and that is how I became involved. I applaud the Government's programme of peace education and am pleased that my son is well aware of the nuclear threat, and how he can be involved in working for peace and in protecting our environment, which our generation and those generations before us have damaged so much—in some cases, beyond repair. Mostly this damage was unknowingly done, but perhaps if we had had the education to understand what damage we were doing, we may have found some other way to achieve our aim.

Mr President, I cannot allow this opportunity to go by without making some comment upon the mindless union militancy that we have experienced lately. If a trade union had behaved in the way we have witnessed the National Farmers Federation behaving, then the national Press would vilify it without any hesitation; but somehow it seems the rules are different for certain sections of our society.

Given the help that both the Hawke and Burke Governments have given the rural sector, surely they are entitled to a better response than they receive now. When will we learn that "jaw-jaw" is better than "war-war"? I hope the farmers can learn from the iron ore industry. They do themselves no credit by this behaviour, and I am glad that the Leaders of the Opposition distance themselves from this talk of defying the law.

Members should be aware of a success story that is happening in the Kimberley with the announced extension of the Camballin project.

This is only a part of the turnaround that has happened, and instead of multimillion dollar projects that have in the past fizzled out as quickly as they started, now smaller, cheaper, more plausible schemes are taking place in which people can participate. They are not fly-by-night, make-a-million-bucks operators, but the people who are prepared to make a commitment to the area, bringing long-term stability. This is being done with only minimum direct Government subsidy, if any, but with maximum support by way of facilities, such as roads and other forms of communications, as well as schools and medical facilities. The people and the Government are to be congratulated on the consensus and consultation processes that show progress is being made in the attempt to bring into being the great potential of this region.

Mr President, I want to finish by recording my thanks to the two people who have been the most supportive and understanding during the period up to now, my wife Edna, and my son Mark. They have had to go through the most remarkable changes, and have been there with me all the way.

I support the motion.

[Applause].

#### *Adjournment of Debate*

**HON. J. M. BROWN** (South-East) [2.45 p.m.]: I move—

*That the debate be adjourned.*

**HON. G. E. MASTERS** (West—Leader of the Opposition) [2.46 p.m.]—by leave: I point out that I had discussions with the Attorney General prior to the lunch break and he indicated he would take this course of action. The Opposition does not disagree with the move this time because an arrangement was made wherein the Opposition agreed that the Bill which the Government proposes to put before the House is one of urgency. That agreement was made before the change in the sessional orders, but I do not believe that we should take this course of action at any other time because the new sessional orders were designed to enable the Address-in-Reply to progress, and when it is adjourned for a particular day the Government would go about its business and on the following day the Address-in-Reply would continue. I understand the circumstances applying at this time, but I indicate the Opposition will take strong objection if it occurs again.

Question put and passed.



Debate thus adjourned.

### **TREASURER'S ADVANCE AUTHORIZATION BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 24 June.

**HON. G. E. MASTERS** (West—Leader of the Opposition) [2.48 p.m.]: I rise to support the legislation. My understanding is that this Bill may be treated as a Supply Bill and in that event members are able to speak on any subject they like, and obviously I will take advantage of that arrangement.

The Opposition certainly does not oppose the legislation brought forward by the Minister for Budget Management. It simply means that the Government is seeking \$150 million from the Treasurer's advance account during the financial year commencing on 1 July 1986. That will not be disputed by the Opposition, but in saying that I take the opportunity to make some remarks about what has happened over the past few days.

Over recent days the Government has presented or forecast to the public that more and more Government charges will be imposed on the community. I remind the House of a statement made in a document called "People in Business" of 4½ months ago. I quote from part of that document under the heading "Taxation and Charges" as follows—

Central to this Government's policies is the belief that taxes and charges must be kept to an absolute minimum.

Ensure the economic strategy of the last 2 State Budgets of minimising taxes and charges is maintained. This stringent policy has meant that most State Government taxes and charges have risen by less than the rate of inflation . . .

It goes on to say Labor will—

Launch new initiatives for the further reduction of payroll tax.

I point out that that was 4½ months ago. Since that announcement—in recent days—the Government has proposed more taxes, reduced services, and broken election promises. Among the tax increases that have been presented to us are the following: Payroll tax—I just referred to the Labor Party's statement in which a reduction in payroll tax was proposed—to rise by 11.3 per cent; taxes on beer and liquor to rise by 51 per cent; petrol tax to rise by 86.7 per cent; and hospital bed charges forecast to rise by an unspecified percentage, which will lead

to increased medical insurance costs. Departmental fees and charges are up by seven per cent or more.

Since 8 February and particularly in the last few weeks, there has obviously been a strong move by the Government to greatly increase Government charges, despite the comments made before the election and the promises to the electorate 4½ months ago.

I said during my speech on the Address-in-Reply there was a growing tax revolt in the community against ever-increasing Government charges and the growth of the Government sector. All Governments, whether Labor, Liberal, or National Party, ought to pay attention to what the community is saying. Woe betide them if they do not. Those increases will add fuel to the resentment at the growth of Government. An increase of between 45 per cent and 50 per cent in tobacco tax is forecast; it has not been announced, but I understand it is under consideration by the Government. So it goes on.

It is interesting that just before the Premiers' Conference took place Mr Burke made a statement to the effect that it looked as though the Government would have a deficit of \$306 million for the coming year. That is a deliberate distortion and a misleading statement. I was a Minister for three years, and I know how departments work. Mr Burke knows how they work, but the public do not.

A deficit of \$300 million sounds bad, but Mr Burke did not say that when departments come forward with their estimates and budgets every year they always put up a fairly high figure at first to continue existing services and meet the cost of new services. The figure is always pretty high. I have no doubt that when Mr Burke used the figure of \$300 million he was taking the highest figure the departments had produced. The first presentation by departments to Ministers and the Treasury was for an increase in estimates of 15.4 per cent. The Premier and I, and anyone who has been a Minister, know that those first estimates and requests from departments would be totally rejected by the Government which would say a 15 per cent increase was not tolerable and the public would not stand it. The Government would say, "We cannot lift taxes to that level; go away and do your homework", and the departments would then come back with a lower figure.

If the increase was set at seven per cent, which is the estimated inflation rate for the coming year, the Government would have a

deficit of \$91.1 million. So we are talking about a reduction from \$300 million to \$91 million. If the Government cannot save \$91 million out of a Budget of about \$3.5 billion something is wrong. I suggest that at this desperate time when people are deeply worried and concerned about what is happening the Government should say there will be no increases and that it will work within its Budget.

That is what private enterprise has to do. It cannot go out and say, "We are faced with additional costs and charges and we will charge the consumer another 10 per cent". It would not get away with it. Members opposite may laugh, but I do not suppose they have ever had to foot the bill or risk a dollar; but private enterprise cannot lift its charges by 10 per cent. Business cannot get away with it, and nor can Governments.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Have you been to a supermarket lately?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I suggest if the member went to a supermarket and some other places he would find a considerable difference in prices. Supermarkets are very competitive, and they buy at the best possible rate, and from that fierce competition—

Hon. Graham Edwards: They raise their prices.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Obviously there must be some increases.

Hon. Graham Edwards: No wonder the Government went broke when you were a Minister.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! The Leader of the Opposition will address his remarks to the Chair and ignore the unruly interjections.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I ask the members who interjected who they think is going to pay for extra water and power charges, local government rates, and payroll tax when businesses face a low margin of profit? If the Government sets an example prices could stabilise.

Hon. T. G. Butler interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: My Government increased charges in its Budget; I accept that; but I am saying the time has come when all Governments, of whatever political colour, have to cut their cloth to suit the public. I am not arguing about what happened in the past because I was part of that, and it was often accepted then that increases of 10 per cent were reasonable. Some time ago I was in local

government, and the local government bodies used to say that a 10 per cent increase was about right because that was the inflation rate. They thought that they were doing well, but times have changed.

The Premier was guilty of some deception—if not a great deal of deception—at the Premiers' Conference when he came out wringing his hands and saying the State Government had lost a lot of money. In fact it was \$34 million off the capital works programme funded by the Federal Government, and the allocation for recurrent expenditure has increased. The Attorney General can correct me if I am wrong, but the figure is up by \$115 million.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: What about the effect this year of the changed tax-sharing arrangements entered into two years ago?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am simply giving the figures.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: The figures come to \$140 million this coming financial year.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Attorney General can explain that. I am saying that the loss which the Premier claimed outside the Premiers' Conference was not as severe as he made it out to be. The problems with departmental expenditure were not as great as he suggested. The figure of \$300 million was a diversion, and that is a kind way of expressing it. I know he is good at these tactics, as is the Attorney General. I imagine there was a certain amount of skill involved. The Attorney General should not frown; he is as good a politician as one could find on that side of politics.

There was a different mix of figures and the Premier did all those things to which I have just referred. It was part of a gigantic hoax. We have listened to talk of Government economies and efficiencies, but we have witnessed Government waste and growth over the last three years. The way things are developing now the Government may well have almost repeated—not with the same success—its performance of three years ago when it promised prior to an election there would be no great increase in Government taxes and charges.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Nor was there over the three-year term.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Government charges went up around 30 per cent in the first year.

What did the Government do? It said that it would cut not only the salaries of members of Parliament, but also the salaries of directors of

departments and senior public servants by 10 per cent. The Government received headlines over that issue and the public forgot about the increases in Government charges.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: The increases were within the CPI figure.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I dispute that. It is not right. The promise of keeping the size of the Government down has been a farce. In the three years in which this Government has been in office and by its own admission the Public Service has increased by something in the order of 11 per cent. Figures which were recently published in the local newspapers showed that the size of the Public Service had increased from 14 977 to 16 649 in three years—an increase of 1 652. That is not all. I have mentioned the figure for the Public Service, but I understand that the number of people employed by the Government is around 100 000. I am not talking about the Public Service only.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: How much did it increase over three years?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will ask the Attorney General that question.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You will be surprised by how little.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Attorney General can surprise me.

The number of Government employees is approximately 100 000 and I will put the following question on the Notice Paper to the Attorney General: If the Public Service has increased by 11 per cent—1 652—what is the average growth in the number of Government employees, which the Opposition estimates to be in the vicinity of 100 000?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Don't forget that the population has increased—be fair.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The interjection from the Government Whip implies that because the population has increased the number of Public Service and other Government employees should increase. The Government has made a claim that it will shed 3 000 Government jobs—not necessarily from the Public Service.

Hon. T. G. Butler: From the Police Force?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Some of Hon. Tom Butler's colleagues may not be happy about that—he may have to change parties. Mr McKenzie will be in trouble!

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon. John Williams): Order! Honourable members there is far too much audible conversation and sotto voce interjections; and while it does not do anything for the debate, it certainly does not do anything for the Hansard reporters who are trying to take it down.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Government has promised to shed 3 000 Government employees—not necessarily public servants, although some will be. Westrail has committed itself to shedding 1 200 employees in the 1986-87 financial year. Therefore, the promise of shedding 3 000 jobs now comes down to a figure of 1 800.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: How can you dictate a mammoth figure like that and say it does not matter?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon. John Williams): Order! The Acting Leader of the House knows that he has the right of reply.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am not saying that it is good enough—over a period of time the figure should be greater and this should be achieved by natural wastage and not through sackings. As I have already mentioned Westrail is committed to reducing the number of its employees by 1 200 and that will leave 1 800 to be shed. There need not be a threat hanging over Government employees that the Government will get rid of 1 800 jobs. If the Government had controlled carefully the growth in the Public Service since it has been in power things would have been different. A total of 1 652 extra jobs were created over the last three years, and now the Government is proposing to get rid of some of its employees and that trauma need not have happened.

I wonder whether the Attorney General would indicate to me by nodding his head whether he will be able to inform the Opposition, if it puts a question on notice, of the number of advisers and consultants who have been employed by the Government and the costs involved. On a number of occasions the Opposition has sought this information and has found it difficult to obtain. I assume the Attorney General may be able to answer my question. I do intend to put the question on notice and I ask the Attorney General if the information is readily available. No, he sits in his seat and stares at me—I will try later.

I come to another subject which demonstrates the Government's misuse of funds and its contempt for the public purse. It gives the lie to the statement by the Government that it

is concerned about the public purse and will institute savings in different areas.

The Attorney General is responsible for payments which were made to members-elect of this House, involving \$90 000 of public money. It is obvious he received advice which he considers vindicated his move. He knows very well that the Opposition has also obtained advice on this matter which said the payment was illegal. Section 8 (2) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act creates a six-year term for members of the Legislative Council. Subsection (3) fixes the day on which a member of the Legislative Council vacates his seat as 21 May. Obviously, a member cannot assume his seat in this House until 22 May. Outgoing members vacate their seats at midnight on 21 May. Before becoming a member of the Legislative Council and before a member is entitled to payment as a member of Parliament, he must pass the day of 21 May and take the Oath.

It is also clear that the Act fixes the total number of members of the Legislative Council at 34—that is as clear as it could be. There is no variation in the Acts amendment and repeal Act which suggests that the number of 34 members of the Legislative Council can be varied. That certainly is the view contained in the legal advice received by the Opposition. During the debate on the Acts amendment and repeal Bill, which the Attorney General handled, I mentioned that there was a possibility of members-elect being paid as members of the Legislative Council before they became members officially. More particularly, he did not mention that there could be more than 34 members of the Legislative Council. As I have already mentioned that is another example of \$90 000 being misused by the Government at a time when the public could not afford it.

A Bill is before another place which proposes an increase in the Ministry by two. It will receive a lengthy debate in this House and will be opposed by the Opposition, who feel strongly about it after the comments made by members of the Labor Party some years ago when I was a Minister—it is the height of hypocrisy. The estimated cost of increasing the Ministry by two is \$2 million. I guess comments will be made about why two more Ministers should be appointed. It is obvious to the Opposition that the Premier needs to keep up his numbers in the Caucus and certainly if he gives half the members of the Caucus a job he is likely to have their vote. That is not my statement, it is a statement made by members of the Labor

Party who are concerned that the Caucus is controlling the Labor Party.

I refer now to the sale of the Midland saleyards—a debate that we hoped would take place today and I have strong hopes that it will be debated early next week.

It is contended by the Opposition that \$3.5 million has been poured down the drain on that abattoir deal. It has been completely wasted. There are people who would have paid more money for the property if they had been given the opportunity.

Hon. T. G. Butler: They never made an offer.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is wrong. I can assure Mr Butler that other people were willing to make an offer and when they asked whether the abattoir was for sale they were told that it was not. We have information on that matter and if Mr Butler—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I draw members' attention to the correct title and use of names in this House.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. I suggest that Hon. Tom Butler should spend some time in the weekend studying the documents available on the abattoir sale so that he will be fully prepared when the debate takes place next week. When I refer to the abattoir sale and the loss to the public of \$3.5 million, I am taking into account that the Government is proposing to wipe off \$13.5 million. I am aware that it has been a cost to the public all this time, but nevertheless the potential existed for the sale of that public property for a great deal more than the Government received.

I give another brief example of Government wastage: The concert organised by the Western Australian Development Corporation, which was apparently one of Mr Burke's brainchilds for which he pressed very heavily. I understand that the Year of the Visitor concert has cost Western Australia \$203 000. Someone has said that that is chickenfeed and is not much from a total Budget of \$3.5 billion. Nevertheless the small sums are adding up. It is worrying for the public and of deep concern to the Opposition that this waste continues.

It is interesting to note that the WADC was heavily involved in both the abattoir sale and Year of the Visitor concert, either in an advisory capacity or having responsibility for the negotiations. Members will recall that last year the Perth Technical College was sold and the Attorney General boasted in this House that the WADC was a magnificent institution

whose enterprise and expertise had made \$13 million in a deal because it knew how to conduct business. However, we have two examples which indicate that that expertise does not exist and that the Government would have been far better advised to go outside the WADC. Certainly if it had done so with the concert no loss would have been incurred. Concerts held in the Eastern States with the same performers were a roaring success.

We listened to the Premier's smokescreen about what he would do and his desperate attempt to divert public attention from the Government's increased charges. He has made a number of statements to the Press; some of them have been very successful. We listened to the humbug about the 17.5 per cent annual leave loading and the Attorney General hastened to say that the Premier had stated only that it would be removed if he had his way. Why does he not take the lead and go to the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and offer to back it up in a case to the Industrial Relations Commission?

Hon. Garry Kelly: What about those in Federal awards?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I think I should repeat what I said slowly. At least the Premier could take the lead and demonstrate that he was genuine in his concern. It was a smokescreen. I believe that the 17.5 per cent annual leave loading will be abolished over a period of time. Many people are now making comments in that vein, on both the Labor side and the Liberal side. Similar comments are being made about penalty rates and the like.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Do you support the removal of the 17.5 per cent loading?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, I think Western Australia should set an example and see to it that the abolition of the loading is phased in over a period of time. I do not believe it can be done in the next six or 12 months but ultimately I believe it must be removed. I am not the only person with that opinion; many people share it. The Premier has made the same comment, so we agree on that point.

I wish to raise another matter, the spectre of credit cards being available for a large number of public servants. I have asked questions on this subject but I have not yet received the answers. We talk about Government funds and the responsibility of the Government to police those funds and manage the public purse correctly, but I understand there is a strong possibility that members of the Government—not

only Ministers—have been supplied with credit cards. When I was a member of the previous Government I did not have a credit card, but I understand that the Government's policy is to issue Hon. Joe Berinson, for example, with a gold-edged American Express credit card that has a very substantial maximum limit.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I do not like to disappoint you, but I do not have such a card.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: All right, some of the Attorney General's colleagues do have such a card. Hon. Des Dans does, he told me so the other day.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You are wrong again on a terribly important question of fact.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I understand that a number of departmental officers have these cards and sign for goods and services with these cards. There should be deep concern if Government credit cards are being used all over the place. An investigation should be carried out into the use of these cards bearing in mind some of the comments that have been made about their use.

I have been brief in this debate because of the shortage of time and the necessity to pass this Bill through the House today, as the Opposition promised it would do. I understand the need for it.

I do not oppose the Bill but I am deeply concerned at the way in which the Government is handling the economy and misleading the public. Any State Government, any Minister for Budget Management, could easily balance the books if Government charges were increased in the first year by 20 or 30 per cent of office. The public will be flogged to death in that period and the Government hopes they will forget in the next two years before the election, during which charges will not be increased to the same extent. I suggest that the Government will not get away with it.

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [3.18 p.m.]: I support the Bill and in doing so I wish to raise one or two matters of concern to the finances of the State. I had intended to raise these matters yesterday in the Address-in-Reply debate, but in that speech I indicated that I had to omit a considerable amount of material as a result of the amendment moved by the Opposition in relation to the Bill of Rights.

The Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament contains a reference which I think has relevance in the debate on the Bill before us. The Governor referred to the planned, or

what was then the planned, ministerial statement on managing change in the public sector. I quote—

The Statement will assume that the public will not accept a substantial extension of the tax base to fund new or expanded public services.

We saw, of course, the final product of that ministerial statement the Premier delivered to the Parliament on Tuesday afternoon. Indeed, the undertaking outlined by His Excellency in his Speech was backed up by the Premier. In the preamble to that speech the Premier said, among other things, that new or expanded services required by the community could no longer be provided by simply extending the tax base.

Both of those statements of course sit side by side. They are quite consistent and, indeed, on the surface they are quite responsible economic commentaries. Yet I suggest that at least in one or two areas of current Government administration it really is quite meaningless talk.

Indeed, after the Governor referred to that inability of the public to accept an extension of the tax base, we are told in the next breath—in the next paragraph—

The Government has recently created a new Department of Services with administrative responsibility for the Government Printing Office, Government Stores, State Tender Board, and Astronomical Services.

So, at the same time that we are being asked to accept that we cannot substantially extend the tax base to fund new departments or Government activities, we have seen on the horizon the arrival of two new Government departments. The first is that to which I have just referred, and the second is a matter I shall discuss in some detail.

There has been some considerable disquiet in that part of the community that is sometimes mysteriously referred to as the arts community. One of the responses of the current Government has been to suggest that there needs to be some tightening up and better coordination of resources within that community. On the face of it, I have to agree. Some of the things that Hon. David Parker has done in his role as Minister for The Arts have been commendable. Indeed, he has had to make some of the more difficult decisions that were not made but were rightly in the province of his predecessor in that portfolio, Hon. Ron Davies.

That brings me to a couple of facts and figures which I especially ask the Minister for Budget Management to take back to his colleagues and to the Public Service as a whole. The restructuring of the arts administration includes the creation of the new Department for The Arts, and the creation, too, of three very substantial and highly-paid executive positions within the Department for The Arts.

Those positions were advertised widely, I think across Australia, some weeks ago. They certainly appeared in *The West Australian* in the section where vacancies for executive positions are displayed. The advertisement called for an executive director, with a salary of nearly \$68 000 a year; a director of administration and finance, with a maximum salary of \$53 000; and a director of policy and development, with a maximum salary of some \$53 000.

If one adds together those basic salaries and then adds on-costs, one can see that we are looking at an additional amount of about \$250 000 more to administer the arts than we were spending at this time last year. I genuinely raise with the Minister for Budget Management the question of whether or not this is the right time to be doing that sort of thing, in light of what the Governor told us in his Address to Parliament, in light of what the Premier told us in his ministerial statement on Tuesday last, and in light of what the Minister himself has often told us in this Parliament—and quite correctly, I believe—that the public purse simply needs to be closed up a little more in order to have a bit more of that money remain where it is.

I put on notice some questions to the Minister for The Arts a few days ago concerning those three executive positions which, I repeat, will cost the Government something in the order of \$250 000 in addition to what is currently being spent by the Arts Council. I suggested that it was perhaps time for the Government to make a decision not to appoint those people, as is intended, for a five-year period; but to appoint them for a three-year period. I had a number of reasons in mind, some of them political and some economic.

Most members will be aware that recently the Minister for The Arts made the decision to terminate the services of the Director of the Western Australian Art Gallery, Mr Frank Ellis. Being the Opposition spokesman in that area, I was asked by the media on a number of occasions what I thought of Mr Parker's action. I supported that Minister's right to choose

whomsoever he wished to head the statutory bodies under his control, and indeed I did so publicly. However, I did not feel that was the real issue at stake in that respect. The real issue was that in 1983, after the current Government came to office, it chose to renew the contract of the Director of the Art Gallery for a further five years. That was its decision, and indeed it was a decision that any other Government would have made.

We now find that halfway through that five-year term—a term which was renewed by the current Government—Mr Ellis' services were terminated. I repeat my belief that the Government is entitled, if it wishes, to terminate anyone's services, but it will cost a huge amount of money to pay Mr Ellis out. I do not know how much and I deliberately have not asked in the House how much it will cost, because frankly I think it is a matter between Mr Ellis and the Government. Indeed, I think Mr Ellis has been subjected to enough humiliation in the matter without suffering additional humiliation by way of parliamentary questions of that kind.

However, I was angered that the contract should be terminated halfway through a term which was negotiated by the Government itself. Therefore, in light of that experience, would it not be better in the case of the proposed appointments to the new Department of The Arts, not to make five-year appointments as is envisaged but to make three-year appointments? The reason is that the current Government may well be putting the next Government, of whatever persuasion, in precisely the same position in which it found itself in relation to Mr Ellis.

The appointments under discussion will commence, presumably, some time late in 1986. That means a five-year term will run into late 1991, which is halfway through the term of the next Government. Would it not have been better to satisfy the applicants by saying that instead of a five-year term, they would be given a three-year term? The positions could be advertised, if necessary. Those positions would then be able to be reviewed pretty soon after the next State election.

I asked that question of Minister for The Arts in question 206, in the following terms—

As the next State election is due in April 1989, by which time the three appointees would be only half-way through their five-year terms, would it not be more appropriate to contract the new appointees for three-year terms instead?

Mr Parker replied in the following terms—

The five-year term contracts for senior executive positions are offered by the Public Service Board according to normal and appropriate procedure . . .

Let me interrupt there to say that normal and appropriate procedure was not followed in the case of the sacking of Mr Ellis, so one cannot have that argument up one's sleeve for one occasion and then trot it out for another occasion. Mr Parker's response continued—

. . . adopted for appointments made by the Public Service Board. Such departmental appointments are not and should never be dependent on State election dates or other political movements.

Well, the sacking of Mr Ellis was made the subject of a political movement. I was not suggesting in my question, nor in my public comments, that these people ought to be appointed as political appointees—far from it. I do not believe that public servants ought to be affected in that way.

On the contrary, what I was saying was that if these appointments were to be made and if they were sensible appointees—that is, the appointees have the proper experience and qualifications—then those appointments would naturally be continued and, I dare say, renewed by a new Government after the 1989 election.

If Mr Parker, or anyone else, chose to appoint people without the best qualities, people who were somehow party hacks or people who had inferior qualifications, the next Government would be lumbered with them. Therefore, the very position that Mr Parker found himself in with Mr Ellis—I add here that no-one has ever suggested he was a political appointment—is that which a future Government may find itself in with regard to these three appointees in the event—and I stress the words "in the event"—that these appointments are made on the basis of some nod or wink or of some connection those people have with the Australian Labor Party.

It is a great pity that the Minister for The Arts has taken that attitude in his answer to that question. I put it seriously to the Minister for Budget Management that if he is interested in tightening the belt of public sector spending, that may be a small, but not insignificant, way of achieving that while still permitting the Government of the day to exercise the undoubted right that it has, which is to appoint the people whom it believes can best serve it while it is in office.

The second point I want briefly to cover in this Treasury Bill is one which relates to an issue that was mentioned in the Governor's Speech and which has been the subject of some considerable public discussion in recent weeks. I quote from the Governor's speech as follow—

In its continued pursuit of responsible financial management the Government's 1985/86 Budget is largely on target.

The Government ought to be commended for that action. Incidentally, it follows in the traditions of the O'Connor and Court Government in also bringing in balanced Budgets and even, where possible, Budgets that were slightly in surplus.

The Governor went on to say—

On the revenue side, a significant boost has come from the Burswood Island Casino which is estimated to provide \$4.75 million to the State this financial year.

As members would well know, there is only so much of the gambling dollar to go around this community. There has been considerable and informed speculation—even on the part of the Lotteries Commission staff itself—that the advent of the Burswood Island casino is having an adverse effect on the Instant Lottery. That should not be of direct concern to the Government. It is a choice freely exercised by the people of this State. But the Government does have a role to play in ensuring that the revenue that sporting and cultural groups have been receiving for the Instant Lottery funds is not diminished as a result of people changing their gambling habits from the Instant Lottery on the one hand to the Burswood Island casino on the other. Yet, that is precisely what has happened.

I do not blame the Government for that situation; it is not a Government decision. What I think the Government has to do, however, is to protect the arts and sporting organisations of this State in such a way that revenue received by way of gambling is redirected to those who are being disadvantaged as a result of this change in gambling habits by the people of Western Australia. It is claimed by the Government that that is not in fact happening. Members will be aware that it was the O'Connor Government which introduced the Instant Lottery specifically as a form of guaranteed revenue for those two streams of community activity—sport and culture.

The O'Connor Government did not put any ceiling on revenues that could be raised and redirected to those bodies. The Burke Government made a decision to place a ceiling of \$3

million in each case, making a total of \$6 million. In the last few months I have publicly argued that that is having the effect of squeezing the sport and cultural groups throughout the State in such a way that the Government wins whatever happens. The Government is winning by its own admission in that so far this financial year it has received \$4.75 million from its casino revenue. It is also receiving a diminished but nonetheless substantial amount by way of the lotteries revenue.

The people who are suffering and will suffer are the people in those organisations to which I have referred.

There is none so blind as he who will not see, because on 28 May the Minister for Sport and Recreation, Hon. Keith Wilson, issued a Press statement saying, and I quote—

Claims by Opposition MLC Phillip Pental that the ceiling on the Sports Instant Lotteries Fund (SIL) was adversely affecting sport, were inaccurate and ill-formed, said Mr Wilson.

One has only to refer to the Auditor General's report—as I have done—to find that what I am saying is accurate and what the Minister for Sport and Recreation is saying is inaccurate. I am prepared to acknowledge his argument that the Government, out of loan funds, has been financing some very substantial works, not the least of which is the big centre at McGillivray Park at Graylands. That does not alter the central theme of my argument that these other groups are being robbed of the money that was rightly intended to be theirs as a result of the O'Connor Government's action.

The figures are to be found in the Auditor General's report itself. They are not there in their bald form; one has to analyse them. I take the opportunity to mention a couple of those figures to show that the Government does need to rectify the position. It needs to do that before those two streams in the community find themselves in more trouble than they are at present. Further, an analysis of the Auditor General's figures indicates that the Government has now gone one step further than what I even thought it had done. It has gone to the stage where it is using an unprecedented amount of lotteries income for its own day-to-day use.

The figures are as follows: In 1982-83 an amount of \$12.1 million was distributed by the O'Connor Government under the heading, "Grants Approved". That might be to such organisations as the Scout Association and all those community groups which have benefited



over the years. Of that \$12.1 million, \$5.7 million is accounted for in the "Grants Approved" section. An amount of \$6.4 million is accounted for in the distribution to sport and culture. That is a total of \$12.1 million. Two years down the track, after the current Government had been in office, the amount of money that bodies such as the Scout Association receiving grants under "Grants Approved", or bodies receiving grants by way of sport and culture disbursements has not grown. It has actually declined.

It must be the only figure in the Western Australian Government's activities that has actually declined. In 1982-83, the sum of \$12.1 million was dispersed to these groups; two years later the figure was \$10.1 million, a drop of precisely \$2 million.

The other big recipient of those funds historically has been the hospital fund. Back in the days of the O'Connor Government when \$12.1 million was being given to those charitable, sporting, and cultural groups, the hospital fund received \$9.5 million. However, two years later it was receiving \$17.1 million. That means an increased percentage of those receipts is being used for purposes that were never intended.

The small community groups whose future seemed to be assured under the O'Connor Government are paying the penalty and are being asked to bear the burden of the Government's election promises, because within the space of two years the hospital fund allocation went from \$9.5 million to \$17.1 million. That seems bad enough, but what it means is that in the last year of the O'Connor Government, of all the money that was available from the Lotteries Commission for distribution to the community 25 per cent went in grants approved under that Liberal Government. Two years later, under the current Government, the figure has dropped to 15 per cent.

There has been a dramatic shift in the way the current Government uses its money from lotteries; it is taking away from the community organisations and using the money to finance its election promises and Government programmes. Perhaps that is no more dramatically shown than in the annual grant received by the Scout Association which has recently been given a final \$50 000 handshake and told, "Do not come back for any more because you are not eligible now under the new rules of the Burke Government."

I put it to the Minister for Budget Management that, when he is in a better mood than at present and feeling a little more receptive to this argument, those are two areas of public finance in this State which need some attention on his part.

Apart from those comments, I support the Bill.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.*

[Questions taken.]

**HON. V. J. FERRY** (South-West) [4.07 p.m.]: In line with the cooperation given in handling this Bill, my comments will be fairly short. Nevertheless, the Bill gives me the opportunity to make some observations on a number of matters. I preface my remarks by placing on record the fact that this Bill is one similar to what we used to know as a Supply Bill. History will record that this House has never refused a Supply Bill or its like.

In the early 1970s, during the life of the John Tonkin Government, there was much conjecture that this House would reject Supply on one particular occasion. It is a matter of record that this House granted Supply and did not reject the Bill. Sometimes the comment is made that there was a lot of pressure to reject Supply, but the record shows clearly that that did not happen and that this House has never rejected a Supply Bill. Accordingly, today I adopt the same view and support the Bill.

I am concerned that the Burke Government gives much attention to or takes much notice of its social engineers and social planners. It seems to view society as a social laboratory in which to exercise its experimenting with its ideas. It might be fine in theory, but I tend to err on the side of conservatism in social change, because unless people can accept change for what it is, Governments run into trouble.

This Government is certainly running into trouble in a number of areas. Steady change is better than U-turns or even J-curves. This Government is clearly starting to learn that it cannot live by public relations alone. Time is running out. Since it came into office in 1983, the Government has had a publicity machine which has been quite successful in carrying its glossy stories to the electors and the general public, but sooner or later the public will require substance because they are not fools.

People want real jobs, they want real incomes, they do not want handouts all the time because people have pride and dignity. I am especially concerned for young people in the community. It is very clear to me, and it is

becoming clearer, that young people as a general group do not trust Governments. They do not trust big union power. By the same token, they do not trust big business. They do not feel there is much in life for them. Some feel they are not wanted.

This is a sad indictment on our society today, and Governments must take a large responsibility for this malaise in our young community which is concerned with the future. Much more attention must be given to it. It is quite clear State and Federal Governments, both Labor Governments, are leading to economic disaster, and this adds to this feeling among our young folk.

I make the very real observation that the poor cannot support the poor. One must have a robust and growing economy. By so doing the strong are able to look after the weak. The way Australia is going, a great number of poor people are helping other poor people. No-one wants that at all. Everyone wants to live on a higher plane.

One thing today affecting our economy is the value of the Australian dollar, which is at an all-time low. That is an indication of what the world thinks of Australia. It is a sad commentary on our country. It behoves Governments to adopt policies which will overcome this serious economic setback.

The present Government is not doing that. I want to refer very quickly, this being a money Bill, to the fringe benefits tax, the entertainment tax, and the new fuel tax shortly to be imposed by the Burke Government on the people as well. All these taxes are creating further costs on production. It is a cost to people, it is not productive at all. In fact it is counter-productive.

We cannot live in a handout society. Government must lead. But it must not lead us down the wrong track. It must lead us the right way. The Burke Government is engaged in corporate government, engaging others to do its work for us. I am firmly of the view that corporate government can lead to corrupt government. I am not saying it does, but it can lead to corrupt government. In other States this is a very real situation. It leads to secret deals with big business, with unions and other interests. It leads to an erosion of fairness in Governments' dealings.

This has been amplified in the recent Midland Abattoir dispute. There is a suspicion that all is not well, and that is something which

needs to be addressed by this Government and corrected.

Another feature which I do not wholly agree with is the organising of socialist markets for produce. There is today greater Government direction of the economy through the establishment of Government-owned and Government-controlled companies, financed from the compulsory acquisition of taxpayers' money. This is running counter to the free enterprise market system.

The marketplace is the only true yardstick for trade. One cannot artificially create a price. One cannot artificially create trade. It must be done in the marketplace generally. Governments, through their own direct influence, or the influence of corporate bodies set up by them, tend to tamper with the marketplace from time to time. In a short time that can have an effect. It may first of all be a good effect, but in the long term it has a bad effect. In the end there is a reaction.

In Bunbury the other day a meeting was organised, not by a political party but by business people, at the Lighthouse Inn, and 150 to 180 people attended. This was at very short notice. The meeting was organised in only two or three days. These people came to express their concern, particularly at the fringe benefits and other taxes generally.

A number of small businessmen closed their doors so that they could attend the meeting. Other businesses felt it impractical to close their doors, for sound reasons, inasmuch as some of their businesses were conducted along appointment lines, therefore they could not deny the public they served the opportunity to trade with them or to have access to professional services, or whatever the nature of their business was. A number did attend the meeting as a form of protest, and they closed their doors.

That is happening right around the country. One hears about it frequently. The Burke Government propaganda machine, in the two years prior to the last election, stated that taxes and charges had risen by a certain amount. One does not hear how much they rose over the three years leading up to the last election. The Government conveniently left out those first years when it hiked taxes and charges to record levels in many cases. In the statistics leading up to the last election the Government commented that increases in taxes and charges were moderate over the last two years. They

might have been moderate in comparison to others.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: The increases were negligible in the last two years; they were moderate over the three-year period.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: In the first year they went up astronomically, and the same thing is happening right now. I refer to the fuel tax of 2c a litre. The same thing has happened.

Let us not fool ourselves. This Government is doing the same thing in the same pattern as three years ago; loading the community with taxes and charges for its departmental agencies and other authorities within the community. As we go down the track in the next two years the increases will not be nearly so much. This is not good economic management at all.

I want finally to refer to the farming situation. This afternoon we heard about the reaction of the National Farmers Federation and farmers and graziers on the land generally. I want to respond, not in a personal way, to the gentleman who made a remark as a matter of fact.

The National Farmers Federation is vowing justice, and the Mudginberri dispute is a classic example for the rest of Australia of what can be done. That was a classic example where the industry operated in the face of tremendous pressure.

I raised the example of the dairy industry the other night. Here the Federal Government has foisted upon the dairy industry in this State a levy which benefits this State to no degree at all. Some dairy farmers are being asked to pay a levy inflicted on them by the Federal Hawke Government of anything from \$2 000 to \$6 000 a year, depending on the size of the dairy operation. That money is going directly to the Eastern States to prop up the industry there, while dairy farmers in this State receive no benefit at all.

Is it any wonder that rural producers are talking about these Governments? No wonder at all. If we were suddenly asked to find something between \$2 000 to \$6 000 for no return, we would be asking questions as well. So the farming community has this problem. It is a very real one.

It is all very nice to be quiet and say that if the National Farmers Federation were another union it would be castigated for this or that, but the union has the right to take this stand and it is having a reasonable response.

People working in the rural area today—whether they be farmers, graziers, horticulturists, or sugar producers in Queensland—are getting the stick from the Government as a result of these increased costs. That is the basis of my concern today. I am worried about the economic mismanagement of this country.

I support the Bill.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [4.21 p.m.]: I shall be speaking on the state of the national economy during the Address-in-Reply, but I use this occasion to raise several points. The first relates to the road maintenance tax. As members would be aware, while we were passing the Bill in this House relating to road maintenance tax, in another place the Premier was doubling that tax.

I point out to Government members and others who are not aware that road maintenance tax is a tax on isolation. Very little petrol is used in the delivery of goods in the city. However, it is very costly to deliver goods to Esperance or the north-west. Those who live in isolation are taxed for it, unlike those who live in the city. The Government is not being very considerate to country people when it doubles the road maintenance tax.

It has been said that farmers and off-road vehicle users will get a rebate on this tax. Undoubtedly that will benefit some, but by the time the road maintenance tax on fuel is doubled, those people will be paying far in excess of what they paid in the past. Most of the goods which come into the farm come in by road and the goods one produces on the farm go out by road. All the grain produced on the farm must be transported to the nearest point at which CBH receives it. As a beef producer, I must cart my stock to Perth. Currently it costs me \$1 650 to get a truck loaded with cattle up to Perth and, of course, it will cost approximately \$1 800 with the extra road maintenance tax.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That money does not go back into the roads either.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That money could be used to maintain the MTT or for whatever purpose.

That apart, let us look at how this will affect those who are trying to earn some money overseas for Australia. The Government continues to milk the holy cow. It is little wonder that these industries are collapsing.

I point out that this is happening not only in respect of agriculture, but also in the mining industry. The effects of the new taxes, includ-

ing the perks tax on housing, are being felt by the mining industry in Kambalda and, as a result, it is less viable.

The Premier has indicated that off-road users will receive a rebate on road maintenance tax, but I wonder how that will work. He referred to this briefly prior to the election when country people pointed out to him the difficulties being faced by the rural community. That came to nought, although he did say something about a rebate being given through the Department of Agriculture.

It is almost the end of June. Farmers have passed through the stage at which they use a great deal of fuel to put in their crops. It has taken that period for the Government to get a rebate scheme going and then it appears it has only taken that step because it wants to double the tax.

I wonder how the rebate scheme will work. It should not be handled by the Department of Agriculture, because its officers are advisers, plant breeders, and the like. They are not money collectors, and the whole system will have to be changed to enable the department to handle the rebate system.

This is a rather sensitive topic. Farmers know, although others may not, that the Federal Government used to have a system under which primary producers were registered as off-road users and they were never charged the tax in the first place. Our friend, Mr Howard, decided to change the scheme. He said, "Farmers must pay the rebate and we will give it back to them." Goodness knows why he was foolish enough to accept that advice, but he did. Members can imagine the number of civil servants who are now engaged in returning the money to farmers. One must also consider the time spent by farmers getting the money to the civil servants in the first place.

Recently when I applied for a rebate I received a letter from the Australian Customs Service referring to a circular which it had issued, as it said, "to all registered rebate claimants". That circular was given to a mailing contractor on 31 May. It contained a copy of an extract from the *Commonwealth Government Gazette* of 24 May 1985 which stated, "On 1 July"—that is just one month away—"rebates will not be payable for anything in excess of 12 months in arrears".

What chance did anyone in the country have to find out about that, particularly if one was not a registered rebate claimant? If one had just gone into farming and was not registered, one

would not receive a notice from the Australian Customs Service. Out in the bush one certainly does not read many Canberra *Government Gazettes* and, even if one did, one would not have a hope of claiming a rebate within the month allowed.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Also it should be noted that the rebate has been reduced from 19c a litre to 18c a litre.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: One wonders how that has been done. If one calls at the address of their office, one finds the doors are nailed closed and there is no-one there. That has been the case for some months.

I hope that the State Government finds a more sensible way in which to administer the rebate on fuel. Mr Howard brought in the system to which I have just referred and one knows how popular Mr Howard is for his efforts in that regard. I only hope a better system can be devised.

I issue a little warning to anyone who travels overseas and purchases clothing and the like while away. A new customs regulation indicates that the cigarettes, alcohol, or present for one's wife which one is allowed to bring in duty free must now be carried on one's person. It may not be contained in luggage which is sent ahead. If one is unable to carry the goods through customs, it is dutiable.

I was overseas and I was standing at the airport with my suitcase in my hand. An army officer came up to me and said, "That will go by freight." I said, "But, but . . .", and when two Ghurkas came up carrying automatic rifles I decided that my suitcase should go by freight! I saw the strength of his argument, but I am afraid Australian Customs did not. For once I had a little sympathy for Mr Fraser who had a rifle stuck in his belly button.

Another matter which particularly concerns the State Government is jetty licences. I know the Minister for Budget Management will be interested to hear of my concern about this matter. I am particularly interested in this area because I administered it as Minister for Transport at one time. Jetty licences are granted to people who live adjacent to a waterway or river. For \$30 they can build a little landing to which they can tie up their boats. This fee has increased to \$250. One of my constituents is a widow who lives at Nornalup on the Frankland River. I suppose very few members even know where Nornalup is.

Hon. P. G. Pental: It is a beautiful spot.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: She has an aluminium runabout on the river. She will take people four or five miles up the river for a charge of \$4 or \$5. If a person asks for lunch he can get it included for \$12. When visitors return they are invited to her house for a cup of tea and a scone. She is a pensioner, and not a very young one either, who has lived for some 35 years on the river.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: She is a very nice lady.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: She has enthusiasm for the area, for its beauty and the environment. She enjoys showing it to visitors to that area.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: She is a very respected lady.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Yes, she is a very respected lady who has been a shire councillor and has held many other positions. The Minister for Budget Management might think it is very enterprising for her to do that and that she is in receipt of quite a nice little income from this practice, but I will now point out the difficulty the State Government has put her in. Someone came along and asked her, "Where do your passengers go to the toilet when they go to your house for a scone and cup of tea?" Of course they were not allowed to use the toilet in her house and she has had to build a separate toilet at her expense. She has also had to install a tank to service the toilet. She did all that and borrowed \$8 000 which is costing her \$207 a month in repayments. The officials then came along and told her the jetty where these visitors get off the boat will be licensed at \$250.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: How many passengers can she have?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It is thought that she may have earned \$3 000 before the payment of expenses and meals. This situation is so ridiculous. How can we have an "Albany Tomorrow", a scheme largely based on tourism, when a little old widow who tries to give people travelling in the area something to do, is closed down because of increases in Government taxes?

Hon. V. J. Ferry: It sounds like "Nornalup, Goodbye"!

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It certainly does. How many people live in Nornalup? Would there be half a dozen houses?

Hon. V. J. Ferry: There would be a few more.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It is a very small town and this sort of business is vital. I have written to Hon. Julian Grill and he has

replied that all commercial jetties attract a licence fee of \$250. Even the Barrack Street jetties attract a licence fee of \$250. To use his words, "It would be an undesirable precedent to let this woman have one for less."

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Just think, he is Minister for Agriculture now.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is right. We are told we have a sympathetic Government which is very keen to encourage private enterprise, to get people going, to make them work very hard—

Hon. V. J. Ferry: To encourage tourism.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: —yes, and to encourage tourism, and this is the sort of thing that happens. While I would like to think otherwise, I do not expect the Minister for Budget Management to do anything about it. I do not think the Government is the slightest bit interested, and this is regrettable.

With those sorts of feelings I rather reluctantly condescend to support the Bill

HON. G. M. EVANS (Metropolitan) [4.35 p.m.]: I support the legislation. I want to examine the new Bill and then deal with Treasury's Advances of last year. I want to refer to the Auditor General's report. I hope the Minister will give us an explanation at a later time. Only one adverse comment was made and that was in regard to the advances of the Treasurer. It reads as follows—

The Appropriation (Consolidated Revenue Fund) Act provides an annual appropriation to enable the Treasurer to make advances and it therefore follows that such advances should be authorised annually. For the year under review, fresh authorisations were not obtained for four existing advance accounts totalling \$11 220 567 at July 1, 1984. In addition, authorisations were not provided for amounts totalling \$301 405 in excess of previously authorised amounts on three accounts and a new advance for Urban Land Subdivisions—Cost of Services—1984-85 Program of \$3 124 700 at June 30, 1985.

The next point needs to be noted—

The failure to meet compliance requirements has weakened control on these accounts.

I hope those matters set out in the Auditor General's report have been rectified. It will be interesting to see how these matters are treated under the new Bill. I have discussed this matter with the Minister for Budget Management. I

want to know more about it. It is an interesting subject.

There have been weaknesses in the Treasurer's handling of the defence account. A couple of points do arise on looking at the figures for last year and comparing them to those of this year. We should look at the newspapers this weekend because tomorrow is D-day, cut-off day for the cash receipts and payments of the Government, and we will find out how the Government managed its funds in the past year.

I commented the other day that the \$45.5 million due last year will come forward into this year's Budget. I do not expect the Government to have a Budget surplus of \$35.5 million, but anything less means a deficit. Without this money the deficit would have been much larger. The two interest payments earned on investments on the short-term money market as at 30 June 1985 were not brought in last year and an amount of \$22 million should have been transferred to the State development fund. It comes into this year's calculations and makes the deficit much lower. I suggest that when members read the results of the Government's financial handling over the weekend they take a note of the fact that \$45.5 million was borrowed from last year's Budget. Unfortunately it will not be able to be carried over into next year's.

Hon. Phillip Pandal has mentioned the casino tax and I want to discuss the TAB tax and the casino tax. TAB tax earned between \$21.5 million and \$22.5 million and the casino tax earned \$4.75 million, which is about \$5.75 million extra to the Government from gambling taxes. It will be interesting to see how those amounts come out on Friday night because if the \$4.75 million has been achieved I would be most surprised if \$22.5 million is achieved by way of the TAB tax. I expect it to be less. My early research indicates that 20 per cent of the collections of TAB tax goes to the turf clubs, the WATA and the greyhounds. That income will be reduced. I will be interested to see how those areas are treated in the new financial year.

I was interested in the Government's cost accounting when I read an article in today's *The West Australian* under the heading, "A question of costs". It read as follows—

Mr Burke told the Legislative Assembly that each question cost \$168.58 to answer.

So far this year 552 questions on notice had been asked in the Legislative Assembly and 213 in the Legislative Council. In two weeks an estimated \$130 000 had been spent on answering the questions.

I am absolutely amazed. Okay, I understand bits of pink paper have to be purchased, that costs are involved with typewriter ribbons and perhaps telephone calls to advisers to establish what is going on, but what wages would be saved if we did not ask questions? The questions being answered by every Government department and statutory authority involve infinitesimal costs in relation to those things. I know a very "clever" accountant could say it had taken X number of hours at so many dollars per hour, plus overtime, holiday pay, long service leave, etc., which gives a cost per hour.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: And overtime for the regular work that has to be put aside in order to give questions priority.

Hon. G. M. EVANS: That is my next point. There are no extra costs at all. I would be interested to see at a later date the costing in respect of overtime and whether it was necessary. It is a well-known fact that people love to have reasons to work overtime and this could be one of those reasons.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You understand that attempting to collate the answer to that sort of question would cost us thousands?

Hon. G. M. EVANS: I am interested in how the figure of \$168.58 was arrived at exactly.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [4.42 p.m.]: Mr Deputy President, a rumour is going around this place—I want it clarified—that we are expected to finish this debate at 4.55 p.m. I am a little perturbed about that because the Treasurer's Advance is very important and we are being told that a gag will be placed on it at 5 o'clock or 5.15 and that the legislation must pass tonight. We also have the time limit of 5.30 p.m. imposed on us for the adjournment of the House. I know that can be extended.

As I said, this is a very important Bill and one that encompasses many subjects. It deals with the finances of this State and other matters of concern to all of us. Now one is being cut off from exploring all the points that one wished to raise. I will reduce my remarks to one point. Regrettably I will take most of the 17 minutes available and I apologise to the rest of the House.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! As far as I am concerned no time limit has been placed on this debate. I

have certainly not been notified that I have to gag the debate at 4.55 p.m.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Let me preface my remarks by saying something that I have said in this House many times in the last 25 years; that is, water and electricity are no longer luxuries, they are necessities of life. That phrase was not coined by Mick Gayfer; it was coined by Franklin Roosevelt back at the time of the Tennessee Valley project when he gave people water. There is therefore nothing original about it.

Recently, Mr Grill, the Minister for Agriculture, wrote to the shire clerk of the Mt Marshall Shire Council. He said—

The Premier has referred to me your correspondence of March 21 requesting that I reply directly to you. I also have your copy of the same letter.

Your comments about the adequacy of the Farm Water Supply Loan Scheme are noted and it is realised that in the current rural economic situation a large percentage of farmers are not in a position to increase their debts to secure water supplies. This situation is reflected in the relatively low level of applications from all farming areas for water supply loans over the past eighteen months to two years.

This question of finance, as discussed with Council previously, is one which applies to Government as well as the farming community.

The severity of the farm water supply situation this year is very clear as underscored by the number of shires besides Mt Marshall which have been declared water deficient in 1985/86.

The alternative to on-farm water supplies is extension of the Comprehensive Scheme, in your case the Agaton Scheme. As explained to Council previously, the State Government is not in a position to finance such an undertaking. The Commonwealth Government has made it clear that financial aid will not be provided. The farmers have made it clear that they will not contribute towards it.

The Government announced prior to the last election that it saw the development of on farm water supplies as the most effective method of meeting the needs of most of the current unreticulated agricultural areas. You will be aware that this decision was neither hasty nor lightly considered.

The last paragraph states—

Contrary to Council's opinion, the current policy is seen as the most equitable means of providing assistance to the majority of farmers with water supply problems. I realise that at this particular time many farmers are reluctant or unable to apply for loan assistance, but the construction of reticulated water supplies would also place a heavy burden on the consumer as well as the State, and is not considered to be a realistic solution.

Yours sincerely

J. F. GRILL, LL.B., J.P., M.L.A.  
MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

The reason I read that letter is that we have received yet another negative answer to another question in respect of water reticulation in the agricultural areas of this State. We are back to square one. That is the fate that was suffered by the Bullaring-Greenhill extension, the South Quairading extension and the Mt Hampton extension. In fact, any of the areas that have ever had a priority for reticulation under the CWS water scheme were affected. The reason given was that the State could not afford it and the Commonwealth cannot afford it. Nobody can afford any further reticulation in agricultural areas. In fact, it is 16 years since the last extension was made anywhere in agricultural areas. We also know that the Hawke plan of 1946 was to have the whole lot reticulated by now. However, there has been no moved towards that end.

The Bencubbin people have been told by the Government that it is sorry but that is the way it is. They have been told to go and dig for water because there is no money for scheme water. The other day I heard an interesting news item on the radio. My secretary obtained a transcript of that news item. It was included in the Australian Broadcasting Corporation regional news at 12.30 p.m. on Thursday, 15 May 1986. The transcript reads—

The Federal and State Governments have announced a \$1 million programme over 5 years to assist Aborigines in Western Australia.

In Perth this morning the Federal and State Minister's for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Holding and Mr Bridge, said the programme would allow aborigines secure title to traditional land and it was not a form of defacto land rights.

Money would also be spent on setting up viable economic bases for Aboriginal communities.

Mr Holding said Aborigines in Western Australia had been neglected and up to \$80 million would be spent on the provision of such things as power and water.

Mr Holding—quote:—

“When you go home tonight if you want to read something you turn on the light, if you feel a bit tired and a bit sweaty you turn on the tap and water comes out and you can have a shower—we just take that for granted. Now the fact is that for thousands of Aboriginal people in Australia that is not the fact of life.”

I remind Mr Holding that for thousands of people in Western Australia and Australia, including white people, that is not a fact of life either. We have lived where I live for 80 years, and I do not turn on a tap for Government-supplied water to take a shower at night. The people who live on stations in the north do not get Government-supplied water from a tap or Government-supplied electricity. The Federal Minister is coming the raw prawn when he says that all of us have what he maintains some others have not.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Typical city attitude.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is a city attitude.

I was particularly annoyed with Mr Holding's comments because the previous day I received the letter from Mr Grill saying that because of the lack of money every proposal to do with the spread of water in the agricultural areas was to be thrown out. I was most annoyed to hear this claptrap from Mr Holding over the air the following day.

I fail to understand where the \$80 million, composed of \$40 million from Canberra with a matching \$40 million from this State, is to come from over the next five years to supply water to Aboriginal communities.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: It is not just for water.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Water and electricity.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: No.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I will repeat what Mr Holding said.

Hon. N. F. Moore: And to buy land.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I turn to the article in *The Western Australian* of 16 May 1986 which reads—

More than 20 per cent of a \$100 million five-year package to aid WA Aborigines could go towards land acquisition.

The rest—about \$80 million—will be spent on facilities such as housing, water supplies and electricity.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: And others. I am not denying your total figures; I am just saying that I think you must be making a mistake in thinking that \$80 million is going to water. It is going to housing, water, electricity and other purposes.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: With the House's permission, I ask that this newspaper article and the statement taken from the radio be incorporated in *Hansard*.

*The following material was incorporated by leave of the House—*

Article from “*The West Australian*” 16 May 1986.

MORE than 20 per cent of a \$100 million five-year package to aid WA Aborigines could go towards land acquisition.

The rest—about \$80m.—will be spent on facilities such as housing, water supplies and electricity.

The Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Mr Holding, gave a rough breakdown yesterday when he and his WA counterpart, Mr Bridge, announced agreement on the joint plan to improve conditions for Aboriginal communities.

However, Mr Holding said the amount of land needed could not be defined till Aboriginal communities had been consulted.

In some areas it might be necessary to acquire the whole or part of pastoral leases land and pay proper compensation.

Aid

Under the agreement, the WA Government will match the Commonwealth's \$50m. contribution. The aid will be additional to existing funding commitments.

Mr Bridge said that a proposal had been put to Treasury for provision of an extra \$10m. a year for the period and Mr Holding said he was satisfied that the State's matching funds were available.

A joint Commonwealth-State task force will be set up to consult Aborigines on plans that involve:

Obtaining secure title for land traditionally occupied by Aboriginal people.



Using funds to speed excisions from pastoral leases for Aborinal living areas.

The Commonwealth acquiring other land as appropriate.

Providing power, water supply and other facilities.

Mr Holding said that the first task was to get in touch with Aboriginal communities to define the land that was needed.

That would not be a complex task in some reserve areas where secure title could be transferred within two months.

In other areas, land would have to be acquired.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Hassell, said the aid package was a major land-rights deal.

"The people of WA have been conned," he said.

Mr Hassell said that before the election, the Premier, Mr Burke, promised there would be no land rights.

Now, 96 days after the election, the news was that up to \$25m. of taxpayers money would be spent on land to be given exclusively to Aborigines.

That was racially-based land rights.

Mr Hassell said the Opposition would comment further after carefully studying the spending proposals.

However, Mr Holding and Mr Bridge said the measures were needed to alleviate the plight of many Aborigines who were living in conditions equivalent to Third World countries.

Mr Holding said the task force would talk to Aboriginal communities on their needs and aspirations and then ensure an effective allocation of resources.

The Ministers rejected suggestions that the deal could be seen as land rights by another name.

They also dismissed the idea that the package was to relieve their consciences over not granting land rights.

Mr Bridge said it was a realistic formula that would bring enormous benefits to Aborigines.

Mr Holding said he had no conscience problem in asserting that Aborigines should have secure title to land that they traditionally occupied.

Mr Bridge said it was a reasonable expectation that Aborigines would have secure title to all reserve land at the end of the five years.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I thank the House for saving me from having to read out that article.

I am very anxious to make the point that the last Census showed that Australia has 160 000 Aborigines. According to the 1981 Census, Western Australia has 31 351 Aborigines, of whom 5 812 live in the metropolitan area. Therefore, it can be reasonably expected that they are serviced with water and electricity. There are 3 613 Aborigines in the northern region; 2 573 in the north-eastern region; 3 594 in the north-west region; and 2 487 in the eastern region. The north-central area has 3 809 Aborigines. Those areas are perhaps the only ones which could be said to be totally devoid of water and electricity. I find it very hard to reconcile the fact that those communities will be supplied with water, while others who need the water and who have agreed to pay for it when they get it will not be provided with it. They have paid taxes towards the provision of water. Many thousands of people are in that position, yet a maximum of 26 000 Aborigines living throughout the State will be supplied with \$80 million to be put towards electricity and water.

This is a pretty fair sort of a country, and I appreciate the remarks made by Hon. Tom Helm that he is pleased to see his people being provided with water. But I am not very pleased to see that my people have again been denied the opportunity of having further extensions to the comprehensive water scheme. If \$40 million can be obtained just like that to match the \$40 million that Canberra will put up, surely those extensions should be made. I add that the scheme to provide water and electricity to Aboriginal communities has not yet been catalogued. There is no information on it. It is not even on the drawing board, whereas the other schemes have been printed in book form and fully costed. As yet, nothing has been done in respect of the provisions for Aborigines. Anybody who reads the article that I have had incorporated will be able to see that those provisions are planned for the future.

Hon. J. M. Brown: What was the record of the Opposition when they were in Government for 21 years with respect to extensions of the water supply?

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The Liberal Federal Minister with responsibility for water supplies, Mr Schwartz, chucked out the scheme. I know the story backwards. But that does not mean to say that for the last ten years we have not fought for extension of the water supply. Mr Brown is on record as saying that if a Labor Government were to be elected—I am referring to the election before last—Agaton would be proceeded with. I did not want to bring the matter up, but he raised something with me.

Hon. J. M. Brown: I was asking you, for the record, about what the Opposition did when in Government.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I told the member that the proposal was knocked back by Mr Schwartz in 1969. What more could he want?

Hon. J. M. Brown: You blamed the Federals.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Of course I did, and I will blame them again. Why not?

Hon. J. M. Brown: It was a red herring by Sir Charles Court.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! Hon. Jim Brown knows that he is out of order. I ask him to desist from interjecting.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: In 1969 Sir Charles Court was not the Premier of this State. Let us get this right. He had nothing to do with the extension being put forward. Within 12 months of the proposal's going to Canberra, Hon. Colin Jamieson got the same treatment when he put it forward, so it is an ongoing thing.

The point I am making is that water and electricity schemes for Aboriginal communities that have never been planned can be funded to the extent of \$40 million from the State Government and \$40 million from the Federal Government.

Hon. T. R. Helm: It is for houses too.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I point out to Hon. Tom Helm that that is not what the article says. It refers to some houses, water, and electricity.

Hon. D. W. Wenn: Did you just say some houses, water and electricity?

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I can see that I will have to read out the article, after all. I quote—

Mr Holding said Aboriginals in Western Australia had been neglected and up to \$80 million would be spent on the provision of such things as power and water.

That is an indication that planning on these things is still to be done. That is really amazing, because I thought things were costed before

moneys were granted. Here \$80 million will be spent, some on housing, some on electricity and some on water, on a completely uncosted, unplanned exercise, yet we want to get \$50 million—near enough—for the Agaton water supply and we cannot get past the first base.

I started off by saying we believe water and electricity are no longer luxuries but necessities. I repeat: They are necessities for all, not just for some.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [5.02 p.m.]: I want to mention a couple of points. One is in relation to the article in today's *The West Australian* about which I asked some questions of the Minister for Community Services. The other is in respect of water supplies and electricity, because I believe many Aboriginal communities need water supplies and electricity.

Some of the Aboriginal communities in my electorate live under disgusting conditions from the point of view of basic services. Hon. Tom Stephens referred to this matter in his speech on the Address-in-Reply. These are some of the most depressing and disgusting settlements one could ever see. The water supply at Cundeelec is a very poor excuse for a water supply.

Some of the money advanced is to be used to improve that service although some of the people are moving to Coonanae. There is also a water supply problem there. That money is to be used there in much the same way as at Mt Margaret, which I supported. This does not mean that the people in Agaton should not get their water as well.

I share Hon. Mick Gayfer's concern that if things are to be given to Aboriginal people, and earmarked for them in such a way as to provide a sense of discrimination, then a backlash is created. I hope we might eventually avoid that. If the money could be made available to provide water and electricity for people who do not have them, one might find people more susceptible to that point of view.

The other point concerns Aboriginal children. It was reported in the newspaper this morning that Aboriginal children will no longer be taken away from their people and put into the care of the Department for Community Services.

First of all, I am a parent, and if anybody took my children from me they would find themselves in for one very severe fight. I know

Aboriginal people share the same view about their own children.

Hon. Kay Hallahan has first-hand experience of this. Many Aboriginal children, particularly in the eastern goldfields, will have no chance of improving their standard of living unless they are removed from their environment. I refer to the Cundeelee environment. People brought up in the Cundeelee environment have no hope of getting out of that poverty. They will never know anything but extreme poverty, absolute degradation, and disgusting living conditions. That is all they will experience if they continue to stay in the Cundeelee situation.

What Hon. Kay Hallahan appears to be promoting is that children requiring community services' assistance or accommodation provided by the Department for Community Services should remain in that community. I put the point to this House that many children living in some of those communities would be far better off removed from them.

I know that is difficult for their parents, but I happen to think that in many cases children should be considered ahead of their parents. If the parents are living in slovenly, disgusting conditions—I am not suggesting it is necessarily their fault—then they should forgo in a sense some of their rights in respect of their children if, by forgoing those rights, they give their children some chance to improve their prospects. Living in those sorts of conditions as children, and growing up and remaining there will not improve their situation.

What I am trying to say is that I do not agree that in every case every Aboriginal child should be taken from his parents, but here are circumstances where I think it would be a very sensible proposition. It is a proposition argued by the Aboriginal people themselves.

They gave evidence to our Select Committee on Aboriginal Poverty. They used examples from the Mt Margaret Mission and other missions in previous times where children were taken from their parents and raised in a different environment altogether. They argued that that was the way in which they could improve their standard of living and their chances in society.

What I am suggesting to Hon. Kay Hallahan is this: She suggested in one of her answers that there would be no occasions, or very few, on which a non-Aboriginal person would be given custody or control over Aboriginal children. That is why I asked the question twice. Did it mean non-Aboriginal people may not be

allowed to look after Aboriginal children? I hope she does not have ideological blinkers about this situation and that every child and every community will be considered separately and independently, and the circumstances at each place will be seen in isolation rather than as one massive problem. I do not believe one can provide a blanket, departmental ruling policy or principle in respect of this matter.

I am sorry Hon. Kay Hallahan is out of the Chamber on parliamentary business at the moment, but I hope she reads the *Hansard* and realises that I have a genuine concern for many of the Aboriginal children whom I saw on my travels and who live in my electorate. If they are forced to remain living in the conditions in which they are living now as a result of departmental policies, they have no hope of ever getting out of that cycle. The only way they can improve that standard of living is for that cycle to be broken. For that cycle to be broken, one must take drastic action to change direction in the face of what is happening.

Hon. B. L. Jones: What about underprivileged white children?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The same thing applies. Many parents, black or white, do not deserve to have children. Perhaps because they do not bring their children up properly they deserve to lose some of their rights in respect of those children. The Department for Community Services is there to assist children in that situation.

Hon. B. L. Jones: To withdraw them from black families does not mean—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I accept that. What Hon. Kay Hallahan says is that they will be brought up in the same community, and some will be kept in Cundeelee. They should be put into another environment. I do not mind, but if one is being pedantic and saying this is the principle, I am suggesting it will cause more trouble in the long run.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Minister for Budget Management) [5.10 p.m.]: This Bill has been treated as analogous to a Supply Bill and as a result the debate has been unrestricted so far as subject matter is concerned. Needless to say I have no objection to that, but on the other hand I believe that members will accept that the wide-ranging nature of the debate does preclude the sort of detailed response that might otherwise be appropriate.

I am sure that we will have other opportunities, both in the course of considering specific Bills and by other procedures of the House, to pursue many of the matters that have been raised in the course of debating this Bill, and I intend to leave that detailed discussion for those further opportunities.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) in the Chair; Hon. J. M. Berinson (Minister for Budget Management) in charge of the Bill.

#### **Clause 1: Short title—**

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Given what the Minister for Budget Management said in a very cursory resumé of the second reading debate, the least he could have undertaken was to have circulated to appropriate departments and Ministers matters that were raised by members of the Opposition in the genuine belief that someone was actually listening to them. I did make some reference during my own second reading remarks, without making it too pointed, that at the time several matters were being raised with him, the Minister concerned was otherwise diverted. Such diversions can occur to anyone in the Chamber, but I say on my own account that I certainly did not raise them for the privilege of seeing them take up extra *Hansard* space.

I raised two particular matters which concerned the Minister for Budget Management in a very direct way. The Minister himself drew an analogy between this debate and the Supply Bill debate, and in common with that debate I think that he should similarly see some analogy between what happens on those occasions

when references are made to other departments and other Ministers. That is the least members can expect, and if the point was lost on the Minister at that time—and it may well have been, in a genuine sense—then I ask again that these matters be referred by the Minister in charge of the Bill. As Hon. Mick Gayfer said, we are asked to give parliamentary sanction to a mere \$160 million or thereabouts. The least we can ask is that our comments be taken seriously.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I accept the comment by Mr Pendal, but he should be comforted by the knowledge that what he is suggesting is in fact my invariable practice. Indeed, in respect of the specific inquiries which he directed to the Minister for The Arts, Hon. Fred McKenzie, as Government Whip, has already alerted the Minister's office to the need to consider those comments.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Then I am eternally grateful to the Government Whip, but I think my gratitude ought to have been directed to the Minister because it is his responsibility, with great respect, and not the Government Whip's. Nonetheless I do thank Hon. Fred McKenzie for being alert enough to take responsibility.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 5 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Minister for Budget Management), and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.15 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### AGRICULTURE PROTECTION BOARD

#### *Deer Farming: Requirements*

89. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the Agriculture Protection Board reviewed the farming requirements needed for deer?
- (2) If so, would the Minister table the findings?
- (3) If no review has been held when will such review be undertaken?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) An extensive review was undertaken by deer farming organisations and the Agriculture Protection Board between June and December 1984.
- (2) The summary of submissions on fencing standards and the revised fencing standard subsequently adopted by the Agriculture Protection Board is tabled.
- (3) Not applicable.  
(See paper No. 212.)

### TOURISM

#### *Lake Argyle Project: "Waltzing Matilda"*

104. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) What progress is being made on the five star Waltzing Matilda hotel project on Lake Argyle?
- (2) Does the State or commission have any direct or indirect involvement in the project?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The developers have advised that they are currently finalising finance and the selection of an operator for the project.
- (2) The WA Tourism Commission has held discussions with the developers and is prepared to provide marketing assistance once the project is completed. The commission has no financial involvement.

I understand WA Exim Corporation Ltd has had discussions with potential investors. However, I cannot provide

any further information as this matter is outside my portfolio responsibilities.

### DAIRYING: MILK

#### *Milk Bottles: Withdrawal from sale.*

116. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it correct that milk bottles will be withdrawn from sale in September 1986?
- (2) If so, why?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) and (2) I am not aware of any decision by the dairy produce factories to terminate the supply of milk in glass bottles.

### AGRICULTURE

#### *Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation: Fixed Interest Rate*

117. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

The Minister for Agriculture has stated that a two-year term of fixed interest was a prerequisite for borrowing from Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation's interest rate relief scheme and that this was a reason that farmers were not taking advantage of that scheme.

- (1) Is it the Government's intention and priority to make a profit on the above lendings?
- (2) If not, why does the Government not allow borrowers the advantage of any fall in the commercial money market rate?
- (3) Has the Minister considered the extension of such lending to rural support industries other than farmers?
- (4) If not, why has he rejected this course?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The cost of funds borrowed by the Government to finance the scheme is fixed over the two-year period.

- (3) No. The Minister for Small Business is investigating possible ways of Government help in this area.
- (4) Funds under this scheme were to be provided specifically to farmers.

## AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

### Staff

122. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

How many people were employed with the Department of Agriculture as at—

(a) 30 June 1985, and

(b) 31 May 1986 at

(i) Bunbury;

(ii) all other centres of the south west, each detailed separately?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(a) 1059 permanent officers

164 temporary and term appointments

291 wages

1514

(b)		Salaries	Wages
(i) Bunbury Region			
Bunbury		56	9
Harvey		12	2
Busselton		8	2
Wokalup Research Station		6	14
Vasse Research Station		5	8
		87	35
TOTAL		122	
(ii) Manjimup Region			
Manjimup		17	2
Bridgetown District Office		5	4
Manjimup Research Station		7	6
		29	12
TOTAL		41	

## AGED PERSONS: SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRE

### Collie: Plans

133. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for The South West:

With regard to the senior citizens' centre in Collie—

(1) Has a site been chosen?

(2) Have plans been drawn up?

(3) When is it expected tenders will be let?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) to (3) I refer the member to the answer given to question 37.

## ABATTOIR

### Midland: Valuations

146. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many valuations did the Government have on the Midland abattoir site?

(2) Who made the valuations?

(3) Will the Minister table the valuations?

(4) If not, why not?

(5) When and where was the property advertised?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) to (4) The consultants' report, which has been tabled in the Legislative Assembly, details the number of valuation opinions submitted and who compiled those opinions.

(5) The GHD-Dwyer Report clearly shows that there were several proposals put forward. Two of these emerged as distinct possibilities with Prestige Bricks being the better. Negotiations were subsequently entered into and the proposal accepted.

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

*South West Development Authority: Financial Accounts*

150. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for The South West:

With regard to the statement of income and expenditure of the South West Development Authority for the year ended 30 June 1985—

- (1) How much of the allowances were attributable to—
  - (a) Staff;
  - (b) wages staff; and
  - (c) members of the authority and the advisory committee?
- (2) How many consultants were employed during the year and on what projects?
- (3) What are the “other staffing costs”?
- (4) What land and buildings are owned by the SWDA?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) (a) All allowances paid under the category of salaries, wages, and allowances were paid to salaried staff;
- (b) not applicable;
- (c) nil.
- (2) A list of consultants and relevant projects are listed hereunder—
  1. Mr P. A. Greaves South West Tourism Study
  2. Barker Berry SW Free Trade Zone Study
  3. Mr Graham Houghton SW Small Towns Study
  4. Mr Graham Houghton SWNFL Entry into WAFL
  5. T. S. Martin & Assoc. Bunbury Port Study
  6. C. W. Quinn & Assoc. S E Asian Marketing Study
  7. State Planning Dept Mr Max Poole Mr M. Tooby Bunbury Central Area Study
  8. Wilson Sayer & Core SW Community Needs Study
  9. David H. Dale Yallingup-Sugarloaf Road Study

## 10. Urban &amp; Environmental Planning Group Cape Naturaliste Planning &amp; Development Study

- (3) Other staffing costs include payroll tax, workers' compensation insurance, personal accident insurance, travel and accommodation expenses, meeting expenses, transfer and removal expenses, staff training fees, advertising staff vacancies, etc.
- (4) Property owned by South West Development Authority as at 30 June 1985 is listed as follows—

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being part Lot 29 of Plan 1856 Certificate of Title Volume 1237 Folio 905—situated in Jeffrey Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being part of each of Lots 5 and 6 on Plan 1856—Certificate of Title Volume 1249 Folio 821—situated in Newton Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being Lot 4 on Plan 1856 (Sheet 1)—Certificate of Title Volume 1438 Folio 983—situated in Newton Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being Lot 1 on Diagram 17034—Certificate of Title Volume 1154 Folio 523—situated in Jeffrey Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being part of Lot 38 on Plan 1856—Certificate of Title Volume 174 Folio 199A—situated in Jubilee Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being part of Lot 1 on Plan 2571—Certificate of Title Volume 260 Folio 107A—situated in Vittoria Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being Lot 2 on Diagram 1086—Certificate of Title Volume 12 Folio 77A—situated in Newton Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being part of Lot 11 on Diagram 5192—Certificate of Title Volume 1596 Folio 894—situated in Vittoria Road.

Portion of Leschenault Location 26 being part of Lot 1 on Plan 1856—Certificate of Title Volume 1355 Folio 768—situated cnr Vittoria and Newton Roads.

## DTX AUSTRALIA LTD

*Relocation: Bunbury*

160. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for The South West:

- (1) What progress is being made towards the establishment of the DTX Australia Ltd assembly plant in the Bunbury area?
- (2) What incentives have been or are being offered to the company to attract this industry to Bunbury?
- (3) What is the anticipated time scale for this industry to be established?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) An application for subdivision of the site proposed for the DTX Australia facility is currently being considered by the State Planning Commission.
- (2) A detailed answer on this matter was provided to question 267 asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.
- (3) The time required to establish the facility is a matter for the company.

## GAMBLING

*Casino Tax: Receipts*

187. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming.

What is the total amount of casino tax received by the State Treasury for the months of January, February, March, April, and May?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The Minister advises that the total amount of revenue received as a result of the casino tax as at 31 May 1986 was \$3 810 808.

## ROTTNEST ISLAND

*Housing Cost*

192. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is the 10 June 1986 *Daily News* report correct in saying that "tourist and staff housing cost the Rottneest Island Board more than \$1 million in the past two years"?
- (2) If so, would she provide details?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

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

## ROTTNEST ISLAND

*Non-residential Areas: Control*

193. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is the Government considering proposals to take control of non-residential areas of Rottneest Island away from the Rottneest Island Board?
- (2) If so, to whom would such control be transferred?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Cabinet will consider a range of proposals when the management plan for Rottneest is put before it within the next few weeks. Until Cabinet has completed its considerations, I am unable to provide any further information.

## YOUTH

*Scout Association: Lotteries Commission Ruling*

199. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Is it correct that The Scout Association of Australia (WA Branch) has been told by the Lotteries Commission—

Because of recent amendments to the Act, whereby \$6 000 000 of our money goes to sport and culture, this has had the effect of limiting our resources available for distribution, and accordingly we feel it appropriate that we no longer make grants for organisations such as yours.

- (2) Have the scouts, as a result, been given a once-off \$50 000 final payment?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.



# TOURISM COMMISSION

## *Chairman: Appointment*

203. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to my letter to the Minister of 19 May 1986 regarding the appointment of Mr John Osborn as Chairman of the Tourism Commission and ask when she expects to be able to answer the seven queries I raised regarding his appointment?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The Minister advises that the member was offered an early appointment to meet with her and the Chairman of the Tourism Commission, Mr John Osborn, to put his questions in person. The member declined the invitation to meet the chairman and to put his questions direct to him.

As a result the member's letter has been referred to the Chairman of the Tourism Commission and the Minister has already advised the member that she will be responding in writing in due course.

# GOVERNMENT TRAVEL

## *Holiday WA: Value*

204. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) What is the annual value of Government travel business written with Holiday WA?
- (2) Does Holiday WA automatically get all travel business or does some system of tender apply?
- (3) Is the Minister concerned that Holiday WA prices for air travel are higher than prices on offer from private travel agents?
- (4) Will she investigate why there is such a difference?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The value of Government travel business written by the Holiday WA Centre for the period 1 July 1985 to 31 May 1986 is \$8 317 109, which is made up of \$7 228 549 for domestic travel and \$1 088 470 for international travel.

- (2) It has been Government policy since 1971 that all departments and authorities utilise the Holiday WA Centre—formerly WA Government Travel Centre—for all official departmental travel requirements.

- (3) and (4) As the member would be aware, there is a wide range of fares available depending on individual travel requirements. However, in general terms the fares available through the Holiday WA Centre can be compared with those available in the private sector.

# TRANSPORT: AIR

## *Government: Tenders*

205. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

In view of the fact that the former head of the Technology Development Authority was able to buy air tickets from his wife's firm cheaper than from Holiday WA Centres, would he order an investigation into the possibility of putting all Government-civil service-ministerial air travel out to tender?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The Government is always mindful of the need for efficiency in its agencies. The Holiday WA arrangements with national and international airlines and hotels can be compared with those offered by the private sector.

The Holiday WA Centre has recently instituted a new efficient system for handling Government business. This system has operated for only a short time and I have asked the commission to prepare a cost-benefit analysis three months from now.

# BRICKWORKS: PRESTIGE BRICKS

## *Saleyards: Need*

208. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does the Government know whether the saleyards are essential to the Prestige Bricks development?

- (2) If they are essential, what is there to prevent Prestige Bricks dismissing the Government from the site in six years?
- (3) If the saleyards are not essential why were they sold at all? Could not the Government have sold the rest of the site and left it to Prestige to approach the Government at a later stage if it had a legitimate expansion programme?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) In the overall development aims and objectives of Prestige Bricks it is understood that the land currently used as saleyards is not essential for its operation in the foreseeable future, but might be needed if expansion takes place at some later date.
- (2) The Government has secured a 3 + 3 lease on the saleyards at a peppercorn rent plus an assurance that two years' notice would be given if the land were required for expansion, plus a further undertaking by letter dated 18 May 1986—

it is this company's wish that the saleyards operates with a minimum of disruption as long as the Government wishes. Accordingly, I consider the member's question to be totally conjectural.

- (3) The highest and best use proposition expressed by Baillicu Justin Seward in the GHD-Dwyer report was, following the consideration of several options, for the sale of the complex as one site. The Government referred the matter to WADC for comment, which concurred with the report's advice. On this basis and on the basis that the Government retained the right to receive income from the saleyards at no cost from use of the livestock industry in the foreseeable future, the decision to sell as one parcel would appear to be correctly made.

## STOCK: SALEYARDS

### *Midland: Protection*

209. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

I refer to the Minister's Press release of 19 June 1986—

- (1) Why were measures to protect the saleyards not taken until two months after the Minister had signed a contract of sale?
- (2) Are the fresh undertakings given by Prestige contractually binding as they were given after the contract was signed?
- (3) If the stockyards are closed is there any chance that replacements would be built?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The offer and acceptance special condition (9) makes explicit reference to the lease-back agreement.
- (2) Most subsequent correspondence has been to confirm the agreements reached in establishing special condition (9).
- (3) Yes. However, I expressed the strong view, on several occasions, that I do not foresee the saleyards ever being relocated away from their present site.

## EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING: UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Midland: Saleyard Effect*

210. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

I refer to the Minister's Press release of 19 June 1986 outlining, in particular, the report of the meat industry inquiry 1984 at page 307. What consolation is it to the community of Midland that there may be increased employment in regional saleyards if there has been a loss of jobs in Midland?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The community of Midland is not losing an employer. It is gaining another significant employer and, therefore, should derive great consolation from this achievement.

# ABATTOIR: MIDLAND

## *Sale: Papers Tabled*

213. Hon NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

I refer to the papers tabled in the Legislative Assembly relating to the sale of the Midland abattoir-saleyard complex—

- (1) Has the document marked 186d "Contract of Sale" been stamped?
- (2) If not is there any proposal to draft a further contract?
- (3) When will it be stamped?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) That date of stamping is at the offerer's discretion at any time prior to the nominated settlement date.

# COMMUNITY SERVICES

## *Counsellors: Rural Areas*

214. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) How many counselling people has the Department for Community Services deployed in rural areas of WA, excluding the major towns and coastal towns?
- (2) Has the department supplied welfare money in the form of emergency relief to farming families in the wheatbelt of WA?
- (3) If so, to how many, and what is the total amount?
- (4) What is the department's pay-out of emergency relief in WA for each of the past six months?
- (5) Can the Minister please provide a district office break up of the money distributed over the past six months?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) The Department for Community services has field staff located in Mullewa, Moora, Northam, Kellerberrin, Merredin, Norseman, Esperance, Narrogin, Katanning, Manjimup, Gnowangerup, and Collie. The normal staffing ratio is two officers to each district office, which would give approximately 24 staff

working with the individual and family problems of their rural communities. Some of this assistance does take the form of counselling. The department has temporarily seconded a senior social worker to RAFCO to coordinate the process of information and counselling referrals.

- (2) The Department for Community Services does pay non-continuous emergency relief for people in a wide range of situations or circumstances. The most frequent category of assistances is for "payment of basic domestic expenses". This assistance is provided according to set guidelines and is available to anyone who qualifies, and has included payments to farming families.
- (3) Farming families seeking assistance are not identified apart from other applicants. Therefore expenditure figures reflect a total amount of assistance given by a statistical grouping.
- (4) The department's payment for non-continuous emergency relief for the whole State in each of the last six months is—  
 December \$437 000  
 January \$437 000  
 February \$520 000  
 March \$324 000  
 April \$304 000  
 May \$345 000
- (5) No, but for the benefit of the member, I table figures providing a divisional office break-up of emergency relief for the 1984-85 financial year.  
*(See paper No. 213.)*

# AMERICA'S CUP

## *Liquor Sales: Applications*

216. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) How many applications has the Minister received under section 6 of the Acts Amendment (America's Cup Defence and Special Events) Act since it became law?
- (2) Who were the applicants?
- (3) How many have been granted?
- (4) Who were the successful applicants?

- (5) On what dates were the successful applications granted?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) 30.  
 (2) White Sands Tavern;  
 Mangoes Bar;  
 Club Atlantis—Observation City;  
 Fremantle Sailing Club;  
 James Street Festival, Flanagans;  
 Australian Beer and Wine Festival;  
 Oyster Beds Restaurant;  
 Superflys, Bunbury;  
 Mediterranean Garden Restaurant;  
 Australian Beer and Wine Festival—  
 Variation to Order—Fremantle Oval;  
 Oyster Beds Restaurant—Variation to  
 Order;  
 Fairway Tavern—Golf Course,  
 Wembley;  
 East Fremantle Football Club;  
 Norfolk Since 1887;  
 Auld Mug Tavern;  
 Cagney's on the Terrace;  
 Boko's Piano Bar;  
 Friday's Night Club;  
 Sirocco Club;  
 Papa Luigi's;  
 Lighthouse Inn, Bunbury;  
 Shafto Lane Tavern;  
 Nedlands Park Hotel;  
 F. Scotts, Perth;  
 Riccardo's Restaurant and  
 Winehouse, Northbridge;  
 Marmion Angling and Aquatic Club,  
 North Beach;  
 The Leeuwin Charter Vessel;  
 Motive Travel re Achille Lauro Char-  
 ter Vessel;  
 K. Hitchcock Promotions—proposed  
 cabaret in Fremantle;  
 Fremantle Sailing Club Inc.

(3) 15.

- (4) and (5) Application Granted Date  
 White Sands Tavern 01/01/86.  
 Club Atlantis—Observation  
 City 13/01/86.  
 Fremantle Sailing Club 20/01/86.  
 Australian Beer and Wine  
 Festival 23/01/86.  
 Oyster Beds Restaurant 23/01/86.  
 Mediterranean Garden  
 Restaurant 04/02/86.  
 Australian Beer and Wine  
 Festival—Variation to Order,  
 Fremantle Oval 04/02/86.  
 Oyster Beds Restaurant—

Variation to Order	07/02/86.
Norfolk Since 1887	10/02/86.
Auld Mug Tavern	10/02/86.
Cagney's on the Terrace	10/02/86.
Boko's Piano Bar	10/02/86.
Friday's Night Club	10/02/86.
Sirocco Club	10/02/86.
Papa Luigi's	11/02/86.

## GOVERNMENT ADVISERS

### *Services: Cost*

222. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What is the total number of Govern-  
 ment advisers employed by the State  
 Government as at 17 June 1986?  
 (2) What is the total annual cost of these  
 advisers?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I refer the member to the  
 Premier's answer to question 207 in  
 the Legislative Assembly.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

#### *Flexitime: Abolition*

53. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Budget Management:

I refer the Minister to the proposal of  
 the Premier to cut out flexitime in the  
 Public Service.

- (1) How much is expected to be  
 saved by the removal of  
 flexitime?  
 (2) How does the removal of  
 flexitime save money?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The savings have not been  
 quantified, but increased manage-  
 ment efficiency will result from  
 staff working standard hours.

## ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

### *Children: Fostering*

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

I refer the Minister to a newspaper  
 article in this morning's *The West  
 Australian* in which it was reported  
 that a policy change had been

announced involving Aboriginal children being taken away from their parents. The Minister was reported as having said that "past policies had not acknowledged the rights of Aborigines". What rights were not acknowledged in the past in respect of this matter?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Past practices with respect to placement of Aboriginal children have created some problems in respect of children keeping in touch with their culture and heritage. The general view these days with respect to placement of children is very clearly that, where possible, they should be placed with members of their own community, and certainly with people of their own culture.

#### MIDLAND SALEYARDS SALE

##### *Documents: Tabling*

55. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Budget Management representing the Leader of the House:

On Wednesday, 11 June I asked that the documents associated with the sale of the Midland saleyards complex be tabled in this House. Could the Minister give some indication as to when those documents will be tabled, as 14 days have already lapsed?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

Despite the fact that I am acting very temporarily in the position Hon. Des Dans holds in this House, I am not in a position to represent the Ministers he represents. Accordingly, I am unable to answer this question.

#### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

##### *Children: Fostering*

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

I refer the Minister to her previous answer. Does this now mean that Aboriginal children will not be placed by the Department of Community Services with non-Aboriginal parents?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

It now means that wherever possible Aboriginal children will be placed with Aboriginal families.

#### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

##### *Children: Fostering*

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

Does this mean that Aboriginal children will not be placed with non-Aboriginal parents?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I repeat my previous answer that, where possible, Aboriginal children as a matter of principle will be placed with Aboriginal families or communities.

#### MIDLAND SALEYARDS SALE

##### *Documents: Tabling*

58. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Budget Management representing the Leader of the House:

In view of the fact that the papers I referred to in my previous question were tabled in the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 18 June, is it possible for the Minister to enable the papers to be tabled in this House in accordance with my request? Can he in any way assist their tabling in this House?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I am sorry, but I have to say that I have no background knowledge of the earlier question. Perhaps I did hear it but did not note it because it was not directed to me in the first instance. The best course for me to take would be to draw Mr Oliver's question to Mr Dans' attention immediately on his return.

#### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

##### *Children: Removal*

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

(1) Is the Minister aware of the view of many of the Aborigines in the goldfields that Aboriginal children should be removed from the immediate Aboriginal environment?

- (2) How does she reconcile that view with the new policy of her department?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) and (2) The principles adopted, which are now the policy of the department, are that there should be consultation with families and communities and that where a family would like representation to assist them in their dealings with the department they can ask the Aboriginal Child Care Association to assist them. In this regard, if Hon. Norman Moore knows of communities which have views which may be—I am not saying that they are, because I do not know what they are—at variance with those principles, those communities could ask the Aboriginal Child Care Association to negotiate with them and, on their behalf, with the department.

## MIDLAND SALEYARDS SALE

### *Documents: Tabling*

60. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Budget Management representing the Leader of the House:

With respect to my request to have papers associated with the sale of the Midland saleyards complex tabled in this House—papers which have been tabled in another place—I ask the Minister whether he could use his best endeavours to have those papers tabled here as a mark of respect to this House?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I cannot go beyond what has already been said. Again, I draw attention to the fact that the request is really directed to the responsible Minister, for whom I am not the conduit.