

# Legislative Council

Thursday, 25 October 1984

**THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

### *Extension of Time*

On motion by Hon. J. M. Brown, resolved—

That the time for the presentation of the report of the Standing Committee on the Urban Lands Council be extended from 31 October 1984 to 30 November 1984, that the date fixed for the presentation of its report on the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the Town Planning Board be extended from 31 October 1984 to 31 March 1984, and that the report do lie upon the Table and be adopted and agreed to.

## UNIONS: STANDOVER TACTICS

### *Motion*

**HON. G. E. MASTERS** (West—Leader of the Opposition) [2.34 p.m.]: I move—

- (1) This House condemns the stand-over and coercive tactics being used by the BWIU on a building site at Lot 1, Beechboro Road, Morley, which threatens to develop into violence.
- (2) Calls upon the Government to take urgent action to ensure builders, subcontractors and workers are able to go about their legal business free from intimidation and coercion.
- (3) Calls on the Government to instruct industrial inspectors to investigate allegations made by the union of under-payment of wages and breaches of contractual arrangements.

The motion expresses, in very simple terms, the grave situation which exists and which is becoming typical on some of the building sites in this State. Certainly those problems seem to have increased over recent times. I am sure that I am expressing the concern of all members of the House when I say that the public, generally, are upset with what is happening as, certainly, are members of Parliament on both sides of the House.

The motion is explicit. It identifies the site to which we wish to draw the Government's atten-

tion. The activities taking place on that site are certainly not in the best interests of the community. I am prepared to give the name of the company and the persons involved. On a number of occasions when this sort of thing has arisen, the Government has told us to front up or shut up, give the names and details of the matter or sit down. That is not always as easy as it seems.

It happens in this case that we have a person who is prepared to be identified and to stand up and be counted. We have therefore brought this matter forward in terms of a most important motion for this House to consider. I asked Hon. D. K. Dans some questions yesterday relating to standover tactics which are occurring in the workplace. I think he said that he did not know what the word "standover" meant. Where a man or a woman is threatened personally, where property is trespassed, where business is threatened, where subcontractors and workers are forced off a site, where supplies are cut, where deliveries are stopped, where, as was the case in relation to the wife of one of the persons involved, a person has to go to a doctor because he or she is very upset, and where an Italian migrant small businessman is told to pay up or go broke despite signing what he considers to be a contractual arrangement, those incidents constitute standover tactics.

There are many other examples, but those are the examples which have occurred at this site and which I and my colleagues regard as standover tactics.

We live in a free country and we are proud of it. We expect to be able to go about our business freely and be able to stand up and speak freely. We expect that there should be no interference in the workplace under any circumstances.

Where a Minister is charged with upholding the laws of the land and, as it seems to the Opposition, refuses or fails to take action in relation to the breaking of those freedoms, the Opposition becomes concerned.

The escalation of the dispute—it has escalated—is laid fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Government of the day. I was concerned, as I am sure the Minister was when I asked him questions yesterday, that the Minister said that the matter had not been drawn to his attention and that he had not been informed of it. I accept the fact that, if the Minister was out of the State, there is a strong possibility of that happening.

Nevertheless, yesterday a statement was made drawing the public's attention to the dispute and I would have thought that the Minister would be advised of what was happening. Where Ministers,

Government advisers, or even Government members continually refuse to take action or to acknowledge that situations such as this exist, we simply ask: Who is in charge? Who is looking after the interests of the community? I know that there are two sides to every story. I am not arguing about that.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You surprise me, Mr Masters.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am saying that there is a dispute which is of grave concern and that someone, somewhere, must take responsibility for it and take some action. Hon. Sam Piantadosi agrees with me. He would also agree that the Building Workers' Industrial Union has failed, through various efforts and certainly on behalf of the Government members and the Minister, to gain control of the subcontract system. That is what the industrial relations legislation was all about. That provision was defeated in the Legislative Council by the members of the Council at the request, and with the strong support, of the community in general. Having failed to take over the subcontractor system and failed to gain control of that system, as certain people wished—such people as Mr Bill Ethell who, I suggest, is one of the worst union leaders in this State—

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: He is from Moscow.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He, and some of his men have, over recent times, conducted a campaign of terror. Having failed in the industrial relations area, they attacked major builders. They selectively named some builders and told them that unless they did certain things they would send them broke. This campaign went on, but it failed, and Bill Ethell came out with another bloody nose. He is now selectively taking on smaller builders who are easier pickings. He decided to leave the big ones alone because he was not succeeding in that area.

The main target of the BWIU and Bill Ethell is the Italian community. Mr Piantadosi must have recognised this because there have been a number of reports of attacks on members of the Italian community, business people, and builders. This is one such case in a series of deliberate attacks on these groups. This case is typical of the actions of Mr Ethell. I want to put on record the details of this case, the problems that have arisen and why they have arisen.

Some weeks ago Mr Minniti of Minniti and Son advertised for bricklayers to lay 100 000 bricks. A Mr Max Sains who has his own bricklaying company and is an experienced bricklayer, came to Mr Minniti's office and discussed prices. An agreement was reached on 29 September and Mr

Sains commenced work on 1 October. At the end of the first week, on 5 October, Mr Sains called at Mr Minniti's office and received a payment of \$1 600 for laying 8 000 bricks. Withholding tax was deducted, as is required by the law, and the balance was given to Mr Sains by cheque.

The following week on 8 or 9 October, Mr Minniti suggested that the job was too big for Mr Sains' work force and he agreed to permit another subcontractor to work on the site. Mr Sains agreed with that action. Subsequently a further subcontractor came to the site. These arrangements had been made with Mr Sains. On Tuesday, 16 October, Bill Ethell of the BWIU stepped into the matter and that is when the trouble started. He advised Mr Minniti that he could not have two subcontractors on site and that some other arrangements would have to be made. Mr Minniti protested, and following that Mr Ethell gave him an ultimatum. He said that Mr Minniti could do one of two things; that is, he could employ the bricklayers on a day labour rate or, alternatively, Mr Sains could employ them on a day labour basis. He said that there would be no subcontract arrangement and that the work would be carried out using his methods or it would not be done at all. Mr Ethell told Mr Minniti to accept the terms he laid down or the site would be black banned. Mr Minniti advised Mr Ethell and Mr Sains that under no circumstances would he pay additional costs above and beyond those contained in the signed contract arrangements. I have a copy of the contract that was signed.

On receiving the threat from Mr Ethell saying that he had to do certain things or be black banned and sent broke, Mr Minniti contacted various people. On Tuesday he telephoned the Premier at his home. Mrs Burke said that Brian Burke was not available and suggested that Mr Minniti should ring his office and speak to his secretary. Mr Minniti did so, but received no satisfaction from that call. He telephoned Terry Burke, the Premier's brother, and was put in touch with Tom Butler the Premier's industrial relations adviser, an ex-union man, whose job it is to resolve these types of problems. Mr Minniti took these steps in an effort to resolve the problem.

After talking to Mr Minniti, Mr Butler requested him to go to his office in St George's Terrace at 1.30 p.m. that day, pick him up, and drive him to 82 Beaufort Street, where the union offices are situated. Mr Minniti duly drove into town and picked up Mr Butler. Mr Butler is a highly paid Government adviser and he sat in his office and asked a builder to pick him up and run him to the union office. That is an incredible situation, but Mr Minniti wanted to resolve the mat-

ter and, therefore, did as he was asked. A meeting was held between Mr Ethell, Mr Minniti, and Mr Butler. Part of the way through that meeting Mr Butler asked Mr Minniti to leave so that he and Mr Ethell could have a private discussion. Following that discussion, Mr Butler asked Mr Minniti to drive him to his office, in St George's Terrace, and said that everything had been fixed. Mr Minniti drove Mr Butler to his office, as requested.

On 17 October, the same day, Mr Ethell again visited the site. He said that the men were not to work at those rates and that they should go home. On Thursday, 18 October, Mr Ethell was on the site at 7.00 a.m. and Mr Butler at 9.00 a.m. Mr Butler walked onto the site and a meeting was held with Mr Minniti and Mr Ethell in the builder's shed provided by the builder for the workers. Mr Piantadosi knows this is so because he was there this morning.

Again Mr Minniti was asked to leave the meeting and he did so. Subsequently Mr Butler came out of the meeting and it seemed that the problem had been resolved. Mr Butler returned to his office and everything at the site became topsy-turvy. Mr Ethell continued to place a great deal of pressure on Mr Minniti and he finally said that no work would be done on the site. Mr Ethell told Mr Minniti to pay the rates and make the arrangements that suited Mr Ethell or he would black ban the site. Mr Minniti said, "Over my dead body. I will not deviate from the contractual arrangements".

The events this week have been: Monday the workers played cricket on site, Tuesday they played football, and on Wednesday some of the "heavies" came in to make sure that the pickets stood their ground. No work has been done on site this week. The dispute is about whether Mr Minniti should pay those people who were on site for the days they did not work. That is the background of the case as I understand it.

We have a typical example of what can happen if the "heavies" such as Bill Ethell, people who deliberately disrupt for their own good reason, get involved. Mr Minniti is under personal threat and abuse and he has asked the Premier, the Premier's brother, and Mr Butler to take action. However, no-one told Mr Dans about it. Mr Dans came into the House yesterday and said he did not know of the problem. More importantly, he refused to accept a complaint from a member of Parliament. He refused to accept the written complaint in the letter I sent him. The letter has been returned to me—I assume unread.

Hon. D. K. Dans: If you recall the President said that you could not give me the letter.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He did not; he said that there was no point of order. He did not say that I could not present the letter. The Minister cannot duck away from the situation.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not ducking the situation. When you sit down I will say my piece. You should get on with it because you are doing a good job.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is most unusual for a Minister in either House to refuse to listen to a complaint from a member of Parliament. Traditionally members of Parliament from both sides come to the House and bring forward complaints and problems on subjects such as roads, railways, schools, and hospitals; and we draw them to the attention of the Ministers and the Government. There was a general problem in this case. The letter was carefully written and was not abusive in any way. It asked the Minister to take some action. The Minister's response yesterday was to say that the man should write to him personally. It would be very difficult if we adopted that approach in all cases brought to our attention. Mothers would have to write to us regarding complaints about schools, etc. It is our job to draw these problems to the attention of the Ministers of the day. I cannot believe that the Minister would not accept that letter which simply requested him to take some action as well as putting forward a few ideas.

Mr Dans has set a very bad example by saying, "I will receive no such complaints from a member of Parliament", and that applies to me and to anyone else. Mr Dans said that Mr Minniti should write to him, and I am sure Mr Minniti will do just that. However, it is unbelievable that the Premier has been involved, as has the Premier's adviser, and the Premier's officer; but no-one has told Mr Dans about it.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: And the Premier's brother.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: When I asked questions last night—they were straightforward questions, and not put in an aggressive manner—Mr Dans became irrational. He started to get very abusive, upset, and uptight. I can understand that. I can understand the embarrassment of the Leader of the House when no-one, from the Premier downwards, recognised that he was the Minister who should have been handling the matter. He is the Minister for Industrial Relations, but the Premier, the adviser, the officer, and the Premier's brother could not even advise Mr Dans that there was a serious problem and that they were involved. I am concerned that this should happen; and I

suggest, in all sincerity, that the Minister complains to the people involved and says, "For God's sake, if you can't advise me, how am I supposed to deal with these matters?"

Today I went on site, and I know that Mr Piantadosi was also there. I am sorry I missed him. I went on site with Richard Court. As Mr Piantadosi took the trouble to go on site, I am sure he is now better informed.

I spent a long time on site talking to the unionists and the builder. I understand the builder was not very happy with Mr Piantadosi, but nevertheless the unionists were not very happy with me.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: That is not quite true. You will hear from me later.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am just putting the facts and the details of the case. There is no sense in raving or shouting at each other.

Mr Piantadosi has been on site, and I have been on site with my colleague. I talked to the builder and the unionists, and the people working on the site. When I arrived there, I was met by a tirade of abuse, of shouting and raving, and words that I cannot possibly use, and nor would I use in this place with ladies present. I would not want to upset Hon. Tom Stephens. There was a great deal of abuse. Of course, the worst person for yelling abuse was a man called Bill Ethell, who was foul-mouthed and abusive in front of the media and everyone else.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Were they demonstrating their long-held belief in freedom of opinion?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have something to say about that. We arrived on the site, and received abuse and shouting. However, we walked through onto the site because the people there had no right to stop us. We walked onto the site and spoke to the builder and the people working for the builder. Then I went up to the demonstrators, who were still being very abusive. I was upset by the sort of language that they used. I said, "Where is the bricklayer who has been affected?" They said, "There he is". He was a fair-haired fellow with no shirt, but I am not complaining about that. I went and I said to him, "Do you want to explain what is happening now?" Mr Bill Ethell said, "You keep your mouth shut. Don't say anything". He said, "You keep your trap shut. We don't want you saying anything". He said that to the bricklayer.

Hon. P. G. Pental: That is freedom of speech?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: When that sort of statement is made, it is a sad day. Mr Bill Ethell made that statement to the bricklayer, so I went back onto the site and had further talks.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Was that the Mr Ethell who wantonly and vandalisingly damaged a house?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He is exactly the same man. Of course, he has been prosecuted, and he is now conducting a vicious campaign in the building industry. He is the biggest embarrassment possible, of course. He is mad, and the sooner somebody gets rid of him, the better. He made the statement, "You keep your mouth shut and don't say a word". I become frightened when that sort of thing happens. The young fellow backed off and said, "No, I can't talk to you".

Mr Ethell has convinced some of the people that he is working in their interests, yet he is really wrecking any chances they have of stability in the building industry.

I wonder what will happen. Mr Sains, the bricklayer to whom I tried to talk, was told by the union to put a significant number of people on. Mr Ethell said, "You will employ X number of people more in your team". Mr Sains said, "Well, how am I going to pay for them?" Mr Ethell said, "We'll fix that. You put them on." Mr Sains said, "All right, but I'll have to go to Mr Minniti and tell him to pay more". Mr Minniti said, "No, that's not in your contract". I have a copy of the contract, signed and sealed, for any member to look at it. Mr Minniti said, "If you are going to take more men on, that is up to you, but you pay for it." Mr Ethell said, "You put them on and Mr Minniti will pay, because we will force him to pay." That is what it is all about.

That is the problem that Mr Sains had. He is a straightforward sort of a fellow, but he is locked into this dispute. The dispute is not between Mr Minniti and the union; it is between the union and Mr Sains. He is the employer, not Mr Minniti. Mr Minniti has a contract.

The workers turned up on site, but they had virtually no work. They thought they were on day labour and that they would be paid regardless. It is interesting that after the first day, Mr Minniti went on site to see how they were going and found that two bricklayers and a labourer had only laid 576 bricks in one day. Obviously, Mr Minniti said, "Not on. There is a contract. I will stick to the contract. That's all there is to it."

When I went on to the site for the second time this morning, fortunately Mr Ethell had gone. The abuse and swearing was nowhere near the same, and the attitude and atmosphere were quite different. The unionists started talking to us, and Mr Sains decided he could talk. Mr Ethell had gone, so Mr Sains said, "Yes, I will talk to you".

Richard Court and I stayed there and talked with Mr Sains about the problem.

We went in and checked the facilities shed, and it was not good. It was dirty, filthy, and untidy. I do not know whose fault that was. It was not a place in which one would have a meal; but it would have taken 15 minutes to clean it up. I do not know who was responsible for that.

At least the unionists were quite prepared to talk to us about the problem. I was quite impressed with Mr Sains and the fellows who worked with him. They were in a fix, and they did not know what to do. More particularly, they were frightened. They were told by Mr Ethell and some of his heavies, "If you let us down now, you will never get any work again". I do not know how we can cope with that sort of thing.

On a number of occasions, the Opposition has drawn to the attention of the Minister and the Government cases of standover in the workplace. Time and time again we have raised such cases; and I will not go through all the examples of standover tactics again. We have produced letters sent to the Minister's office complaining, and nothing has been done.

In a debate on Wednesday, 16 May 1984, at page 8409 of *Hansard*, Mr Dans said the following—

If the evidence that the highest police officers in this State are examining is of a sufficiently serious and widespread nature, I shall suggest to the Cabinet and the Premier that either a judicial inquiry or Royal Commission, chaired by a judge of very high standing from another State, be established. Those people who make these allegations, and even Mr Masters can then, under oath, allow themselves to be cross-questioned so that the truth of the matter can be placed on record. That is a very necessary course of action.

These were Mr Dans's words earlier this year.

We have brought forward a documented case of what has happened up to now with Mr Minniti and the people involved at his workplace. If the Minister wants any further examples he has only to look back over recent times. There was the incident of Mr Todd's attacking and harming an Italian bricklayer, and it seems to be a habit for such people to single out Italians and other ethnic groups. From memory Mr Todd was fined \$700.

Again there was Mr Ethell and his colleague who pulled down some brickwork at a Safety Bay site. He and his colleague were prosecuted successfully and made to pay damages. This morning the same man was standing over Mr Court and me.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Perhaps Mr Piantadosi will have the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission do something about this.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Perhaps, but it does seem to be a deliberate campaign aimed at the small Italian business people. Perhaps it is because, when members of the Italian community make a deal, they tend just to say, "Okay, that is the deal", and there is not always the necessary contractual arrangement to cover it and so there are often loopholes. But in the case of Mr Minniti, there was a contract. I will quote now from *The West Australian* and an article headed "Unionist accused of assault"—

A bricklayer has told the police that he was assaulted on a Cannington building site over a union dispute.

Harold Glover, of Morley, said that three union men walked on to the site in Railway Parade on Monday and began arguing with him.

One of them turned off a cement mixer and when Mr Glover went to restart the engine he was attacked by one of the men.

He said that he was punched in the face and knocked to the ground.

So there is another example of what is happening in the workplace.

I do not know what more I have to do to persuade this Minister and this Government that there is a need for an inquiry. There has to be an inquiry. We just cannot go on living in a State where this sort of thing happens and where, in the main, these people get off scot-free. I have just named a couple of people who did get caught, but in the main they get off scot-free.

The motion is quite clear. It begins as follows—

That this House condemns the stand-over and coercive tactics being used by the B.W.I.U. on a building site at Lot 1, Beechboro Road, Morley, which threatens to develop into violence.

I went onto the site this morning and I was subjected to a great deal of abuse, as was my colleague and Mr Minniti. We were threatened and intimidated; there was shouting and swearing and a great deal of carry-on. I am sure every member, even Mr Piantadosi, would condemn this sort of activity. It is not a proper way to resolve a dispute.

The second point in our motion reads—

Calls upon the Government to take urgent action to ensure builders, subcontractors and workers are able to go about their legal business free from intimidation and coercion.

How can Government members possibly argue against that proposition? Surely to goodness people should be able to go about their work without being abused and prevented from doing their work. If the Government argues against that, I just despair.

Part 3 of our motion reads—

Calls on the Government to instruct industrial inspectors to investigate allegations made by the union of underpayment of wages and breaches of contractual arrangements.

We have had many arguments in this place over the use of industrial inspectors and time and time again I have drawn the Minister's attention to what is happening in the industrial area. On those occasions the Minister has said that he would not use industrial inspectors when there was an industrial dispute; he has said that he does not want them involved in disputes. He says that they are there to ensure that workers receive their proper wages and enjoy reasonable conditions due to them on site.

This is just such a time when the inspectors could be used. The *Daily News* has made this statement loud and clear, and for the Minister's information this was in my letter to him, and I quote as follows—

BWIU shop steward Mr Dave Wildgoose said the site would be black until all money owing was paid and the builder agreed to pay award rates.

All I am saying to the Minister is that in this case he must send out an inspector to see whether the allegation is true or false. A contract exists providing for a certain rate of pay; there is a contractual arrangement, a legal and binding arrangement. This has been reported in the Press.

I ask the Minister to please send out an inspector to investigate this matter; send him out on site to talk with the builder and the union leader there; let him ascertain whether the accusation is true or false.

But things do not happen this way. Mr Dans says that he will not use the inspectors in industrial disputes because he believes industrial disputes are police matters. Mr McKenzie disagrees and says that the police should not be involved. The State Conference of the ALP has said that the Criminal Code should not apply in industrial matters.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: And neither should it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The TLC says that the Criminal Code should not apply.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They believe they should be above the law.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: No, you should allow us to get decent legislation through this House.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If an employer broke the law, would they agree that the police should not be involved?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: That is right.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister is in one dickens of a mess. He has said that industrial inspectors should not be used except where awards and conditions are involved; he has said that the police should be involved. But the State Conference of the ALP, Mr McKenzie, and the TLC say that the police should not be involved. What is Mr Dans going to do? He wrote a Green Paper that said that industrial activities should be immune from the Police Act. If all this is true, and if the Federal Government gets its way—it has failed up to now to repeal section 45(d)(e) of the Trade Practices Act—there will be no protection in the workplace for anyone.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Can I ask a question?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: No, the member can make his own speech.

We are getting to the stage of mob rule, because we have a mob out there trying to assert itself. The Minister has industrial inspectors sitting in their offices wondering what they can do next.

Hon. Fred McKenzie interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will discuss that industrial legislation on another occasion, but I can understand the member's sheer frustration. He is in bitter disagreement with his leader. Mr Dans says that we should use the police, but Mr McKenzie says that we should not. It is difficult for both of them. Whichever one of them is right, the question really is: Who the dickens is to go out there to try to solve some of the problems?

We are asking the Government to come clean. Is it dinkum? Is it really wanting to work out these problems? Who is going to work out these problems, and how? We are saying to Mr Dans that he should send out an inspector to view the conditions and to discuss the contract.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Why don't you come clean? What were the amenities like? Did the employer threaten violence?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Government is responding to the rule of the mob. We will have mob rule if we are not careful, and the Government is totally failing in its duties.

The Premier has been involved in this and has failed to do anything about it. His office and his Cabinet Secretary have been involved and have done nothing. Mr Tom Butler, the industrial adviser to the Premier, has been involved and has

done nothing. Mr Terry Burke, the Premier's brother, has been involved and has done nothing.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Lies. Complete lies.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I ask that those words be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: The member has to withdraw those words.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: I withdraw.

*Motion Resumed*

The PRESIDENT: Honourable members should cease their interjections and allow the member to finish his speech so that someone else can have a say.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I ask the House to support the motion. Surely scarcely anyone could deny that it represents something for which we should strive; namely, industrial peace. We should all be striving to overcome disputes and the standover tactics that are being applied in the workplace.

I say again that standover tactics were used at the building site this morning when Mr Richard Court and I were there. After one particularly bad fellow left, things were a little better.

The Minister should send someone out to the site to resolve the problem. We cannot stand coercion and standover tactics in the work force any more. It is not a way in which we can continue to live in Australia. It is not a natural way for Australia to develop—we consider it to be a free country. If we are not a free country and people are allowed to get away with that sort of pressure scot free, there is no hope for us in the future.

I have been at that site and spoken to people from both sides and I know it only needs the Minister to send an inspector out to make an industrial report. We need to get people together on that site. I would be happy to sit down with the people concerned—

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You have organised it all.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have not organised it at all. I think that is an insult. It is certainly not organised.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: It is not an insult; it is true.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I appeal to members in this House, particularly Government members, to support the proposition that coercion is not acceptable and that the Minister should do all he can to resolve the issue with industrial inspectors.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Minister for Industrial Relations) [3.12 p.m.]: I will turn my attention first to the motion which Mr Masters has moved. The first point he made was that the House should condemn the standover and coercive tactics being used by the building industrial union on a workers' site at Lot 1, Beechboro Road, Morley, and that the situation threatened to develop into violence.

Let me first say this it will certainly not develop into violence if I have anything to do with it. Members in this House know very well that the exercise which is taking place at Morley would be more widespread but, because of the actions I took, it did not develop into violence, very little time was lost, and it fizzled out.

I have in my hand a copy of the strike reports for the day, and I will table them if Mr Masters wishes. Looking at that list I note that the Beechboro Road incident has not been recorded. Why has it not been recorded? It has not been recorded—and I will go into the merits of the reasons for the dispute, using the scant knowledge I have of this situation—for the simple reason that it has been brought to this place for determination.

I can assure members that whether it be in this Parliament, the Federal Parliament, or any other Parliament, industrial disputation will never be solved in that way. This is one place where we will not get a result.

I do not blame the Opposition for trying to make political mileage out of industrial disputes, because that has always been the linchpin of the conservative parties of this country. That is the datum line on which those parties have divided the community, and that has not changed. I seek leave to table this document.

*The document was tabled (see paper No. 226).*

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: For lesser mortals who have not been the Minister for Industrial Relations, could you tell us how that list was put out?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I will tell members later. No complaint has been received about this matter. If Mr Masters had been doing his job, instead of trying to make political capital out of the situation, he would have advised Mr Minniti how to go about the complaint so that the dispute could be resolved, or an attempt could be made to resolve it. That has not been done, and I will come back to that point later.

The second part of Mr Masters' motion calls upon the Government to take urgent action to ensure that builders, subcontractors, and workers, are able to go about their legal business without intimidation or coercion. Without wanting to get into an argument with anyone here let me say this:

The Government is fully aware, as are other members in this Chamber, that intimidation and coercion are matters against which citizens are protected under civil and criminal law. I am not at variance with Mr McKenzie, and I am not at variance with the ALP conference which has looked into our legal system, the police, the subcontractors, and other members of our community.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Have you told your conference?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I fully understand what the conference was talking about, but I am saying that if people are intimidated or coerced, they have the protection of the law. Mr Masters is fully aware of the requirements of the legal system in this country.

Any person who takes a different view can call the police for assistance in such circumstances. It has been done, not by me, but by subcontractors and builders. As I understand from Mr Piantadosi, the police were at the site, but left because they saw no need to remain.

Hon. G. E. Masters: They were watching the situation.

Hon. D. K. DANS: They did not have a high profile.

The third point of the motion calls upon the Government to instruct industrial inspectors to investigate allegations made by the union about the non-payment of wages and breaches of contract arrangements. Mr Masters was the Minister for Industrial Relations in the previous Government and he knows that industrial inspectors act only on written complaints which allege non-compliance with award wages and conditions. If that non-compliance occurs, an industrial inspector pays a visit to a site.

As the motion states, this is a serious problem if it has been represented correctly by Mr Masters. I do not know that it has. If Mr Masters had endeavoured to bring this dispute to a close he would have advised Mr Minniti of the way to go about bringing some resolution to the problem. He chose not to do that and brought the matter to this House. The same course has been followed in another place with the use of extravagant language.

We are at a time when inflation is down by 14 per cent and industrial disputes are at the lowest rate for the last seven years. To June of this year that rate has been exactly 251 per cent in Western Australia. I am not trying to minimise the seriousness of the situation at Morley. I am saying that there is absolutely no need to use extravagant language such as that used by Mr Masters.

There has been no violence and there will not be any. I do not notice people attacking one another in the streets. That is the picture that Hon. Gordon Masters is trying to paint, and it is not a new scenario. It is one that he tried to paint when he was in Government, and it is one which he paints when in Opposition—he would like to take over the industrial relations portfolio. I am fully aware of what he is up to as is every other member in this Chamber. The last thing he wants to happen is for the trouble in Beechboro Road to go away. He wants to keep stirring it and stirring it. The point is that Mr Minniti is no fool, and he has elected to deal through the Opposition.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is not right.

Hon. N. F. Moore: You did not hear Mr Masters' speech.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I did hear it, but we have passed that point. What Hon. Gordon Masters should have said was that in the Chamber last night Mr Dans said he knew nothing about the matter. If he were genuine he would have done that. Let me suggest that Mr Dans was right, because I suggested to Mr Masters last night that he should ask Mr Minniti to ring me.

During the course of Mr Masters' comments he said that I said we should have a judicial inquiry if enough evidence were produced. Everyone in this House knows that a senior police officer visited the Leader of the Opposition after the allegations were made on an earlier occasion and out of that came one shred of evidence on which there is a pending case, therefore, there is no evidence.

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: If I cannot believe senior police officers in this State, whom can I believe? The police investigated the allegations made by Mr Masters, and the Leader of the Opposition said that he had further allegations, but that he would store them away. Let us put that aside.

From the scant information I have I would like to point out how this matter arose and why it is in the House today by way of a motion rather than the people concerned using their best endeavours to try to bring the matter to a verbal conclusion. This sort of thing hurts no-one and has the support of Mr Minniti and the people who work for him. There will always be problems where human beings are involved, whether it is in the workplace, in the family situation, or whatever.

I would dearly love Mr Minniti to visit me and to put his cards on the table and say, "Look, this is what happened, what can you do about it?" I would say, "This is the way to go about it".



Mr Masters knows that when this matter blew up in the first instance I called together representatives of the BWIU, the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders Association, and another group. He knows that, and on that occasion one side was not very happy, but by the same token the dispute never got out of hand. There was no playing on rusty vehicles, banging cymbals, or beating rusty drums.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You are not taking the credit for it?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am, and I have letters on file thanking me for my assistance in keeping the matter at that level.

The point is that happened because all the participants were most anxious to resolve the dispute and to isolate it rather than make political capital out of it. I recollect one person wanting to make political mileage out of it, but I had to sit back and listen to his colleagues tell him to take a dive.

When a dispute arises the ultimate action one can take is to try to prevent it from going further, and also to prevent others that might follow it. That is what we are talking about; we will not solve the problem in this House. It will not be solved by Mr Masters taking on the mantle of the *de facto* Minister for Industrial Relations.

This dispute arose when the BWIU alleged that Mr Minniti had not complied with the award provisions. I do not know whether that was the case, but apparently the complaint referred to the amenities on Lot 1 Beechboro Road, Morley. I have been given a check list, but I will not go through it because Hon. Gordon Masters said that he visited the site this morning. This check list is the first one I have seen and it says that there were no amenities on the site.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Is the check list signed by Mr Read of the BLF? I have got one.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not saying it is right or wrong, but it gave rise to the dispute. As a result, a half day strike occurred because the building did not comply with the amenities claim. The dispute escalated when the union claimed for time lost. What is the normal sequence of events when that stage is reached? The Leader of the Opposition knows what should happen next. The matter relating to the award provisions should have been referred to the Industrial Commission to resolve. Is that not right?

Hon. G. E. Masters: You know that the dispute is not about that at all.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am saying that the allegation made was about those conditions. They have not been rectified.

Hon. G. E. Masters: We did not say that.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Let me say that the Opposition said that the shed was not as good as it should have been.

It is on the check list regardless of what other areas are being canvassed. I have had a little experience with these things, but that particular episode should have been referred to the commission. I understand that the builder would belong to the builders association, which in turn is represented on the Confederation of Western Australian Industry. However, the correct procedures were not followed and I wonder why they were not?

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: It is a set-up.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It was not—honestly.

Hon. D. K. DANS: If the matter had been taken to the Commissioner he would have prevented further conflict arising. If, as Mr Masters' suggests, that is not the real reason, then the commissioner could have thrashed out the real problem.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It could be thrashed out tomorrow if you send an inspector to the site.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Minniti—

Hon. G. E. Masters: You are playing with words.

Hon. D. K. DANS: When Mr Minniti decides to recognise that I am the Minister and that neither Mr Masters nor Mr Court—

Hon. G. E. Masters: Or Mr Burke!

Hon. D. K. DANS: All right, if Hon. Gordon Masters wants to include Mr Burke I will accept that. Then, and only then will I enter the dispute. If, during the course of this debate today, the matter is referred to the Office of Industrial Relations in writing, there will be an inspector on the site immediately.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Right.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Masters has not done that because this is a political gimmick. Sure, there was a dispute over amenities and there may have been some other matters involved, but some of the people close to that confrontation saw it as a good excuse to try to give the Opposition something to hang its hat on.

The Opposition, both State and Federal, is going down the track because conservative parties in this country have not had the nous to understand there is a new Australia with a lot of hope and aspirations. The Opposition is still in the dark ages and it is trying to divide the community. That sort

of thing does not work anymore, because the public has a different attitude from the attitude of my mother and father, and different from that of people five, 10, or 15 years ago. It has not learned and that is the hallmark of conservatives wherever one might travel.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: But some of this confusion arose from Mr Butler's decision.

[Resolved: That business be continued.]

Hon. D. K. DANS: In answer to the Hon. I. G. Pratt's interjection, I do not think so. Mr Butler acts as an industrial adviser, and often as an industrial liaison officer. As I understand it, he genuinely thought we had reached agreement. Perhaps he did, perhaps he did not, but that still does not alter the fact that at that point Mr Minniti found things had gone bad. His advisers, who on this occasion were not members of the Master Builders Association or the confederation—

Hon. G. E. Masters: The Housing Industry Association.

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: —should correctly have taken the action I have just outlined. I am entitled to think that action was not taken because there was a shred of political mileage in the situation.

Should Mr Minniti come to his senses and recognise the State of Western Australia—I am making this speech as Minister of Industrial Relations—I am sure he will get this dispute under way reasonably quickly. It amazes me Mr Masters has not advised him to do that.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: He has nothing to gain by that.

Hon. D. K. DANS: He wants to spread it out. There is a light at every corner! There is standover and intimidation. Good gracious me, Dante's *Inferno* had nothing on this.

Hon. Norman Moore: It is Dans' *Inferno*!

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Masters usually has a good tale to tell, but his presentation is always the same. He uses the same words, the same phrases, and the same gestures. He has varied the theme today, and I admire him for it. From the limited scenario he has had to work with, he started, not only to divide the community, but also he brought in a little racism. He used Professor Blainey's stuff in reverse.

Hon. Norman Moore: What garbage. Are you saying Professor Blainey is a racist?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am talking about Mr Masters.

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is always members of the Italian community to whom he refers.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Dead right.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is an interesting point. Perhaps next week we may hear of another ethnic group when Mr Masters wheels in another motion and goes through the same charade he has gone through today.

Hon. Lyla Elliott interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: That is a very good interjection. The member says it is very strange he has never advanced situations in relation to Pommie shop stewards.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I do not think that is right; I have.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I cannot recollect it. The member would probably be thrown out of the Union Jack club if he did!

Hon. G. E. Masters: I do not think so; I think I would be promoted.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I would see some merit in this motion if it had been introduced in a sincere manner. If Mr Masters were to turn his mind to genuinely wanting to assist in the resolution of this dispute, I would welcome his assistance, but as I said when I started, bringing in these things by way of motion—the way the member goes on and on—will not resolve disputes.

Whilst all this is going on and Mr Minniti is receiving the wrong advice for political purposes—I do not know if he realises that—we are getting further from the resolution and this particular dispute. My advice is to go through the normal channels towards a resolution. If they do not work, of course, we are in a different ball game.

Surely Mr Masters knows the procedure. As I said, if these allegations are correct, I will simply go through the check list, because I have seen one previously and it intrigues me.

I have a picture of a toilet here. I do not know how to read a picture of a toilet into *Hansard*. That would be rather difficult, even for Mr Masters to do. From what I see, it does not look very attractive. This check list is marked as follows—

LUNCH SHEDS	Yes	No
Weatherproof	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Adequate Light	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## [COUNCIL]

	Yes	No		Yes	No
Coat & hat hooks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is toilet adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Vinyl or lino floor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Toilet paper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fly wire screens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WASHING FACILITIES		
Door fly straps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Opening windows	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wash Troughs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Extractor fan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Soap	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hot water urn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Towels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Laminex table	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. G. E. Masters: All those things are marked as absent on that list.		
Seating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not see why the matter could not have been taken straight before the commission.		
Notice Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. G. E. Masters: Unless the builder agreed to fix it immediately.		
(Over 50 men) food cupboard or fridge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. D. K. DANS: There is nothing there, because he has never been over to see me.		
Mops, Brooms, buckets, compound, disinfectant, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Several members interjected.		
Is shed clean	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not know that. Irrespective of that, if he did fix it, to comply with that union check list—which must be part of the award—and the dispute still continued, then there would still be ample grounds to go along to the Industrial Commission. But again that was not done. I must come to the conclusion, firstly—		
Covered garbage bin	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. G. E. Masters: That is not what the dispute is about at all.		
Cool drinking water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. D. K. DANS: I am aware that on many occasions—and long before Mr Masters thought about industrial relations—what appears to be the reason for the dispute is not apparent.		
Regulation First Aid Kit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. G. E. Masters: I have told you what the reason is.		
Is Award displayed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hon. D. K. DANS: It does not matter. That could have been taken up by the builder himself with the commission, and during that commission hearing on that basis those other matters could have been aired. There is no doubt in my mind that could have been done and still could be done.		
TOILETS			It still could be done if the builder wants to go there. If the builder wants to contact me or the Office of Industrial Relations, he is free to do so. I do not want to labour this point, but those things have not happened.		
Dry pan toilets are not acceptable under any circumstances			I hope that the House rejects this motion. I know I could have sat on my hands and said nothing and simply let the vote be taken, because I		
	Yes	No		Yes	No
Regulation First Aid Kit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Sewered (1 to 15 men)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Urinal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Chemical (1 to 7 men)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Flush pan (1 to 7 men)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is toilet clean	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

know that the tyranny of numbers will operate. However, irrespective of that, the dispute continues and I am interested, firstly, in containing the dispute and, secondly, in seeing that it is settled, because whatever corner of the ring one stands in, disputes eventually have to be resolved. Every dispute in the past has had to be resolved and disputes which were in evidence when Mr Masters was Minister for Industrial Relations were resolved. Disputes which have looked terrible to me while I have held this portfolio have been resolved and disputes on the waterfront when I dealt with them some years ago were resolved, frequently when I thought there was no hope of resolution. Accommodations were made in those cases, because, whatever people say about union officials or, for that matter, about members of Parliament, ultimately it is the members of unions—the people on the job—who make the decision as to what will happen.

Just as we may push our own political points of view, sometimes we forget that it is the people out there, come election day, who have the final say. In just the same way as people on the job are not cowered into submission, neither is the Australian electorate, or for that matter the electorate in any democratic society.

We can discuss this all day and all night in this place and sling our points of view backwards and forwards, but we are not getting any closer to resolving the dispute. I strongly suggest to Mr Minniti's advisers sitting opposite that he go through the right channels and he will get every assistance from the Government via me.

**HON. S. M. PIANTADOSI** (North Central Metropolitan) [3.42 p.m.]: I am not amazed by the proposal made by Mr Masters. I was on site early this morning and my story does not compare with that Mr Masters has related to this House. I have spoken to Mr Minniti. I have known him for over 25 years and to prove that, I have original documents whereas Mr Masters has only photocopies.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Original copies of what?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Originals of the documents that Mr Masters has—of the check list.

Hon. G. E. Masters: They are not the same as you have. They are completely different.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: They were given to me by Mr Minniti.

Hon. D. K. Dans: The trouble is that he will not give me anything.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: I approached Mr Minniti this morning and he spoke with me. He informed me of a few matters that were going on

and I asked him whether he wanted me to speak with him and the union to see whether the problem could be resolved instead of having it become a political football.

Hon. G. E. Masters: What did he say to that?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: If Mr Masters would let me finish he would know what Mr Minniti said and everything else.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Very well.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: It is my turn to speak and if Mr Masters listens, he might learn something.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I shall try.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Minniti agreed that I could speak with the union and with him in an attempt to resolve the dispute.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are not making it a political football now, are you?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: That interjection is not worthy of a reply.

I spoke to both parties. I spoke to Mr Minniti again and he had changed his tack somewhat. He said that he did not want to speak to anyone any further, because he had spoken to people in the Liberal Party. He said the people he had spoken to were Mr Masters, Mr Court, and Mr Del Piano, his solicitor, and a prominent member of the Liberal Party. Mr Minniti said he would not speak to anyone other than the Liberal Party. He said that he had spoken to Mr Terry Burke and he had not got anywhere.

I then said to Mr Minniti, "Do you want to see the Premier?" I asked him that, because he had indicated that he did. I said, "I can bring the matter to the attention of the Premier this morning". Mr Minniti said that he was not interested in seeing the Premier.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.01 p.m.*

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: As outlined before the afternoon tea suspension, I went to the site because I had known Mr Minniti for some 25 years and I also knew one of the union organisers involved.

Hon. P. H. Wells: In what capacity?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: As a constituent.

Hon. P. H. Wells: You went as a member of Parliament.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Yes.

Hon. P. H. Wells: That is not political.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: The difference is that I went there to try to resolve the problem, not as quoted in the *Daily News* of today's date when Liberal MPs, Mr Gordon Masters and Mr Richard Court said they went to the site to sup-

port local builder Mr Sam Minniti who, they claim, is being victimised by "union standover men".

Hon. G. E. Masters: And we were showered with jeers and abuse.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: They went there in support. Mr Dans was asking whether they had advised Mr Minniti to go through the normal channels, to go through his parliamentary office, to lodge a complaint in writing with his department, but they did not bother. They went there to support the dispute and ensure that it lingered on because it suited their purposes.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It certainly does not.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: I believe the whole scenario has been set up by Mr Masters and Mr Court. They have admitted it themselves. Their own statement condemns them. Did Mr Masters advise them to go and see Mr Dans?

Hon. P. G. Penda: Why did the Burke brothers ignore them? So much for the ethnic community.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Minniti was asked this morning whether he wanted to speak to the Premier. Embarrassed, he said that he could not go because he had committed himself to two members of the Liberal Party. He had no time to see the Premier who would have seen him at 10.45 a.m. today.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Minniti cannot refute that that proposal was put to him and he declined the offer. What must be pointed out is that as well as the amenities check list which Mr Dans spoke of earlier, there was no water on site for over a week and the application was made to get the builder to connect water to the site. That application was made about the ninth, but the water was not connected until the 15th.

Hon. G. E. Masters: There was some water available next door.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Yes, through a 60 metre PVC pipe which was contravening the Water Authority by-laws, if Mr Masters would like to check.

Hon. P. G. Penda: What has that got to do with standover tactics?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: There were no standover tactics. I was there this morning when the police arrived. I was there and I spoke with the superintendent. All the Liberal MPs were trying to do was to incite trouble.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like the Leader of the Opposition to stop interjecting and the member to direct his comments to the Chair.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You don't expect to get clap, Mr Masters?

Hon. G. E. Masters: No.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: They were contravening the Water Authority by-laws in providing water through a 60 metre, two-inch PVC pipe. It is all right, he can break the by-laws. There was no argument to assist Mr Masters' case, and possibly he did not bother to point out to Mr Minniti that he was contravening the law. That is okay. He can take the law into his own hands—no problems there. We must bear in mind some of the problems encountered with dirty water. There is the risk of contracting amoebic meningitis, as well as some of the problem areas in which the men on this site were working.

Hon. G. E. Masters: This is what the dispute is about.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: There were no sheds, no water, no toilets, but when the facilities did arrive, the first inspection date was 11 October.

A further instruction on Friday, 19 October, revealed the following: Yes, there was a shed on site but only after the men had withdrawn their labour; the shed arrived the next day. The builder had some four to five days' notice but there was no shed and there were no other facilities. Apart from the new shed there were no hooks for any of the men's equipment or gear, no flywire screens, no opening windows. There was a notice board, but no seating for the shed, no bins, no drinking water, and no first-aid kit. Surely even Mr Penda would expect a first-aid kit on a building site!

The award was displayed in the shed and it is quite obvious the award had been displayed and Mr Minniti must then have been fairly conscious of what the award states. The first-aid kit was missing, the urinals were not there, the toilet that was there—and I have had photographs taken if Mr Masters cares to see them—was not fit to be used and contravened the Factories and Shops Act.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I said it was filthy.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: And did Mr Masters advise Mr Minniti that he should get a new toilet?

Hon. G. E. Masters: I thought you were talking about the shed. The toilet is okay. The shed was filthy.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Are you referring to toilet No. 3 or toilet No. 1?

Hon. G. E. Masters: I am talking about the one that was there today. Did you say anything was wrong with the toilets?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: This issue started on 11 October. That is all right. They had no facilities for 14 days.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I did not say that.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Masters did say that.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It is a great, big set-up.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: That is where the dispute started. The workers had to withdraw their labour in order to get the shed and other facilities such as water on site.

Hon. P. G. Pental: And the hooks.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: This builder has been in the game a long time and is aware of what is necessary on site and the provisions of the award. He did not bother to provide any of those facilities. It was only when the workers withdrew their labour for half-a-day in order to obtain the facilities that he provided them. The shed arrived the following morning although Mr Minniti had stated earlier that he could not get it for 10 days. It arrived because the labour had been withdrawn.

Hon. P. G. Pental: When did the hooks arrive?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Pental should ask Mr Minniti because he collected them.

Hon. P. G. Pental: I am devastated by that.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Another disturbing aspect is a letter which talks about standover tactics, and it is signed by a solicitor and partner in a legal firm who is a member of the Liberal Party. It was sent to one of the subcontractors.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Who signed it?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: It is virtually a standover of the subcontractors and it says that if they did not agree with the terms and conditions laid down by Mr Minniti, it would result in the contract being discharged and having no further legal effect, and the workers would be on their own.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It referred to breach of contract.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Yes. If they did not agree to the conditions. It said that if they did not agree with the conditions they would recognise the contract had been repudiated.

Hon. G. E. Masters: He is talking about the conditions of the contract.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Conditions of employment and the job site.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Conditions of the contract.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Masters is being selective.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I am not.

### *Point of Order*

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I ask that the member table the letter immediately he completes his remarks.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a matter of whether it is convenient, it is the only proper time. If the member would identify the document, that is all that is required at this stage—that the document be identified.

### *Motion Resumed*

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: It is a letter from McLeod and Del Piano, solicitors and barristers, acting on behalf of the builder. They quite clearly indicate they are standing over the workers and telling them that they must work under those conditions or there will be no contract. Has Mr Masters advised Mr Minniti whether that is legal or whether he can do it? Workers are being subjected to abuse on site by the builder, and he also threatened to shoot some of them.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Rubbish!

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: That statement was made.

Hon. G. E. Masters: What, 15 to one—don't be silly.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: That statement was made. It was not 15 to one.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It was this morning. He is only about 5ft 4in tall and you are saying he threatened them!

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: There were not more than 10 people on site including the builder when I was there.

Hon. G. E. Masters: There were more than that.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: You brought along a few of your own.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I did not need to. They are bully boys.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: By his own admission, Mr Minniti said he would come to this House. He said that to me when I was there and that he would have a go at the Government and everybody else. He said he was meeting two members of the Liberal Party and he would take up the issue with them. Mr Minniti has not turned up today. I do not know whether Mr Masters advised him that he should not come up here. Only Mr Masters knows that part of the story.

A proposal was put to Mr Minniti that if he wanted to see the Premier, I would arrange it—and he said he had had trouble in getting an appointment so I offered to take him directly to the Premier as soon as he came to Parliament House for the opening session at 10.45 a.m.—but Mr Minniti declined that offer. He told me he had a meeting with Mr Masters and Mr Court and would not be seeing anybody until he had discussed the matter with them.

Hon. G. E. Masters: He lost confidence in you.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: He would not see the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Hon. G. E. Masters: He did not like you.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: He did not say that. I am quite happy to take Mr Masters there tomorrow if he wishes.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Certainly.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: At 8.30 a.m.?

Hon. G. E. Masters: Certainly.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: I live around the corner.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If members want to make some arrangement about meetings they must do it outside. In the meantime they should get on with the business.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Masters is quite evasive. I took the opportunity to organise it now. If Mr Masters is willing, I am happy and prepared to meet him on site with Mr Minniti.

I also put a proposal to Mr Minniti to meet him this afternoon as he had a meeting this morning. I said I would raise the matter with the Premier and if he wanted to speak with the Premier I could arrange it for this afternoon. He declined that offer.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I don't blame him.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: He also declined an offer of an after hours meeting tonight at his place or at Parliament.

Hon. Tom Knight: On double time.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: For whom?

Hon. Tom Knight: You said a meeting after hours.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: He charges double time, does he?

Hon. Tom Knight: Maybe you will.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Unlike Mr Knight who always refers to money, I donate my services voluntarily. Maybe Mr Knight should pay his accounts too.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not tolerate that sort of general conversation between members while a member is endeavouring to address the Chair.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: It is quite unruly.

The PRESIDENT: That goes for the member on his feet, too.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is a rather chatty conversation.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: Mr Minniti declined all those offers because it is quite clear he is under instruction and he would be embarrassed by any proposal because some deal had been done. Mr Masters referred to Italians, and I point out that if someone has given his word and then backs away, he loses face. That is very important to Italians. Mr Masters put that man in that position and he should be ashamed of his actions.

Hon. G. E. Masters: What about the contract?

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: The community will find out what Mr Masters and his thugs have tried to do, not only on this occasion, but in the past.

I refer to a situation three weeks ago with the people from Westcrete whom Mr Masters hounded, but who did not succumb to his wishes. They wanted some problems resolved.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: You have been having a dream again.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: It is no dream. Mr Masters wanted to use them in an argument between them and Mr Scott of the BWIU about a concrete pour at Duncraig. Mr Masters wanted to make a political football out of them.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Say it again; I have never heard of it.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: I am referring to the Westcrete issue at Duncraig three weeks ago.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Let him go, he is embarrassing Mr Dans terribly.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am proud of him.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: I have no need to embarrass Mr MacKinnon. The rats and cockroaches which were around when he was Minister for Water Resources did that for me.

I am not disturbed about those comments. As I said, it does not need another member to upset Mr MacKinnon because other influences do that for me, influences such as the rats and cockroaches.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Stick up for the BWIU some more.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Mr MacKinnon was severely embarrassed by that issue. The Press referred to the water supply inspection which he organised as a "farce".

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections must cease, otherwise I will take some action. I have put up with them long enough. The member has to stick to the motion and ignore the interjections because they are tempting him away from the motion. I ask him to ignore them and speak to the motion.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: I will finish my speech. I stated earlier that all indications were given to me this morning by the builder and the workers that this dispute smacks of a set-up by the Liberal Party. It is an attempt by the Liberal Party to gain some political mileage out of the issue.

I made sound offers to both parties and especially to Mr Minniti in an attempt to resolve the dispute. I made an offer for him to see the Premier at 11.00 a.m. He declined that offer. On his own admission he said that he would see only two members of the Liberal Party, Hon. Gordon Masters and Mr Richard Court. He said he would not see anyone else, including the Premier or the Minister for Industrial Relations.

I am completely and totally disgusted by the actions of Hon. Gordon Masters. According to today's Press, the Opposition went to the site and sat down with the builders, just to ensure that the Opposition gains as much political mileage as it can.

HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [4.22 p.m.]: I think the most important thing that has come out of this issue, as far as Western Australia is concerned, has not come from the substance of the motion but has come from the reply by Hon. D. K. Dans to the motion. I feel a certain amount of sympathy for Mr Dans because I believe that, in the last 24 hours, he has tried to be truthful to this House. I think he is honestly and sincerely interested in settling the dispute. The reason there is confusion about this matter comes from the way the Premier is running this Government. This is not the first time that we have seen the Premier and his advisers going over the top of his Ministers. It occurred in relation to the canals at Mandurah recently when the Minister for Planning was not permitted to carry out his statutory obligations until the Premier came out of hospital, so that the Premier or one of his advisers could

oversee what the Minister did. In that case it was the Premier—

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: What has that got to do with this?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am glad that Hon. Sam Piantadosi interjected. What did he advise Minniti to do? He advised him to go to the Premier at 11.00 a.m. today.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You should clean your ears out.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: The member repeated it six times.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: I did not say that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: The suggestion was—

The PRESIDENT: The member will stop interjecting.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: He should stop telling lies.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member is not permitted to use that language in this Chamber.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I ask that that word be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has to withdraw. He knows it so I ask him to please withdraw it.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: The member should not mislead the House about my statement.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member knows that when he makes an unparliamentary comment and it is requested that it be withdrawn, he must withdraw it. He does not have the opportunity to make an explanation. I ask the member to withdraw.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: I withdraw the remark.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest to honourable members who are pursuing this debate that they make their comments without being provocative. I ask them also to stick to the motion.

#### *Motion Resumed*

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I was referring to the confusion that exists within this State at present in relation to ministerial responsibility. That situation bears very directly on this matter. I repeat that Hon. S. M. Piantadosi told us a number of times in his speech that he had offered to take Mr Minniti to the Premier at 11.00 a.m. today. That can be checked in *Hansard*. There are provisions in the Standing Orders which allow such matters to be checked.



### *Point of Order*

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: On a point of order, Mr President, I did not say that. I said that I had offered to take Mr Minniti to the Premier when he said that he had tried to see the Premier.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is provision in our Standing Orders, if a member believes that he has been misrepresented, for him to rise and point out that misrepresentation. However, the time to do that is at the conclusion of the speech of the member on his feet. I say, with all goodwill to all members, that there is provision for misrepresentation to be rectified. However, that can be done only at the conclusion of a member's speech.

### *Motion Resumed*

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I believe that, under Standing Orders, *Hansard* can be checked to see whether a member actually said something which is in dispute. I am happy to have *Hansard* checked, because I stand by what I said. Mr Piantadosi said that he had offered to take Mr Minniti to the Premier at 11.00 a.m. today. Not only did Mr Piantadosi say that, but the Premier also invites people to do that. Advertisements appear in newspapers requesting people to take their problems to the top.

We have also seen the Premier appointing advisers to oversee his Ministers. These Ministers have their own advisers. The Premier tells people to take problems to the top. How can Mr Dans blame Mr Minniti for wanting to see the Premier when the Premier has invited him to do that?

The Premier has appointed advisers to oversee Mr Dans's area of responsibility. Surely, Mr Minniti has only accepted the Premier's invitation. This has placed Mr Dans in a very uncomfortable position and I have sympathy for him. As Minister for Industrial Relations, he should know that he has to carry out the duties and responsibilities with which he has been charged, without interference from the Premier. Mr Dowding should also be able to carry out his planning responsibilities without having to wait for the Premier to get out of hospital. If the Premier is to continue to advise people to play leapfrog over his Ministers and to do that publicly, as he did in the Mandurah canals case, then the confusion and chaos will continue.

Mr Dans has actually turned Mr Masters' motion into a motion of no confidence in the Premier. If there is any confusion about where Mr Minniti should have gone, the Premier is responsible because of the invitations that he issues to people to see him.

He issued invitations to the people to go over the top of his Ministers and directly to him. It is about time ALP members got hold of the Premier and gave him a good shaking. They should tell him that if he wants them to be Ministers and to show responsibility, he must give them responsibility and that he should not invite people to bypass them and go directly to him.

It is a wonder that Mr Dans does not resign over the issue.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [4.31 p.m.]: I will be brief in winding up the debate. There has been some hilarity during the debate and much joking and laughing. However, we are discussing a small businessman who is under threat, whose business is under threat, whose livelihood is under threat, and whose family is under threat. We are asking for the Government's assistance.

The statements made by Mr Dans are incorrect. The dispute is not about conditions and amenities. Mr Minniti has told me, and I guess anyone else who asked, that certainly the amenities were not up to scratch, but that he will supply anything required. The dispute is about extra money for laying bricks; a higher rate for each 1 000 bricks laid. A contract was signed and sealed under the name of Minniti and Son on 5 October. We are dealing with a contract signed for laying bricks at a certain rate for 13 units at Lot 1 Beechboro Road, Morley. The conditions and rates are specified on the contract which has been signed by both Mr Sains and Mr Minniti.

The leader of the BWIU (Bill Ethell) has quite cleverly put pressure on Mr Sains in regard to employing more men on the site and he has set down different contract conditions. In that way he is trying to break the original contract. Mr Ethell, Mr Piantadosi, and Mr Dans have said that the dispute is about the amenities on the site; that is not the case. The dispute is about the breaking of a contract. It is another example of standover tactics.

It is true that Mr Minniti is a little, tough, nuggety fellow who does not speak English very well—as he would be the first to admit—but when he telephones a member of Parliament and bursts into tears, saying that he does not know what to do because his wife is upset and he cannot take it any more, that is a very serious matter. People are standing on his site abusing and shouting at those working there and at those coming on and off the site. That is clearly coercion and intimidation.

I was present when Mr Minniti stood on the first floor of the building and they yahooped, and screamed and shouted abuse at him. Do we have

to tolerate that sort of coercion and intimidation in this free society? Should we allow people to inflict this pressure on a person carrying out his business activities?

A contract has been agreed upon and Mr Ethell has come along with his troops and said that Mr Minniti must pay more to the workers no matter what rates that contract specifies. Mr Ethell said that if Mr Minniti did not do so, he would send him broke. That is what we are discussing today. The dispute has nothing to do with the toilets; if there is anything wrong with the amenities Mr Minniti will get them fixed. If the people demonstrating on the site want nothing more to do with the building contract, they can leave the site. The contract has been broken and Mr Minniti will be able to get other people to do the work. However, those people stay on the site, threatening, abusing, and frightening other people involved. I am concerned when members in this House laugh and joke about such a matter. We should be able to raise issues of this sort in the Parliament and bring them to the attention of the Minister. There is something wrong if members think it is amusing. Mr Dans said that if any action is to be taken, the problem should be brought to him and that Parliament is not the proper place in which to raise it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I said that we would not resolve it here.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: As far as I am concerned, Mr Dans suggested to this House that the matter should not have been raised or tried to be resolved in this House. I think that Mr Minniti regards the Premier as the most important person in this State and I do not imagine that he thought he was making a mistake by ringing the Premier of Western Australia or his office when he needed help. One would have thought that was the best action to take. Mr Minniti was referred to the Premier's chief industrial adviser, Mr Tom Butler. How on earth could Mr Minniti, who speaks broken English and who is running his own business, think that he should have taken other action? Mr Dans has said Mr Minniti should have come to him and to hell with the Premier.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: This is not a joking matter! I seriously and honestly believe that if this dispute could be settled this evening I would be the happiest man in the world. I cannot tolerate people suffering in that way. Mr Piantadosi is used to standover tactics; he used them as a union leader and I guess he is trying to do that now.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member must withdraw that statement.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I withdraw the statement.

#### *Motion Resumed*

The PRESIDENT: I ask every member to stop interjecting and to let us get the debate out of the way.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We have a man who runs a small business which is being threatened and we in this Parliament should help him as much as we can, whether in or out of Parliament. That man should not be required to do more than go to the Premier. Mr Piantadosi agrees with that because he offered to take Mr Minniti to the Premier on six or seven occasions. He is now trying to renege on that statement.

The Opposition is saying that these coercive tactics are wrong and the Government should take some action to try to rectify the situation. If certain claims are publicly made in the Press and in this House, in letters to Mr Dans from me or anyone else, industrial inspectors should be on site to investigate them. Mr Dans knows as well as I do that there is no need for a written complaint. In fact, he knows that better than I do. He is trying to make an excuse. As Minister he can pick up the telephone now, say that he wants someone on the site in 30 minutes and that would happen. It is a silly and dreadful excuse to make on this occasion.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You are not going to become *de facto* Minister for Industrial Relations.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the Minister intends to ignore the plight of people like Mr Minniti, the community will soon understand that he is not prepared to help them with their problems.

Hon. D. K. Dans: People will soon understand that you are manipulating and using them for political purposes.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Sooner or later people will realise that they cannot ask for or receive any help from this Government, the Premier, the Premier's horde of advisers, and, least of all, from Mr Dans.

To my knowledge Mr Dans has never faced up to one of these serious issues and he will allow Mr Minniti and his family to suffer rather than resolve the situation.

It is important that we vote in support of this motion because it represents all the things we in this country stand for and our belief that we live in a free society. Long may it remain so.

*Personal Explanation*

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: I seek leave under Standing Order No. 77 to make a personal explanation. I claim to have been misunderstood and misrepresented.

Leave granted.

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: During my speech, I said that in speaking to Mr Minniti he stated that he was trying to get through to the Premier, but that he had some difficulty. It was at that stage that I offered to bring him to the Premier, because I knew that the Legislative Assembly was sitting at 10.45 a.m. I made the offer after he had said that he had difficulty in getting through to the Premier. He said that he had been given one telephone number and another, but he could not contact the Premier. That is why the offer was made to him by me personally to bring him to the Premier in the first instance.

*Motion Resumed*

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

*Ayes 15*

Hon. C. J. Bell	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. P. G. Pendall
Hon. Tom Knight	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. W. N. Stretch
Hon. P. H. Lockyer	Hon. P. H. Wells
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. Margaret McAleer
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	(Teller)

*Noes 10*

Hon. J. M. Brown	Hon. Robert Hetherington
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. Mark Nevill
Hon. Graham Edwards	Hon. S. M. Piantadosi
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Tom Stephens
Hon. Kay Hallahan	Hon. Fred McKenzie
	(Teller)

*Pairs*

<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Hon. John Williams	Hon. J. M. Berinson
Hon. Neil Oliver	Hon. Peter Dowding
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. Garry Kelly

Question thus passed.

**DENTAL PROSTHETISTS BILL***Personal Explanation*

HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [4.44 p.m.]: Under Standing Order No. 75 I seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation related to a statement I made during the second reading of the Dental Prosthetists Bill.

Leave granted.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: On reading my duplicate of the *Hansard* speech, I note that following some interjections I made a reference which would not be true in all senses. It should be corrected while the Bill is under consideration.

I said that it would be interesting to look at the situation in Victoria, New South Wales, and Tasmania. I said that those States first established the provision of registration for all dental technicians, and the establishment of qualifications standards. I then stated, "Thereafter they provided for technicians to progress and to operate within the public area". That statement is not 100 per cent correct.

The statement is correct for New South Wales, which brought in legislation in 1975. Tasmania introduced legislation in 1957; and although I did not read that legislation in its original form, I assumed that it was the same as the New South Wales legislation because it was referred to in the debate in New South Wales. Therefore, as far as I know, that statement is correct in relation to Tasmania.

However, in relation to Victoria, my statement was certainly incorrect because, at the same time as introducing legislation for registration, the Victorian Government also allowed advanced technicians to work on the public. That did not apply to technicians generally, but to advanced technicians only. That statement should be corrected.

It is not true that all the States were similar. Certainly in Victoria, at the beginning, the technicians were allowed to work on the public provided they were advanced technicians.

**CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT BILL***Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

*Second Reading*

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill represents the most significant advance for public land management and conservation in Western Australia's history. Developing an effective system of public land management in Western Australia, a system which will ensure the protection of our lands, the conservation of our unique flora and fauna, and the provision of facilities to ensure that the people can enjoy our natural environments, is a daunting task, but it is also an exciting challenge.

The fact that much of Western Australia's lands are the most ancient in the world, our isolation, and climate, are the principal reasons that our landscapes, soils, vegetation, and flora are unique. This uniqueness—for example 8 000 plant

species are endemic to Western Australia—means that we have a responsibility, not only to this State, but to the rest of the world, to ensure that we do conserve our ecosystems for future generations. Ironically, it is the very characteristics of our lands that are responsible for their uniqueness which makes this task so difficult. It is these characteristics which make our ecosystems so fragile.

It does not require a scientific study to conclude that much of our lands have suffered from extreme land degradation. Even short excursions into the rural areas reveals the extent of salination, rural tree decline, and wind and water erosion. Nearly 1 000 of our endemic plant species and 116 species of native fauna are endangered. Even the numbat, the State fauna emblem, is at risk.

It would be unfair and incorrect to blame any sector of our society for the land degradation that has occurred. Much of this degradation could not have been avoided because it occurred before we had the knowledge to manage the land properly; and we have all shared the considerable benefits that have resulted from exploitation of the land. It is possible now, however, because of major advances in our knowledge of natural ecosystems and land management technology, and the recognition by sections of the community of the importance of our natural environment, to redress the errors of the past. We can maintain production from the land, prevent its degradation, and conserve its unique resources, if we can harness this technology and the goodwill in the community at large.

Over 53 per cent of the land surface of this State is public land. Clearly, it is the responsibility of the Government, or more accurately, the collective responsibility of the people of Western Australia, to ensure that at least in this part of the land estate, we do have good land management and that we conserve our rare flora and fauna; but, it is also the responsibility of the Government to assist those who own private land to practice good land management and to conserve, where possible, our flora and fauna, because the benefits of good land management on private lands accrue not only to the individual owner, but also to the State as a whole.

While it is easy to point to neglect of land management, we should not overlook the fact that much has been achieved. The fact that there is such a broad community recognition of the need for better public land management and conservation of our flora and fauna is a major achievement in itself, but there are also concrete examples.

In May of this year, this Government accepted the recommendations of the System 6 study which was the final study in a series of studies initiated in 1972 by the Tonkin Government, to create a system of reserves and national parks throughout the State. I wish to pay tribute to the public servants, members of community and industry groups, and to the previous Government, for their contribution to this 14-year study, which has resulted in the formation of a comprehensive system of reserves and national parks throughout the State.

As significant as this achievement is, the whole exercise will be academic if we do not provide the legislation, administrative arrangement, and the resources, to ensure that these reserves and parks are managed effectively. There must also be effective management of public lands outside those which have been reserved for special purposes. It is essential that we manage to preserve options for their future use, for without effective management, we will not have the luxury of deciding what they can be used for. There is little use for land that is saturated with salt or which has lost the top metre of its soil.

Much of our land, including many of our national parks, will rapidly deteriorate if we do not upgrade our management. The nature of many of our natural ecosystems is such that once they have degraded beyond a critical level, their rehabilitation is almost impossible. Much of our public land is at that critical point.

The achievement of a reservation of a comprehensive system of representative ecosystems throughout the State can be viewed as a first step. I believe this Bill heralds the beginning of the second and equally important step—the provision of legislative and administrative mechanisms which, with additional resources, will provide for effective management of these reserves and the remainder of the public land estate.

When this Government took office, one of the most difficult areas that it was confronted with was public land management. There were three major problems. Firstly, the whole question of public land management was controversial. Large amounts of resources were consumed in emotional confrontations between Government agencies, community groups, and industry. Secondly, it was obvious that public land management had been grossly under-resourced by successive Governments for decades. The third problem was that the Government system of public land management was grossly inefficient. Land management was being carried out by several different Government agencies with little co-ordination, and with duplication of functions.

The Government established a task force on land resource management to carry out a comprehensive review of land resource management. The task force produced its interim report in October of last year and its final report in February of this year. This was the most comprehensive review of land resource management that has ever been undertaken in the history of the State and involved extensive consultation with community groups, industry, local authorities, and Government agencies.

The task force made recommendations in three main areas. Firstly, the task force, recognising that a prerequisite to proper land management was wise land use, identified the need for land use planning in rural areas and made a number of suggestions as to how this could be achieved. These recommendations were referred to the statutory inquiry into planning because of their obvious relevance to that inquiry and the need, acknowledged by the task force, for further consultation, particularly with local authorities, before any acceptable system of land use planning could be introduced.

Secondly, the task force identified the need for a mechanism to co-ordinate the Government's own land resource policy. Cabinet accepted the recommendation to form a land resource policy council, within the Department of Premier and Cabinet, made up of the permanent heads of relevant Government agencies.

The third set of recommendations of the task force related to management of the land. The task force, after evaluating a variety of approaches to land management, concluded that the only way that Western Australia could have an effective land management system, was by the formation of an integrated land management department. Cabinet accepted this recommendation, in principle, and directed that, in the initial phase of the implementation, a new integrated Department of Land Management be formed from the National Parks Authority, the Forests Department and the wildlife section of the Fisheries and Wildlife Department.

The proposal was referred to the Chairman of the Public Service Board for implementation and an implementation group has been working over the last several months drawing up the necessary administrative arrangements and legislation to achieve this amalgamation. It is this legislation, the Conservation and Land Management Bill, which is now before the Parliament.

This Bill is designed to achieve three main objectives—

Firstly, to ensure the security of tenure and purpose of lands which have been reserved for nature reserves, national and marine parks, other lands reserved for conservation and recreation, and State forest and timber reserves;

Secondly, to provide a mechanism for public participation in land management policy formulation; and

Thirdly, to provide the legislative basis for an administrative system of land management which allows effective management of the public lands of Western Australia in the most efficient way.

The legislation involves the repeal of the Forests Act and the National Parks Act and, consequential amendments to the Wildlife Conservation Act, to make it compatible with the new Bill.

A number of the clauses in this Bill have been taken directly from the Acts to be repealed as they are concerned with technical matters pertaining to land management. Explanatory notes have been provided to assist members' understanding of the Bill, how the department will function, and the relationship between this Bill and other initiatives that the Government has taken in this area.

The major features of the Bill are the provisions for reservation and revocation of land reserved for special purposes, the creation of a Department of Conservation and Land Management—which includes three statutory policy-forming bodies—and the provisions for management of land vested in the policy forming bodies. To assist members' understanding of the relationship between the policy forming bodies, the department, and the Minister, a structural diagram was attached to the explanatory notes that have been circulated.

This Bill applies to land that has been reserved as State forest, timber reserves, national parks, nature reserves, marine parks and marine reserves, and other land which has been reserved for the purpose of conservation and recreation. The legal mechanisms which are used to vest land and the procedures for revocation of that land remain essentially unchanged from those which existed in the Acts that this Bill will replace. This Bill does not change the security of purpose or tenure of any public land. The Bill has been amended, however, to give all future national parks the equivalent of an "A"-class security.

The Bill includes a provision to allow for the reservation of marine parks and reserves, none of which currently exist in Western Australia, despite the fact that our marine environments are of equal significance to those on our lands. These provisions are based on the existing clauses in the Fisheries Act to create aquatic reserves.

The Bill establishes three statutory bodies—a Lands and Forests Commission, a National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority, and a Forest Production Council.

The Lands and Forests Commission consists of two members from the community who will represent conservation and production interests respectively and the executive director of the department. Lands reserved for production will be vested in this commission. Its principal function will be to advise the Minister on forest production policy for forest lands reserved for production, to be responsible for the preparation of land management plans for forest production areas, and monitoring the implementation of these plans.

The National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority, which essentially represents an amalgamation of the existing National Parks Authority and the wildlife authority, has a majority representation of members of the community who have an interest or special expertise in conservation, recreation, and natural surroundings.

The Bill has been amended to increase local authority representation to two and to include a representative of fishing interests. This authority has vested in it all lands that have been reserved for conservation or as national parks. It is the intention of the Government to vest in this authority those areas of State forest which have been set aside for conservation or as national parks. It has the function of advising the Minister on conservation policy throughout the State and is responsible for the preparation of land management plans and the monitoring of these plans.

The Forest Production Council has a majority representation of industries which are concerned with forest production. It includes members who are representative of all sectors of the timber industry, from the growing of trees to the final processing of the product.

This is the first time that a formal body has been created to advise the Minister on forest production policy. The Bill has been amended to provide for the Director of the Timber Bureau—a non-statutory body to be established in the Department of Premier and Cabinet—to be a member of the Forest Production Council. The Bill establishes a Department of Conservation and Land Management which has three main functions. Firstly, the department is responsible for managing public land vested in either the commission or the authority, according to the policy determined by those two bodies and the Minister.

Its second function is to provide a management service to other Government agencies, local

authorities, community groups, and private bodies, to manage land under their control or to provide technical advice on land management. The Bill has been amended to provide for consultation with local authorities before the department enters into management agreements. The department is also responsible for administration of the Wildlife Conservation Act.

The Bill has been amended to ensure that the executive director of the department has appropriate tertiary qualifications. The incorporation of this amendment in the Bill ensures that the qualifications, terms, and conditions of appointment, and therefore independence of the executive director, follow those laid down in the Forests Act for the Conservator of Forests.

One of the most important areas of this Bill are the clauses dealing with the management of land vested in the commission and the authority. The Bill clearly sets out the objectives of management for each category of land vested in the commission and authority, and places constraints on the activities for which this land can be used to ensure that it is managed for the purpose for which it is vested.

A feature of the management provisions are the requirements that land management plans be produced and that these plans be subject to public review. The Bill has been amended to preserve confidentiality, and to increase community awareness of land management planning, and requires compulsory submission of land management plans to the local authority in the area for which they are being produced.

This legislation significantly improves the security of tenure and purpose of public lands that have been reserved for special purposes. A large proportion of the land which is vested in the commission and the authority cannot have its tenure revoked without the agreement of both Houses of Parliament. The security of tenure of those reserves which do not have "A"-class status has been increased by the provision that changes to their tenure must be referred to the commission or the authority. In addition, for the first time, there is established in the Statutes a legal procedure to reserve marine areas for conservation or as parks.

While it is important to safeguard the tenure of public lands, such safeguards are pointless if management is not in sympathy with the purpose for which they are reserved. The legislation ensures that the purpose of the reservation is adhered to by placing a statutory obligation on the commission, the authority, and department, to manage the land according to specified objectives. For example, forest production lands must be managed to en-

sure sustained yield and to permit multiple use. No commercial exploitation of forest produce or flora is permitted on national parks or nature reserves. The Bill has been amended to prohibit the granting of leases or licences in wilderness areas.

While it is possible to enshrine in any Statute specific objectives or limitations on activities, the most effective safeguard for security of tenure and purpose of land is a provision for public review. This legislation, by ensuring broad community representation in three policy bodies and by requiring public review of land management plans, means that no action—by the Government, the policy forming bodies, or the department—which involves changing the security and tenure of any reserved land, can take place in secret.

The Government believes that the most effective way of avoiding the confrontation that has been a feature of public land management over the past decade and replacing it with a consensus approach, is by providing formal mechanisms for public participation in policy formulation. The legislation achieves this by the creation of three statutory policy forming bodies which have broad community representation and by the statutory obligation to involve the public in land management planning.

While it is the responsibility of the department to carry out management of public land, that management is being carried out for the public and, accordingly, the public have a right to participate in formulating the policies which determine management procedures.

As important as it is to ensure the security of tenure and purpose of reserved lands and community participation in land management policy formulation, these provisions would be worthless if we were not able to manage those lands that have been reserved.

At an early stage of the review of land resource management, the Premier acknowledged that the problems of under-resourcing of Government land management agencies would not be overcome simply by reorganising existing agencies. But he made it very clear that the Government was not prepared to increase expenditure in this area until it could be demonstrated that extra expenditure could be used in the most efficient way.

Clearly, efficiency is essential because in a State the size of Western Australia, with a huge area of public land and a small tax base, it will always be difficult to provide adequate resources for public land management.

I do want to dwell on the inadequacies of the current system of public land management lest it be thought that the Government is criticising the

public servants in existing land management agencies. Clearly it is the failure of successive Governments to develop efficient public administration systems, not the Public Service, which is responsible for the current situation. But, a few examples are sufficient to illustrate how irrational the existing arrangements are.

Currently, three Government agencies, operating from the same country town, carrying out similar functions, are so independent of one another that they have three different and incompatible communication systems. Can we justify a situation where the National Parks Authority, because of its size, has no option but to purchase vehicles from another Government agency, which sells them because it would be inefficient to maintain them? Similarly, it is difficult to determine the rationale for several independent bushfire organisations, a system which has, at times, led one agency to despatch its units from Perth to a fire in the lower south-west simply because it did not have local units available.

It is fair to say that although there are numerous examples such as the ones I have cited where there is obvious inefficiency and lack of co-ordination, the simple fact is that there are so little resources available for some land management agencies that duplication is virtually impossible. But this only emphasises the Government's concern that should additional resources be provided without rationalisation of the agencies concerned, excessive duplication would be inevitable.

The new system of public land management which will be possible when this Bill is proclaimed, in summary, involves the formation of an integrated agency which will implement the policy formulated by bodies which have broad community representation.

This system, while ensuring the protection of the lands that have been vested in the commission and the authority, allows the most efficient use of the resources available for management. For example, in an integrated land management agency, all of the administrative overheads associated with any Government department can be minimised by incorporating them into one system. Financial systems, clerical services, computer systems, publications, communications systems, drafting facilities, are all services which can be provided more efficiently simply because of the economies of scale.

Even more significant efficiencies can be achieved by amalgamation of the technical support systems, which are vital components of any land management agency. Thus, none of the component agencies involved in this amalgamation

has the resources or personnel with the required disciplines to form an effective land management planning unit. By amalgamating the three agencies, a unit can be created which is large enough to be viable and which has the range of scientific disciplines necessary to carry out land management planning.

Research, training, fire management, and disease control, are just a few of the other functions which are common to the three agencies concerned, and which will be able to be carried out more effectively and efficiently in the new department.

There has been criticism that the new department will be too large and consequently suffer from the problems attributed to large organisations. The proposed Department of Conservation and Land Management is not large by any standards, but the department has been designed to ensure that it does not suffer from bureaucratic inertia.

One of the features of the new department is its regional system of management. Most of the staff of this agency will be located in 10 regional centres covering the whole State. Each region will have considerable autonomy. This regional system of management will ensure that the department retains the benefits of a small organisation, while retaining the advantages of an organisation which has sufficient resources to provide the services essential to a land management agency.

For example, a region based in the Pilbara will be staffed with personnel with skills appropriate to the main function of the department in that region—national park and nature reserve management and wildlife administration. Regional administration will be controlled by a regional manager ensuring that public land management in the region is sensitive to the local environment and local people. But the region will also have access to the services which can only be provided by the whole department, such as aerial photography, drafting, information services, and all routine administration. Research and land management planning are two functions that can only be provided efficiently from a relatively large organisation and these services would be provided to each of the regions.

The proposal to form an integrated land management department has received broad support from groups representative of a spectrum of interests. They see in this proposal significant advantages to the organisations they represent. To local authorities it will result in improved liaison, better co-ordination, more effective public land management in their shires, the opportunity for

participation in land management plan formulation, and greater sensitivity to local management problems.

The conservation movement will benefit because it will be able to participate in policy formulation and substantially more resources will be available for wildlife conservation, and national park and nature reserve management.

The timber industry has supported the proposal because, for the first time, it will have a formal mechanism, the Forest Production Council, to participate in policy formulation and the land management planning proposals will give it the long-term security over timber resources that is needed before it can invest in the modern processing facilities that are essential to improve utilisation and increase its ability to compete.

To the public servants involved, the proposals mean that they will have greater options for employment and improved opportunities for promotion.

Ironically, the only significant opposition has come from some sections of the conservation movement who view the proposal as a takeover by the Forests Department and some members of the Opposition who interpret the proposal as a dismemberment of the Forests Department.

Since these are mutually exclusive propositions, they both cannot be right. In fact, both are wrong.

This Government rejects completely the proposition that the Forests Department, or specifically foresters, are not capable land managers. As is the case in any Government agency or profession, there are a range of philosophies.

The fact is that with the Forests Department, there is a very strong disposition towards conservation, a disposition which was reflected in the strong opposition that foresters voiced to the expansion of the bauxite mining industry.

Another reason given for exclusion of the Forests Department from an integrated land management agency is that the production function of that department would be in conflict with other functions of the integrated agency. There are three principal reasons why this proposition is not valid—

Firstly, over much of the forest estate, the forest is already managed for a number of different uses, including conservation and recreation, as well as production. This requirement to manage forest production areas for multiple use has been made mandatory in this Bill. If the argument that foresters are unsympathetic to non-productive uses of forest lands is accepted, and I stress that this is



not the Government's view, then logically, it can be argued that the inclusion of wildlife and national parks personnel with forests in an integrated agency will substantially improve the conservation and recreation values of those forest lands which have been reserved for forest production. But, if it is argued that a production and conservation function in a land management agency cannot be mixed, then how can one explain why the Forests Department has been able to successfully undertake these functions?

Secondly, as I have already outlined, very stringent provisions in this Bill ensure that there is no conflict between the production function and conservation and recreation functions of the new department. I do not want to list these provisions again in detail, but I point out that the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority will be responsible for management of conservation and national park areas and there is a specific provision excluding commercial forestry activities in national parks and nature reserves.

Thirdly, contrary to what has been suggested, inclusion of production as one of the functions of the new integrated agency will bring substantial benefits to conservation and recreation. In effect, the staff and resources which must be employed for production forestry and for which there is a revenue return for the Government, can be utilised for conservation and recreation activities. As I have already noted previously, the overheads that are associated with the running of any agency can be shared and the costs of such overheads minimised. Thus, without detracting from the resources devoted to production forestry, it is possible to provide substantial additional resources for the conservation and recreation functions of the new department.

The Government is confident that all public servants, whether their particular discipline is engineering, wildlife biology, forestry, geography, or environmental science, will carry out the policies of the Government, provided that they have an appropriate organisation and the resources necessary.

The Department of Conservation and Land Management has been designed to reflect a new concept in public land management. It will not be dominated by any existing agency, profession, or discipline.

The concept of an integrated land management agency is based on the fact that effective land

management can only come from an understanding of ecosystems and how to manipulate these ecosystems to achieve an objective. Thus, it does not matter whether the objective is to preserve numbat habitats, grow more trees, or provide for recreational opportunities in the natural environment, the same knowledge and skills are required. The complexities of ecosystems and ecosystem management is such that no single profession, discipline or manager, has all the knowledge or experience necessary. It is only by integrating all the knowledge and skills that are available that we can begin to develop an effective land management system in this State.

This Bill provides the administrative mechanism to achieve that integration, while ensuring that management objectives that are decided upon for the land that has been reserved, are compatible with the purpose of the reservation and reflect the desires of the public for whom the land is being managed.

When this Bill is proclaimed, we will have in Western Australia, the most efficient land management agency in the Commonwealth. The Government is committed to ensuring that this agency will have the resources required to make this State's public land management system the best in the Commonwealth.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. V. J. Ferry.

## **OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE BILL**

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

While in Opposition the Australian Labor Party at both Federal and State levels undertook to promote the health and safety of people at work and so prevent the costs and misery of work-related injuries, diseases, and death. Labor Governments in Australia have confirmed their commitment to this by planning to introduce legislation which will significantly improve standards of health and safety.

The policies and planned laws and organisational changes embody principles developed elsewhere—notably those enunciated by Lord Robens who, in 1972, reported on the British

system—and incorporated into the ILO Convention, No. 155 and its recommendation No. 164.

I want to remind members that Australia was represented by Governments, employers, and unions at those sessions of the 1980 ILO conference which formulated the Convention adopted in 1981. We are unable to ratify the Convention until all States move to comply. Western Australia is taking that step.

In December 1982 the then Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr McPhee) and the shadow spokesman (Mr Hawke) both confirmed the need to ratify the ILO Convention and develop a national strategy on occupational health and safety. The issue must transcend party politics. In November 1983 when Mr Willis announced the formation of the interim National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Mr McPhee indicated strong bipartisan support for a major effort in this area.

The Australian Labor Party and the Australian Council of Trade Unions made occupational health and safety a priority in the statement of accord, and at the national economic summit held in April 1983, representatives of Governments, employers, and unions stated that the nation must give occupational health and safety a greater priority. The National Labour Consultative Council later made the first tripartite statement, thus contributing significantly to the awareness of occupational health and safety.

The permanent National Occupational Health and Safety Commission will soon be established, its major role being to facilitate and co-ordinate a national strategy to prevent work-related injuries, deaths, and illness. It will be a tripartite structure with each State represented. The States, as members know, exercise jurisdiction in this area and it is planned that with this structure, uniform standards will be adopted nationally. In the 1984-85 Budget, \$12 million has been set aside for the commission.

I shall now outline the reasons for the necessary changes. The increasing incidence of industrial injury and the accompanying increasing costs are two major reasons for reforms to reduce and control both. Although some extent of the problem can be gauged from compensation claims' data and costs, we have next to no information on the incidence of occupational diseases, except for some related to mining and to asbestos exposure.

What we do know, though, is that workers are exposed to a range of physical hazards including machinery, noise, electronic keyboards, and dusts, resulting in trauma, hearing loss, repetition strain injury, and chest conditions.

Workers in some occupations we now know stand a disproportionate chance of claiming compensation for injuries. Experience in the work force protects, and those who are most vulnerable from inexperience are young workers and women who return to work after child-bearing and rearing. Overall, men stand about a one-in-eight chance each year of making a claim; women one in 40 and women in service, sport, and recreation jobs comprise 19 per cent of the female work force, yet make 41 per cent of the claims in this area.

We know that workers in all workplaces continue to be exposed to chemical substances which are introduced without any systematic evaluation. From June 1985 new industrial chemicals will be subject to national pre-marketing notification and assessment procedures. A major problem for both employers and workers is that they do not have the necessary information about chemicals in order to afford or to be afforded protection.

We need a system of collecting data about hazards as well as accidents and other incidents so that the information can be used to prevent harm.

Cost is a crude indicator of the size of the problem. Conservative estimates put the national financial cost of work-related injury at \$6.5 billion each year, or equal to about four per cent of the gross domestic product. This is double the more widely publicised road accident costs of \$3 billion. But neither of these figures measure the human costs of pain, disability, and disruption to family life.

We can review the Western Australian workers' compensation premium income and payments in round figures as follows—

	Premium Incomes	Claim Pay- ments
	\$ Million	\$ Million
1980-1981	88	64
1981-1982	104	80
1982-83	140	111

Many insurance experts say that the cost of work-related injury is actually four or even six times more than that paid in compensation claims payments. In Western Australia then the cost of occupational injury may have been \$550 million last year. The costs of work-related disease, apart from mining-related chest disease and asbestos-related disease, are unknown and hidden.

One of the major problems that has to be addressed is the development, type, scope, provision and administration of existing health and safety legislation. A number of major defects exist

in the present regulatory system. These are not the fault of any one department, but reflect the failure of successive Governments to give prevention a high priority.

There are 44 Acts and 58 sets of regulations or by-laws in Western Australia that in some way protect the health and safety of people at work. Their administration is spread between 19 departments and 13 portfolios, although most responsibility rests with the departments of industrial affairs, health, and mines. However, no agency is charged with co-ordination or with a liaison function, and present staff and support facilities of departments are often not engaged exclusively on matters of occupational health and safety. For example, Department of Industrial Affairs inspectors are responsible for factory safety as well as for shop trading hours.

Further, it is estimated that about half the work force is not subject to any statutory cover, and that half includes people in the hospital industry, in the information industry, and in commerce and agriculture—all comprising vulnerable occupations.

Much law was derived from British Statutes of the nineteenth century and is not only outmoded, but also unable to respond to the organisation and hazards of industry in the late twentieth century. The first Western Australian Factories and Shops Act and the Inspection of Machinery Act were proclaimed in 1904, and although they and the old Inspection of Scaffolding Act of 1924 have all been reviewed, there have not been any major reforms. Although the existing factories and shops, machinery safety, and construction safety legislation are administered within one department, inspectors have different powers under each Act and there are inconsistent penalties for similar breaches.

Lord Robens found problems such as I have outlined in Britain and concluded that "these deficiencies are of a kind that cannot be cured by piecemeal improvements within the existing system. A thorough-going overhaul is needed."

It would be futile to provide more of the same, and this Government undertook to translate its platform into policy and to seek ways and means of developing and implementing it.

Policy proposals: At this point it is pertinent that I state the policy objectives. The major thrust is to pass one occupational health, safety, and welfare Act in order—

to ensure that work and workplaces are as free from hazards to safety and health as is feasible;

to rationalise existing legislative and administrative arrangements;

to set and enforce legal standards on health and safety;

to establish statutory rights and responsibilities of employers, workers, and unions;

to provide a licensing system for workplaces, work processes, equipment and chemicals;

and most importantly, to promote tripartite consultation and the observation of international labor organisation standards both in formulating policy in a commission and in implementing policy at workplaces.

The scope of such an Act is to protect all workers in all workplaces.

Means of implementation: Because of the implications of these proposals the Government had no intention of simply imposing them, but has embarked on a continuing process of consultation with all parties concerned and interested.

The Government actively supports the principles of consultation in the areas of welfare, education and housing, as well as in industrial relations.

Consultation with all interested parties allows a broad range of views to be expressed and received with the aim of involving the public in law reforms. This benefits both the public and the law.

Emphasis has been placed on canvassing the broadest possible ranges of views, on trying to obtain consensus wherever possible, and on seeking reliable information on the likely effects of Government decisions.

This was considered necessary for a number of reasons—

Firstly and obviously, because the issue of occupational health and safety is and must be a matter of such importance to all of us—politicians, Government, workers, employers and the community as a whole;

secondly, because these proposals represent a significant departure from the approach to this problem of past Western Australian Governments;

thirdly, because the Government believes that there has to be substantial understanding of the proposals and commitment to them by employers and workers if they are to have the maximum effect;

and finally, because the Government wanted the advice of those active throughout industry on the practical application of the proposals.

The dissemination of a public discussion document in October last year was a benchmark in that process and has led to a flow of submissions to Government.

All were read and considered, and those organisations which responded have received a report of the content of the 180 submissions made. Both the discussion document and the reply are included in the report of the deliberations of the Western Australian Tripartite Labour Consultative Council.

We believe that the responses gave a clear character for the Government to continue its initiatives on safety legislation. There is general agreement for the key areas for which reform has been proposed and I would like to touch on each of them.

It was agreed that—

The need for reform is overdue;

the enabling Act should be written in plain English, stating its aims and with widest possible cover, including binding of the Crown;

the new legislation should be based on Robens' philosophy and ILO principles;

there should be a tripartite commission addressing itself to questions of law, policy, research, and training;

the commission should consult with advisory committees;

existing administrative arrangements should be rationalized;

the Government should increase the numbers of inspectors and create a technically competent inspectorate;

all parties to the safety process should have specific statutory duties, and interlocking partnerships should be created;

arrangements should be made for effective workplace consultation;

controls of chemicals must be improved;

new emphasis should be placed on education and training;

there should be a valid and reliable data base on hazards and industrial accidents with proper research facilities;

there should be appropriate funding and allocation of resources; and

uniformity of standards between industries and nationally should be achieved.

But it has to be said too that the means of implementation of some of these matters of principle has different implications for different parties.

While there is broad agreement that unions be involved in the formulation of law and policy at the proposed commission, there are objections to their being involved in implementing that policy in individual workplaces.

It was therefore decided that further consultation is necessary and that we would implement policy in two stages.

First the commission will be established and we will start to rationalise existing administrative and legislative procedures. Then when the structure is in place the Government will address the issue of the comprehensive Act and find the best means to ensure that all workers are protected.

As members know I established by Statute the Western Australian Tripartite Labour Consultative Council which considers any aspects of industrial relations matters, and then makes recommendations to me as Minister for Industrial Relations. The report of the council's meetings and material taken to it for deliberation has been issued to all members of both Houses.

With Cabinet agreement, last December I established a steering committee of representatives of the heads of the Departments of Industrial Affairs, Health, and Mines, and it now includes a representative from the Department of Conservation and Environment and one from the Civil Service Association.

The steering committee has fairly wide terms of reference, but essentially its function is to make recommendations to me as Minister as to how best to rationalise the administration of health and safety laws. In the Cabinet minute authorising drafting of the Bill now being introduced, approval was also given for this committee to provide the mechanism for amalgamation of the health and safety functions and resources from the Department of Industrial Affairs and the occupational health branch. It is proposed that this amalgamation start on 3 December. The commission will then have the kernel of its department operational when it is established in April.

With the earlier commitment to continuing consultation about the implementation of a new Act in workplaces let me describe what the proposed commission will do.

Occupational Health and Safety Commission: Overwhelming support for the concept of an occupational health and safety commission, notably for its tripartite structure, was expressed in responses to the discussion document. There was also support for, and requests that, the commission take a high public profile especially in relation to using media effectively, to running campaigns, and to raising awareness.

A central tripartite policy-making unit is fundamental to introducing the kinds of laws and changes that are planned, for this structure is necessary to determine priorities for funding, training, research, and dissemination of information. The decision-making processes should ensure a mutual commitment to policy.

Tripartism is fundamental to the ILO Convention, as well as to national proposals. Employers and unions as representatives of industry meet with the third party of Government. While agreement is sought, it is not just a matter of discussing, for instance, what standards are desirable, but which ones are capable of implementation and how, so that a commitment from both sides can be achieved and a recommendation made to the Government. Involvement and co-operation should be stimulated.

The form, structure, and aims of the Bill reflect not only the policy and responses to it, but also the contributions of the tripartite council and its agreement.

The long title of the Bill indicates the scope of the policy and leaves it open for the Government, after consultations, to introduce amendments to enlarge the provisions of the future Act. As such the aims are aims of an occupational health and safety Act: the commission will derive its functions from those aims although concerned with existing legislation it will be able to address issues in some areas where there is no present statutory cover for workers: for example, in dissemination of information and training proposals. Consistent with policy, the aims of the Bill are to promote safety to prevent injury by seeking to secure safe and hygienic working environments. The promotion of tripartite consultation is emphasised. Policy making, co-ordination, and education are major initiatives of this new and constructive approach.

The functions of the commission are spelt out in plain English.

These functions are to do with making recommendations to the Minister about laws and provisions of laws, about setting and maintaining standards, about the promotion of education and training, about liaison with various authorities and organisations, and about information gathering and dissemination and research.

It will provide a central focus from which the State's occupational health and safety strategy can be developed and implemented. It will be looked to for leadership and it should, through its relationship with the national commission, provide a means for advance in the field.

The commission will be established on or after 1 April next year, the initial cost being estimated to

be \$321 000—if only three common law claims at \$100 000 each are saved the commission would pay for itself. The commissioner's position will be advertised nationally and internationally to attract suitable candidates.

The Occupational Health and Safety Commission will consist of a commissioner who will be the full-time chairperson and a secretariat with a policy, research, and publicising function. This unit will work directly with the commission, independent of the day-to-day needs and work of the department.

There will be 11 part-time members of the commission—

- three persons nominated by the Confederation of Western Australian Industry;

- three persons nominated by the Trades and Labor Council;

- three persons who have some expertise in occupational health and safety; and

- one representing the Government as an employer and one representing the operational department of the commission.

Because we are aware of how busy persons nominated to bodies like the commission can be, we want to involve more people from all areas of industry in the standard-setting process, and we propose to do this by giving the commission power to establish committees to advise it.

The commission will thus provide a forum for an exchange of information between employers and workers facing similar occupational health and safety problems.

Our proposals should open up lines of communication between the parties in particular industries.

We expect to establish some specific industry committees: for example, small business and agriculture. Employers and people from the unions directly involved in the industry will be on these committees and will review the particular conditions applying to their industries and make recommendations to the commission.

Importantly, there will be a few standing advisory committees to provide a continuing infrastructure. Certainly the need is acknowledged for two most important ones—one for migrant workers, the other for women and young workers, so that their conditions and needs are constantly under review.

*Ad hoc* working parties will be constituted to review regulations; for example, scaffolding requirements and vibration.

Administration: The Government has a policy commitment to improving the administration and

enforcement of safety laws. It plans, as I said earlier, to start by amalgamating existing staff and resources of the Department of Industrial Affairs and the occupational health branch of the Health Department into a new structure dealing with occupational health and safety by Christmas.

The commissioner will be the permanent head of the department and the tripartite commission will establish priorities for further amalgamations into it.

In order to streamline administrative authority, the Governor will be able, with the agreement of relevant Ministers, to transfer laws or provisions of laws from one Minister to the one responsible for this Act. For example, the hearing conservation regulations would, because they apply to workplaces, sensibly be transferred from the Minister for Health. Once transferred, the commission will be able to make recommendations about that law or provision. As other responsibilities and functions were transferred, so administration would be facilitated. There will also be regulation-making powers.

Provisions of the Act may be proclaimed on different dates. Although the amalgamation will be done administratively, it may be necessary for the Minister to arrange transfer of statutory responsibility before the commission is established.

In the submissions there was broad agreement that administration must be rationalised and that the size and competence of the inspectorate be upgraded. It was also generally recognised that one agency with regional branches is timely in the name of rationalisation of resources, efficiency, and avoidance of overlap. It was seen that the proposed department would provide advantages to the whole industrial community by increasing services, by co-ordinating the functions of a range of personnel, and by providing technical, scientific, and information support. It is clear too that the complexities are such that no single technically or professionally prepared person has all the knowledge and experience, and that a multi-disciplinary approach is necessary. Further we have made a commitment to the present staff of the two departments that we will do everything to ensure that their career options and aspirations are not disrupted, and in fact are enhanced.

Review procedures are established in order to evaluate the functioning of the commission and the department. It will be important to ascertain that the objectives of this Act are being met, as well as to make an assessment of how the department is administering other legislation.

**Conclusion:** There are no short-term expedient answers to these complex issues, but inviting,

fostering, and using the active participation of parties concerned is a means by which the Government can more appropriately meet its responsibilities.

These are our first and careful steps towards implementing a State strategy in occupational health and safety. We are proud to be associated with these efforts and to be part of the national momentum towards improving working environments.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. G. E. Masters (Leader of the Opposition).

## ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.41 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Last year the Commonwealth amended its enrolment procedures to allow for "silent enrolments". Persons who believe that the disclosure of their address on the Commonwealth electoral roll could place at risk their own safety or that of their family, may apply to have their addresses removed from the Commonwealth roll.

It is now proposed that the State Act be amended in the same way.

The Bill provides that persons whose safety is at risk may apply to the Registrar to have their addresses deleted or omitted from electoral rolls. Applications are to be verified by statutory declaration. Applications may be refused and the roll is subject to review by the Registrar from time to time.

The appropriate procedures will be handled on the State's behalf by Australian electoral officers, to enable the current co-operative enrolment programme to be applied consistently. This is proposed to be by arrangement between the Governor General and the Governor.

The recent attacks on Federal court judges have highlighted the need for this amendment, which has the support of the Standing Committee of Attorneys General.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. I. G. Medcalf.

## ELECTION OF SENATORS AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.43 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The principal purpose of this Bill before the House is to bring the Election of Senators Act into compatibility with Commonwealth legislation.

At present the State Act specified times and places which are not consistent with equivalent dates and places enacted by the Commonwealth.

The Bill proposes removal of the requirement to give not less than seven days' notice of the issue of a writ for any election of senators for Western Australia. Notice must still be given and the deletion of time strictures would be of benefit in orderly planning. As the Commonwealth Act now provides a period of seven days from issue of writ to roll closure, a period of public notice is inbuilt. This seven-day period is available for enrolments and corrections if these are necessary.

The Bill proposes the following time schedules which are consistent with the Commonwealth Act—

Close of rolls—seven days after issue of writ.

Nominations—Not less than 11 or more than 28 days after issue of the writ, with limited extension of one day in the event of the death of a candidate before the close of nominations.

Polling day—To be not less than 22 or more than 30 days after nomination day.

The hours of polling are to be from 8.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. for Senate elections, just as they are for House of Representatives elections.

The Bill provides for the removal of references to "places of election", "place appointed for nomination", and "declaration of the poll", all of which are covered by Commonwealth legislation.

I understand that where necessary, other States also will be moving in the direction of uniformity.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. P. G. Pandal.

## BEE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bee Industry Compensation Act provides for the levying of licence fees on hives owned by beekeepers in order that compensation may be paid to beekeepers whose hives are destroyed in the course of disease control programmes established under the provisions of the Beekeepers Act.

The Act has operated successfully since 1954. However, for the period 1982-1984, compensation payments to beekeepers from the bee industry compensation fund have exceeded the amount of money in the fund. The industry is now faced with repayment of an overdraft of \$80 000 and, as a result of this overexpenditure, can expect a massive increase in the hive levy in 1985.

Following approaches made to me by the department, and with the support of industry, the Minister for Agriculture established a Compensation Fund Review Committee to review the fund and make recommendations on ways and means of restoring its viability.

The proposed amending Bills will be dealt with conjointly.

Upper limit to the payment of compensation—currently the amount of compensation payable to a beekeeper is the value of the property at the time it was destroyed. The Compensation Fund Review Committee is unable to relate the amount of compensation payable to the hive levy paid by beekeepers. The proposed amendment will allow the committee to recommend to the Minister an upper limit to compensation, in a direct relationship to the anticipated income from licence fees.

Reduction or withholding of compensation—on several occasions in the past two years the compensation fund committee has been obliged to authorise compensation payments to beekeepers who, in the committee's view, were not entitled to compensation because of their failure to observe the provisions of the Beekeepers Act, and the proposed amendment would allow the committee to withhold or reduce compensation, where a beekeeper has failed to observe the prescribed

measures for disease control and has, by his actions, placed other beekeepers at risk.

The amendments have been recommended by an industry committee established to consider the long-term viability of the Bee Industry Compensation Fund.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Margaret McAleer.

## BEEKEEPERS AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Beekeepers Act requires beekeepers to register and to obtain a brand with which all his or her hives must be identified. It provides the legislative support for the control and eradication of diseases and pests of bees and for the appointment of inspectors to carry out the required procedures. The Act also provides for the control of the movement of bees, hives, and hive products, both within the State and from other States.

The Bee Industry Compensation Act provides for the levying of licence fees for hives in order that compensation may be paid to beekeepers whose hives are destroyed in the course of disease control programmes established under the provisions of the Beekeepers Act.

Disease control programmes have operated successfully since 1954. However, in 1982-1984 compensation payments have exceeded funds available. In order to remedy this situation it is necessary to amend both Acts. The amendments have been recommended by an industry committee and include the following—

**Registration**—A beekeeper is required to register as a beekeeper under the Beekeepers Act and also to pay licence fees under the Bee Industry Compensation Act. The lack of a statutory link between the requirements to register and to pay licence fees has given rise to problems where a person resists either one or the other. The effect of the proposed amendment will be to make the payment of licence fees payable in accordance with the Bee Industry Compensation Act a prerequisite for registration as a beekeeper.

**Registration period**—The registration period for beekeepers was reduced from five years to two years on 1 January 1983. A further reduction in the registration period from two years to one year would allow the Bee Industry Compensation Fund Review Committee more flexibility in setting a licence fee which is directly related to the prevalence of disease and the financial status of the fund.

These amendments complement those being sought to the Bee Industry Compensation Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. C. J. Bell.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.49 p.m.] I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [5.50 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words on the adjournment and I assure members it will take me about two minutes only.

I want to draw the attention of the House to what I consider to be a very inadequate series of answers to questions I asked on notice. The fact that we have now changed the rules in respect to answering questions means that members would not be as aware of this as they would have been under the old system.

I asked about five questions on notice in respect of a matter in Broome and I was given one answer which purports to relate to all the questions. The answer I received bears no relationship to about three-quarters of the questions.

I recall being abused when we were on the other side of the House by members of the then Opposition for what they called "secret Government" and the refusal to answer questions. Here is a classic case of a Government which will not give answers to legitimate questions. I will not take the time of the House to read out the questions and the answer that I received. It is quite unacceptable, and it is my view, and I believe the view of all members, that we are entitled to proper and adequate answers to questions that are asked in the Parliament. Whether or not the Government likes the questions or the answers that they have to give, they have some obligation, in my opinion, to give an answer. The answer I received bears no relationship in some cases to the question. Some of the answers are quite absurd.

I wish to give notice now that the issue of a resort motel at Broome, which has been the subject of a number of questions I asked in the House,



is not finished with at all. I will not be fobbed off by the answer to the questions I asked today. The fact that the Government will not answer the questions indicates quite clearly that it has something to hide. I propose to take the opportunity next week to expose this whole mess to the Parliament and I trust the people of Western Australia will see what this Government has done to two

legitimate business people in Broome and the unacceptable manner in which they have been treated. I also object to the unacceptable manner in which the Government has treated my questions.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.51 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

#### *Seaman Inquiry: Submissions*

335. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) When was the last grant made to an individual or organisation to assist in preparation of a submission to the Seaman inquiry?
- (2) Which individuals or organisations have yet to submit final returns relating to grants received from the Aboriginal liaison committee?
- (3) On what date did each of the individuals or organisations referred to in (2) receive their grant?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) 25 July 1984.
- (2) See (3).
- (3) Mark Chambers 19/10/83  
South West Monetary Compensation Commission 13/10/83  
North Central Aboriginal Consultative Committee 17/10/83  
Wallungurra Council Inc 23/9/83  
Ngonjuwah Council Inc 2/11/83  
Jigalong Community Inc 2/4/84  
Cullacabardee Village 23/9/83  
Frank Chulung NAC-WAG 23/9/83  
NAC (AUBREY LYNCH) 23/9/83  
Ieramugadu Group Inc 14/10/83  
New Era Aboriginal Fellowship 14/10/83  
Bibulmun Community 30/11/83  
Rob Riley WAA Area-NAC 2/5/84  
Alicia Frisina (South West Coastal Area) 2/5/84  
Central Midlands Aboriginal Progress Association Inc 9/3/84  
Aubrey Lynch, Eastern Goldfields Land Council 10/5/84  
Mrs Lorna Little, C/- Aboriginal Legal Service 20/7/84.

### WATER RESOURCES: DAM

#### *Harris River Dam*

339. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) When was the last approach made by the State Government to the Federal

Government for funds for the Harris River dam?

- (2) What was the response?
- (3) What priority does it hold with the State Government?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Any approach to the Federal Government for financial assistance for water resource projects must be supported by a documented proposal. Preliminary engineering and environmental studies have been completed for a dam on the Harris River and a report to the Government is being prepared by the Public Works Department.

When this report has been received and considered, a decision will be made on the priority to be given to the project and the timing of a submission to the Commonwealth Government.

- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

### WATER RESOURCES: WATER ALLOCATION

#### *Carnarvon*

342. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the Minister received a letter from a Mr A. Hobbs in Carnarvon requesting a water allocation?
- (2) Has the Minister replied to Mr Hobbs' letter?
- (3) If so, when was the letter sent?
- (4) If not, why is the Minister delaying his reply?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) 25 October 1984.
- (4) Not applicable.

347 and 348. *Postponed.*

### HEALTH: HOSPITALS

#### *Wooroloo Hospital*

349. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

I refer to question 300 of Wednesday, 17 October 1984, and ask—

- (1) What type of nursing post is to be established?

- (2) Will it be permanently staffed on a 24-hour-per-day basis?
- (3) If "No" to (2), what hours and under what conditions is it envisaged that the nursing post will operate?
- (4) Will the closure of the hospital result in significant cost savings in Government expenditure?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), what amount of savings is envisaged in the current financial year?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The range of services to be provided at the nursing post has not been finalised. A decision will be made following a comprehensive review of existing and alternative services available in the area. This review will take place simultaneously with the negotiations with the Prisons Department.
- (2) No decision has yet been made. Any decision related to staffing levels must await the review of existing services.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) The net cost of operating the Wooroloo Hospital in 1983-84 was \$197 894. The cost of operating a nursing post will be substantially less. However, final savings will be dependent upon answers to (1).

350. *Postponed.*

## ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

### *Kennedy Hill Reserve*

351. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

I refer the Minister to a letter to me from the Minister for Planning dated 16 October 1984, in which he states—

Advice from the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs that the location was inappropriate due to the proximity of the Kennedy Hill Reserve and his concern that there could be severe

social ramifications if the development was allowed to proceed.

and ask—

What are the severe social ramifications that would occur in the event of the resort development proceeding?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

See reply to question 355.

## PLANNING: KENNEDY HILL RESERVE

### *Zoning*

352. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning:

Did the town planning consultants to the Broome Shire recommend that the Kennedy Hill-Lookout Hill area in Broome be zoned for hotel development?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The member is referred to the answer given by the Premier to question 355.

## PLANNING: KENNEDY HILL RESERVE

### *Development*

353. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning:

I refer the Minister to his letter to me of 16 October 1984, in which he states—

Advice from the Department of Town Planning expressing concern regarding the scale and appropriateness of the location of the proposed development, bearing in mind the very many potential development sites that there could be in the Broome area.

and ask—

- (1) Why is the location referred to inappropriate for the proposed development?
- (2) Will the Minister list the very many potential development sites in the Broome area?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) The member is referred to the answer given by the Premier to question 355.

**LAND: BROOME**

*Lot No. 1220*

354. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Is it proposed that all or part of Lot No. 1220, Broome be converted to an 'A'-class reserve?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) will the Minister table a plan showing the proposed 'A'-class reserve; and
  - (b) when is it expected that action will be taken to convert the land?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) See reply to question 355.

**LAND: BROOME**

*Resort Development*

355. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Did the Premier advise Mr Lee Bonser that he would support Mr Bonser's proposals for a resort hotel in Broome if a successful environmental study on the foreshore was completed?
- (2) Is the Premier aware that a successful environmental study was completed by Wood & Grieve, Consulting Engineers, on behalf of Mr Bonser?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I refer the member to questions without notice 5 to 16, 37, and 40, and questions on notice 122, 134, 136, 138, and 140.

In December 1983, Cabinet made a decision relating to the site.

That decision was fully communicated to the parties involved.

That decision was that no Government land next to Mr Bonser's land would be available to build a tourist hotel.

The Government has announced its intention to release land elsewhere in Broome near Gantheaume Point for a tourist development.

Other sites under investigation include for such developments Riddell Beach area and its hinterland, and an area north of Bali Hai behind the foredunes.

The reasons for refusing a tourist development at Kennedy Hill have been fully explained.

356. *Postponed.*

**LAND: BROOME**

*Lot No. 1220*

357. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Has a portion of Lot No. 1220 in Broome been offered for purchase by the owner of the Mangrove Motel under S45A of the Land Act?
- (2) If so, what area of land has been offered?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) See reply to questions 355.

358 and 359. *Postponed.*

**WATER RESOURCES**

*Denmark Water Supply*

360. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What annual income is derived from those customers connected to the Denmark water scheme?
- (2) What is the breakdown of the \$310 000 expenditure on the scheme in 1983-84 on costs other than capital items?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Annual income from Denmark water supply rates and water consumption in 1983-84 was \$119 755.

- (2) Breakdown of expenditure on the Denmark water supply scheme for 1983-84 (figures are rounded up)

Operating and administrative expenditure	\$143 500
Interest on capital funds	\$120 500
Depreciation	\$45 900
	<hr/>
	\$309 900

361. *Postponed.*