

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 8 November 1983

The SPEAKER (Mr Harman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

## BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Local Government Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill introduced, on motion without notice by Mr Carr (Minister for Local Government), and read a first time.

2. Western Australian Tourism Commission Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion without notice by Mr Brian Burke (Minister for Tourism), and read a first time.

## MISS ADRIENNE VON TUNZELMANN

*Presence in Speaker's Gallery*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Harman): I wish to announce for the benefit of members and for the information of the Press that Miss Adrienne Von Tunzelmann is in the Speaker's Gallery. She is the Clerk of Committees of the New Zealand Parliament.

## LIBRARY BOARD OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA AMENDMENT BILL

*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion without notice by Mr Davies (Minister for the Arts), and read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**MR DAVIES** (Victoria Park—Minister for the Arts) [2.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the amendments to section 3 of the principal Act is to remove an anomaly in that Act relating to the definition of "nominee member". A drafting error in the amendment Act of 1974 to the principal Act, relating to the definition of "nominee member", left some doubt about the term of office of some members of the board, and the term of office of any member appointed to fill a mid-term vacancy on the board. In the amendments now proposed, it will be clear that the expression "nominee member" includes all members of the board other than the Director-

General of Education or his deputy. It will also be clear that a person appointed to fill a vacancy caused by a mid-term resignation shall occupy the position for the unexpired balance of the term of office of the person resigning.

The amendment to section 5 of the principal Act is designed to establish without any doubt whatever the fact that a "nominee member" shall be eligible for selection for reappointment.

The amendment to section 21 of the principal Act is designed to establish without any doubt that the Government has the power to make regulations relating to the conduct of public libraries operated by participating bodies under the Act. For many years, this power has been assumed and the Government has, in fact, made regulations for the conduct of public libraries, and these were understood to be valid instruments regulating the way in which public libraries were conducted. In recent years, the Crown Solicitor has cast doubt on the Government's power to make such regulations and, to put the matter beyond all doubt, the proposed amendment to the principal Act is now placed before this Parliament.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Thompson.

## MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION BILL

*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion without notice by Mr Davies (Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs), and read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**MR DAVIES** (Victoria Park—Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs) [2.27 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the establishment of a multicultural and ethnic affairs commission.

Mr Speaker, the State Government recognises that Australia is a multicultural society, consisting not only of people born in Australia, but also of many people of diverse ethnic origin who have migrated to Australia. Australia's population is now fundamentally different in ethnic composition from what it was not so long ago. Just over 20 per cent of the Australian population are migrants, and many of these have come from countries where English is not the first language.

In Western Australia, this population change is even more marked. The 1981 census indicates that 27 per cent of our population were born overseas and that our migrants originated from

close to 100 countries. Many of these people have brought with them not only new languages, but also different customs and traditions.

The Government recognises the significant contribution which has been made by ethnic groups to the overall lifestyle of Australians and that they will continue to do so. It further believes that each ethnic community has a right to preserve its traditions and culture within a context of full involvement in all aspects of our community life.

This Bill is based on a philosophy which is to promote and facilitate a cohesive society that encourages equal opportunity and participation by all Western Australians regardless of their ethnic origins.

To date, very little has been done to develop and implement a policy that recognises the nature of our multicultural society and the implications this has on our social, economic, and cultural life.

Towards this end, the Government has committed itself to establishing a commission which will provide the avenue of access for individuals and groups to make their needs known. It will endeavour to determine the means of meeting these needs and to seek to identify issues that may cause concern or lead to conflict.

To achieve such access and the necessary level of communication, the Government has determined that this commission will be established as an independent body quite apart from departmental influences.

I am confident that in this way, the commission will be able to more effectively serve the ethnic communities of this State.

Development of this legislation took into consideration the particular requirements of Western Australia. Consultation with the wider community included a public invitation for written submissions and views on the proposal for a multicultural and ethnic affairs commission, its structure, role, membership, terms of reference, and operation. The genuine interest shown and the constructive comments made by many individuals and organisations have been welcomed by the Government.

The commission will comprise one full-time commissioner and 10 part-time members. It is intended that the membership will reflect a substantial representation of people who have experience, knowledge, and interest in issues that concern migrants and ethnic groups, and who can make significant contributions to the development of effective policies.

As a full-time member, the commissioner will be able to offer considerable commitment to the

affairs of the commission while being available for consultation to the Government and community representatives.

It will be noted that this legislation will enable the commission to establish committees as it may think fit for the purpose of assisting it to carry out its function. Such committees will be able to examine specific areas of need on multicultural and ethnic affairs issues. The consultative nature of expertise committee work will further ensure that the views of ethnic communities and individuals can be sought and considered.

The commission may also invite any person or organisation to act in an advisory capacity to the commission to broaden its access to information and advice.

I am confident that through such means the commission will be accessible and able to act as a focus for consultation on the views and needs of migrants and ethnic groups at every level of the community.

Major functions of the commission will be to advise and make recommendations to the Government on policy, on provision of services, and on the most effective use of funds. Such advice would be based on consideration of community needs and aspirations.

Consultation with Government departments and instrumentalities, individuals, and community groups will be essential to determine the needs of ethnic communities and to develop and implement appropriate policies. This legislation will provide for this process.

Another important function of the commission will be to promote community awareness and better appreciation of our multicultural society in order to facilitate co-operation, understanding, and harmony throughout the total community. Furthermore, it will be committed to ensuring that all Western Australians have the same rights, opportunities, and responsibilities, and that individuals or groups are not disadvantaged because of their ethnic origins.

Wherever possible, the commission will act with a view to encouraging involvement and provision of support services by the ethnic communities themselves along the lines of self-help initiatives.

Clear evidence indicates that migrants and members of different ethnic groups face a range of difficulties as they endeavour to adjust to a new life in Western Australia.

Despite the range of services available in health, education, and welfare to help newcomers overcome their settlement difficulties, many of

these people continue to remain socially and physically isolated. This can be due to constraints of language barriers, access to information, residential location, and cultural differences. The strains of unfamiliar local conditions, communication difficulties, and upheaval of transition often result in profound anxiety, distress, and trauma for individuals and families. The effects are felt equally by men, women, and children of all age groups and backgrounds. Even after social and economic adjustment in the community has taken place, other problems remain, particularly in the area of language, education, and employment. The Government, through this proposed commission, acknowledges that such needs exist and that it has a responsibility to provide for them.

Many issues of concern were stressed by individuals and organisations through their submissions. In many instances, issues raised may be the responsibility of the Commonwealth, or its agencies, employer bodies, educational institutions, unions, or the State. In this regard there is a very real need for a body such as this proposed commission to fulfil a consultative and co-ordinating role.

Priority was often given to matters such as the recognition of overseas professional, technical, and trade qualifications. There are many migrants here who are not able to practise their skills due to non-acceptance of their qualifications. Not only does this result in personal distress, and sometimes unemployment, but also resources available within the community are not being fully utilised and the valuable contributions these people could make are lost. A co-ordinated review of such areas of concern with the responsible authorities would appear to be a priority.

Knowledge of English plays a critical role in a migrant's successful settlement in the community. It can affect all aspects of life from school, home, employment, and the use of available services and facilities. New initiatives are needed to further assist adult migrants and their children to learn English at all levels. In addition, special courses for occupational needs are required.

It is envisaged that the commission will be able to play a role in advising on the development of future programmes to meet specific needs of our population from a non-English speaking background, as well as on the promotion of community languages as part of the educational system.

Difficulties in gaining access to existing services are often due to a lack of competence in English and/or an unfamiliarity of migrants with their rights and responsibilities. Consequently, a

number of areas need examination; for example, availability of adequate interpreting and translating services, the provision of information in community languages, particularly in the areas of health, welfare, law, education, and such specific issues as workers' compensation and medical services.

Some members of ethnic community groups have particular needs in settling and functioning adequately; for instance, isolated migrant women, the elderly, and pre-school children of non-English speaking parents have been identified as areas of concern and warrant attention.

The Government is committed to the development of appropriate policies and implementation of programmes. It also recognises community initiatives that may be taken towards meeting needs.

It is intended that the commission will be responsible to the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, and will provide advice and recommendations on any matter relevant to this Bill.

Funds to enable this proposed commission to operate have been provided for in the current Budget Estimates from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Office. In addition, the commission will be required to present to Parliament an annual report relating to its activities.

The Government gave a commitment prior to the last election that it would establish such a multicultural and ethnic affairs commission. As the responsible Minister, I am proud to be associated with the implementation of this policy initiative.

Migrants have made considerable contributions to the welfare and development of this great State of ours. There is no doubt that they can offer a great deal more. However, they must be given the opportunity to participate to their fullest potential and also be encouraged to share an equal responsibility.

I firmly believe that this proposed commission will provide the means and that it will go a considerable distance towards achieving these aims. I am confident that our lifestyle will be further enriched and that future generations will acknowledge the positive steps now being taken.

In conclusion, I stress that this Bill does not aim to create special privileges or advantages for the migrants within our community. It supports the concept of developing a more harmonious society, of achieving equal recognition, and of facilitating equal access and opportunity to services and facilities for all people living in Western

Australia. I am sure it will do this by addressing the gaps and imbalances that exist.

I express my appreciation to the many ethnic groups which have taken the trouble to make submissions on this proposed legislation when invited to. I also appreciate the part played by the representative of the Opposition in seeking advice from community groups. I am quite certain that the information he has been given is along the lines of that received by me. It is from those submissions that this Bill has been drafted. In many ways it is typical of Bills which have been before the House on many occasions and it has a familiar structure, with many of the clauses in this Bill having appeared in previous Bills relating to the setting up of organisations of similar ilk.

The most important aspect will be the people who comprise the commission. I make it clear that firstly, the person appointed as commissioner must have the widest possible experience and must have had some very close relationship with the problems that exist, not only in Western Australia but also throughout Australia. Secondly, I believe that the persons who are appointed as part-time commissioners will be appointed not because they represent a particular ethnic group, but because they have broad expertise to offer. Whether those persons happen to be of one particular ethnic group is of little consequence. Of course, I am certain that such a situation will not arise but I would like it understood that part-time commissioners will be appointed on the basis of the experience and the knowledge they have to offer.

I also express my thanks to the department. It is a small department which has undergone some fairly traumatic changes in the past six months as a result of the different approach to immigration adopted by the Burke Government. I have received great co-operation from that department and I know the members of the department are looking forward with a great deal of enthusiasm to supporting the commission and assisting the work to be done in the community to ensure that no groups of people are disadvantaged.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hassell (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## MINING: URANIUM

### *Lakeway and Yeelirrie: Urgency Motion*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Harman): I have received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition, as provided for under Standing Order No. 47, notifying me of his intention to move for the adjournment

(3)

of the House for the purpose of debating the following matter—

This house supports the principle that no one State within the Commonwealth of Australia should be discriminated against in developing its natural resources and creating employment, and to this end—

1. condemns those parts of the Federal Government's uranium policy which deny Western Australia the opportunity to encourage and promote the development of the Yeelirrie uranium project and the Lakeway deposits;
2. condemns the Western Australian Government for its failure to defend and fight for the Yeelirrie and Lakeway projects in the same way that the Bannon ALP Government in South Australia promoted the Roxby Downs project;
3. urges the Western Australian Government to immediately intervene and ensure that those associated with the Yeelirrie and Lakeway projects are encouraged to proceed with the discussions and arrangements necessary to ensure the success of these projects.

I have agreed to allow this debate to proceed. There will be a maximum of six speakers for 20 minutes each. Three of those speakers will be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition.

### *Point of Order*

**Mr COWAN:** Mr Speaker, I would like you to clarify for me the position concerning an opportunity being given to members of my party to speak on this motion.

**The SPEAKER:** The position is that those arrangements can be made behind the Chair.

### *Debate Resumed*

Seven members having risen in their places,

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Leader of the Opposition) [2.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Opposition is concerned at the lack of action by the Government of Western Australia to support a project that not only would bring in a large amount of export income and royalties to the State—

**Mr Brian Burke:** Could we have a copy of the motion?

**Mr O'CONNOR:** Yes.

Mr Bryce: It is really a question of courtesy that you did not run off enough copies beforehand.

Mr O'CONNOR: I can understand the concern of the Deputy Premier, because he has done nothing until now. All he has done is to ask for a copy of the motion. I have arranged for a copy to be given to the Government immediately.

Obviously the Government is embarrassed about this matter. It has done nothing to support Western Australia; it has done nothing to support employment in this State and the income that would come about by the operation of the Yeelirrie and Lakeway uranium mining projects and the royalties that would follow. Instead, the Government has increased taxation so that the people are pushed under. They are facing increases in taxes and charges, rather than receiving the benefits of the employment and income that would come to Western Australia if these projects went ahead.

The Government stands condemned in that area. I believe that the Government will soft-pedal this matter, as it has done all the way through. One has only to look back to as recently as 1978 to see that the then Opposition in this State was honest in this regard. Now it is not being honest.

No one State within the Commonwealth should be discriminated against. However, Western Australia has been discriminated against, and the State Government has not stood up for it. It has not acted on behalf of the people of this State to obtain what they are entitled to. One has only to look at South Australia; its Premier, Mr Bannon, supported the State's right to operate Roxby Downs. While Mr Bannon was doing that, the Government of this State sat back and did little.

Some three or four months ago, I attended in Sydney a meeting to establish a businessmen's operation. Mr Hawke, the Prime Minister of Australia, and Mr Bannon, the Premier of South Australia, attended that meeting. The Prime Minister indicated his support for South Australia and the fact that Roxby Downs would go ahead. The reason Roxby Downs has gone ahead is that the Premier of South Australia and the Parliament of that State supported the project. They said, "We want Roxby Downs for employment and the people of South Australia. We want it for income for Australia, and for royalties for South Australia". At that time, the Government of Western Australia sat back and failed to support something that would be beneficial to the people of this State. It sat back and did very little.

We on this side of the House condemn the Government for its failure to uphold the rights of this State and for its failure to stand up for Western Australia and to do what Mr Bannon did in South Australia. The Government should intervene immediately in an effort to make sure that Western Australia has what it is entitled to.

Yeelirrie is one of the 10 biggest uranium deposits in the world. Roxby Downs is probably the biggest. At this stage, about \$35 million has been expended on Yeelirrie, and that is a substantial amount of money. However, despite what the Minister for Transport said before the election—that he would push to have uranium transported through Esperance—the Government has given no support for a uranium operation in this State.

It is difficult for one to accept that it is all right for South Australia and the Northern Territory to export uranium, but it is not all right for Western Australia to export it, because the Government in this State has not supported the projects in this State. The Australian Labor Party has a history of repudiating anything to do with the nuclear cycle. In 1977, the ALP rejected a motion by the Court Government to ensure uranium mining. The *Hansard* of that time, at page 1246, shows how the then Opposition tried to emasculate the operations of uranium mining in this State. The then Leader of the Opposition, the member for Welshpool, was honest in his comments when he said—

In addressing myself to this motion I indicate very clearly that above all other things the Australian Labor Party probably has done more research and given more leads into the problems associated with the mining and sale of uranium than any other political party in the history of this country.

He continued—

I say without fear that within the next 20 years uranium will be of no further use in power generation.

That was in 1977. The then Leader of the Opposition continued—

Scientists have been experimenting for a long time with alternative means of generating power.

Later he said—

There are many matters to be settled before we can hope to do anything about mining and exporting uranium in this country.

The Leader of the Opposition then went on to move an amendment to incorporate the following words—

notes the decision of Federal and State Liberal Governments not to defer the mining of and export of uranium and deplores their failure to—

1. Ensure that customer countries will apply effective and verifiable safeguards against the diversion of Australian uranium from peaceful nuclear purposes to military nuclear purposes;
2. apply international safeguards which will ensure that the export of Australian uranium will not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the increased risk of nuclear war;
3. ensure that adequate procedures will be applied for the storage and disposal of radioactive wastes to eliminate any danger posed by such wastes to human life and the environment.

We are quite happy that certain safeguards should apply, but it is foolish to give preference to South Australia and to the Northern Territory. The Government in this State is not standing up for the State's just deserts. It is not using strong arguments to ensure that we receive the same benefits as other States, so it does not deserve to govern Western Australia.

Mr Laurance: Hear, hear!

Mr O'CONNOR: What South Australia, the Northern Territory, and Queensland are able to do, we should be able to do. In fact, section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution indicates clearly that we should be able to do just that.

In a similar fashion, will we lose a sugar industry on the Ord River because of the lack of activity by this Government? The Federal Government has abandoned us not only in regard to uranium, but also in regard to an active sugar industry on the Ord. These are two industries that could help Western Australia to survive at a time when the economy is tight and we need industry and employment in this State.

Mr Blaikie: They have succumbed to the greenies; they have even sold out the timber industry as well.

Mr Davies: What about the State sawmills? Don't talk about the timber industry!

Mr O'CONNOR: We will talk about the Shannon River if the Minister for the Environment wishes.

The SPEAKER: Order! This debate is not about the State's sawmills.

Mr O'CONNOR: I agree, Mr Speaker. It is not about the State's sawmills, but if it were and if an election were to be held, the Minister for Agriculture would lose his seat on that issue alone.

The Minister for Agriculture might smile, but he would not be smiling were an election to be held in his electorate, bearing in mind the position there. I have never seen so many—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: I shall return to the point I was making.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: In 1978, the then Leader of the Labor Party in Western Australia is reported on page 5103 of *Hansard* as saying—

The current "Australian Labor Party Platform Constitution & Rules" states, under the heading "Uranium" on page 25—

Recognising that the provision of Australian uranium to the world nuclear fuel cycle creates problems relevant to Australian sovereignty, the environment, the economic welfare of our people, and the rights and well-being of the Aboriginal people; believing that having regard to the present unresolved economic, social, biological, genetic, environmental, and technical problems associated with the mining of uranium and the development of nuclear power in particular to the proven contribution of the nuclear power industry to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the increased risk of war;

I will not read it all, because I know you, Sir, would not allow me to do so. However, it continues—

Accordingly, a Labor Government will—

- (a) declare a moratorium on uranium mining and treatment in Australia;
- (b) repudiate any commitment of a non-Labor Government to the mining, processing or export of Australia's uranium;
- (c) not permit the mining, processing or export of uranium pursuant to agreement entered into contrary to Labor's policy.

He goes on to say—

So we want to make it very clear that the Australian Labor Party is opposed to uranium mining at this stage and until a satisfactory decision is reached on how it can effectively and safely be handled throughout the world—

At least the Leader of the Labor Party of Western Australia at that time was forthright enough to indicate clearly his view and that of his party. However, in recent months the opposite situation has applied. The Government in this State has sat back and waited for the Federal Government to make a decision. It has sat back and abandoned Western Australia. The Government of this State has abandoned the work force and it does not care that unemployment is increasing substantially in this State. Nor does the Government care about the taxes and charges it imposes on the people of Western Australia. Indeed, it is prepared to impose further taxes and charges, because it is not prepared to stand up for an industry which should be allowed to operate in this State, bearing in mind that the Federal Government will allow uranium mining to proceed in South Australia and the Northern Territory.

It is a disgrace for a Government which is supposed to represent this State to abandon it in the way in which this Government has. The Government has abandoned this State, yet it has supported other States and the Northern Territory. The Government has let down the unemployed people of this State and it has increased taxes and charges, because it just does not care. Some people might say that in fact the Government does care, but in the opinion of the Opposition the Government has failed to indicate that it cares for people and, indeed, in recent months it has walked away from making any decisions about uranium mining in Western Australia.

Recently members of the Government have not been prepared to answer questions asked in the Press or in Parliament. They have walked away from an issue which is important to this State.

Let us look at what the present Minister for Transport had to say when he was in Opposition. On 13 May 1982 at page 1942 of *Hansard* the present Minister for Transport is reported as saying—

The Opposition opposes this Bill, the objects of which are two fold: Firstly, to grant security of title to tenements specified under the Act, those tenements belonging to Western Mining Corporation, or its subsidiaries, for the purpose of mining uranium:

That Minister at a later date went to Esperance when an election campaign was being conducted and indicated, as reported in the Press, that he would support the export of uranium through the Port of Esperance. I ask you, Sir, is that honest? I ask you that, because I believe you are an honest man. Is it honest for a Minister of the Government, a shadow Minister in Opposition at that

time, to say in such strong terms that he would support the export of uranium through the Port of Esperance when he had indicated at an earlier date that he would not have a bar of uranium mining in this State?

At page 1944 of *Hansard* of 1982 the present Minister for Transport said—

I have indicated the Opposition strongly opposes this Bill in terms of the attitude of the ALP in respect of the mining and processing of uranium within the boundaries of Australia.

Our policy on this matter has been clearly articulated: Under a Labor Government, the mining and processing of uranium in Australia will be banned; a moratorium will be placed on the mining and processing of uranium until such time as sufficient safeguards in respect of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and of waste disposal have been implemented.

That is very different from what he told the electors of Esperance when he was trying to win their votes at the last election.

Mr MacKinnon: He will not win them next time.

Mr O'CONNOR: Clause 41 of the State ALP platform reads as follows—

A Labor Government will—allow no new uranium mine developments to commence or come on stream.

The position is very clear. Under the heading "Yeelirrie blow upsets WA Libs" in *The West Australian* of 8 November 1983, the following statement appears—

WA Liberals were quick to condemn the federal ALP caucus uranium decision yesterday for "locking out" the potential uranium mine at Yeelirrie for political expediency.

Our attitude was quite justified. The Premier is reported as saying—

... he understood that the caucus had supported the Federal Cabinet's view and he was pleased it had made a decision that should clear away the controversy surrounding an issue that had been embarrassing for the ALP and for the State and Federal Governments.

"I hope that all members of the party will pull together now to implement the policy as it has been interpreted by the national Government," he said.

Mr Burke declined to answer questions about whether talks were proposed with the Western Mining Corporation about the Yeelirrie project.

Mr Brian Burke: I just interrupt you to say that I was not asked questions about that.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have only one minute left.

Mr Brian Burke: I did not decline to answer anything. I simply said, "That is the statement and I will not answer questions".

Mr O'CONNOR: The Opposition speaks out very strongly on this matter and we believe Western Australia should be allowed the same facilities as those which pertain in the Eastern States. If South Australia is permitted to export uranium, Western Australia should be able to do so; if South Australia obtains royalties, so too should Western Australia; and if people are employed in the uranium mines in South Australia, people in this State should not be excluded from being similarly employed.

MR PETER JONES (Narrogin) [3.08 p.m.]: I support the motion. Basically it relates to the position at Yeelirrie and the difficult situation in which the Government finds itself in the development of that project. Since this Labor Government was elected the people of this State have not received the same sort of determined effort, or the same kind of treatment in the formulation of policies and the making of decisions at Federal and State levels as occurred previously.

There is no doubt the Premier and his Government hope the problems surrounding the Yeelirrie project will simply go away. More particularly, the Government was hoping that the Federal Labor Party would get the local ALP off the hook.

Mr Blaikie: They were hoping Yeelirrie would go away.

Mr PETER JONES: Members opposite were hoping they would not be pushed into the corner in a governmental sense with their own policies, especially those policies into which the fanatics in their party had pushed them. Despite the promises made prior to the election, despite public utterances made in support of Yeelirrie and the development of that project, despite assurances given to the company concerned, immediately following the election the complete opposite was put into practice.

We have had the Premier say in this House that it was not the Government's problem and that it was a problem of policy for the Federal Labor Party which would determine whether Yeelirrie went ahead. In other words, despite the

fact that an agreement Act has been passed by the Parliament, the fact that \$30 million already has been spent by the joint venture partnership on the Yeelirrie development, the fact that it will provide a considerable impetus to the economic life of the eastern goldfields, and the fact that the Government's own members supported the project prior to the election, especially the now Minister for Transport who clearly said the project could go ahead, and that despite the problems the Labor Party had about uranium, it fitted Labor Party policy because it was a project already committed, the Premier was nobbled and got at by all those people, not only since the election but also perhaps before it. So he knew what the policy would be, yet he carefully and untruthfully misled the company and the public of this State until after the election, when suddenly everything stopped.

It was very pleasing to see today that Western Mining Corporation Ltd. has made it clear it will go ahead with Yeelirrie, and this relates to the other part of the motion.

The Government is now right there in the hot seat; it now has to put up and make it clear it will support the managers of this great project. The Leader of the Opposition has said not only will Yeelirrie bring all those things to the eastern goldfields, things which have been supported by members of the Government representing that region, but also it is one of the 10 biggest uranium projects in the world. It is a project to which considerable funds have already been committed, and now the Government is in the position of having to come out and support the people who are going ahead with the project and who have publicly announced they will proceed with it.

This motion calls upon the Government not to make any equivocal statement, not to waffle and say it will hide behind Federal policy or anything else; the motion calls on the Government to come out and say it will support the project; it will get behind it and get the project underway where it is possible for the Government to do anything about it.

This situation stands to the eternal shame of the Deputy Premier, who has advised the managers of the project and has admitted in Parliament in answer to question 66 that the project had to stop and that the managers could not continue with any discussions until the Federal Labor Party had decided what its policy was to be. It stands to his eternal shame that the Deputy Premier was prepared to admit that a meeting of Federal Labor members of Parliament would determine what would happen to development in this State. He was admitting that the elected Govern-



ment of this State, which he always tells us has a mandate, was in this position. He stood up last Friday at a seminar conducted by the Perth Chamber of Commerce and trumpeted how the Government was supporting development and how it stood behind projects that would bring so much employment to this State.

Mr Bryce: Look at the speech.

Mr PETER JONES: I have it here. The Deputy Premier was prepared to admit to the Parliament that he ordered those parties involved with the project to stop, despite all the funds already expended and despite all the advantages the project would bring to the State.

Now we have the situation where, despite what has been said about the way in which the Federal ALP machine works and the way its policy is determined, we find on 20 September the Premier indicated that national ALP policy was the policy of the national Government. As from yesterday we know how ridiculous that is. I have no doubt there will be those people within the Labor movement who will again seek to agitate very strongly to reverse this decision. Already they have given notice of their intention to call conferences to overturn the decision.

Mr Bryce: I will accept your apology when you read the answer to question 66 again.

Mr PETER JONES: The Deputy Premier said he had asked the joint venturers to cease their discussions.

Mr Bryce: Don't you realise that is the sole prerogative of the national Government?

Mr PETER JONES: The Deputy Premier will not get an apology from me.

Mr MacKinnon: A gutless Government.

Mr PETER JONES: The Deputy Premier advised me on that day that the future of the project was dependent on the Commonwealth's review of its uranium policy and that matters were pending the outcome of that review. He indicated also that approval had been withdrawn for continued negotiations for the sale of uranium from Yeelirrie. Subsequently this House was advised by the Premier that there was no point in giving support to Yeelirrie because the joint venturers had not obtained any contracts, but this happened when the Government's own Ministers had prevented any further discussions occurring about finalising contracts.

Let us return to the point in question, which is that the Premier and his Government are in a real hole because they have now three factors to take into account.

Firstly, they have been in a position of having to support and hide behind the supposed Federal policy of the Labor Party on uranium. The Federal Government, led by the Prime Minister, has now clearly overturned that policy and has allowed Roxby Downs to proceed. I have no doubt the Deputy Premier will say that this is allowed for because it comes under the escape clause of uranium being mined in conjunction with other minerals. That is just a load of rubbish. When we consider that the copper and gold from Roxby Downs will be worth some \$60 billion yet uranium will be worth some \$97 billion, we see it is not really a matter of uranium being mined in conjunction with copper and gold, but the other way about.

The second of the three things of concern to this Government must be some of the fanatical supporters in its midst, people like the Vice President of the ALP, who said on television last night that the Federal Government's decision was a matter of concern and that further discussions would take place about what would happen in this State and more particularly how the Federal policy of the ALP determined last year has been interfered with. Obviously this is a matter of concern to the Government, particularly in view of the fact that those who spoke so forcefully in the preparation of its policy at the last Federal council will not accept this decision. People like Mr Hogg from Victoria have been very vocal already and last night he made it clear that nothing would be overturned. So the ALP is still in turmoil.

This project and the people in this State who would obtain jobs as a result of it should not be penalised because of this policy gyration in the Labor Party. I am sure the member for Warren is very much aware of the way in which single-issue fanatics can interfere with the policy of a Government and more particularly not just place the seat of a member in jeopardy, but guarantee it is lost.

The Labor Party stands condemned for the way it sold the member for Warren down the drain in relation to the timber industry of the Shannon River basin. Labor Party members in the eastern goldfields are concerned about the Yeelirrie project, so why are they not putting pressure on the Government to have it indicate its clear support of the development of Yeelirrie? In addition, the third factor is that Western Mining indicated today it intends to proceed with the project because it is a good project, and undoubtedly it is.

Mr Bryce: Why didn't you get it off the ground in five years?

Mr PETER JONES: Do we need to go back over those matters? The Deputy Premier knows

exactly what happened. He has every bit of information available to him on the situation as it was. Whatever difficulties there may have been in the past—there were a number—they do not excuse the Government for not doing anything about the project since it has been in office. What we must have now is this Government getting on with helping the joint venturers, who have publicly said they want to get going with this project. That is what all this is about. If the Deputy Premier says anything less than that the Government will help the joint venturers, it will be not just to his shame, but also to the condemnation of the Government.

Of course, when either the Premier or the Deputy Premier replies, he will refer to export licences issued by the Federal Government. Last time this matter was raised, the Premier trumpeted that it was not a State matter, but a Federal one because the responsibility for the granting of export licences rested with the Federal Government. That point is clearly understood, but it cannot excuse this Government's inactivity.

The issue of export licences did not prevent Mr Bannon from standing up and coming out publicly on behalf of South Australia in support of Roxby Downs. The issue did not prevent a Labor State Premier coming out publicly in a strong way trying to ensure that the Federal policy of the Labor Party—the policy this Premier has advised this House is the policy that should be determined at the Federal level—was overturned as it has been in respect of the Roxby Downs project.

Mr Thompson: Perhaps the South Australian Premier had more regard and respect for his State than this Premier has for WA.

Mr PETER JONES: The Premier of South Australia had more guts in support of his State than this Premier had in his stand for this State. It does not matter what the policy of the Labor Party is now, the fact is that the Federal Government decision-making machinery has made some decisions regarding the mining and export of uranium, decisions which were heavily influenced by what Mr Bannon did. Those decisions might have been a little more influenced if this Labor Premier had stood up and advocated the development of Yeelirrie. Unfortunately, he did not do so; he must still hope that the matter will go away.

He has been caught out, and he and his Government must say whether they will support Yeelirrie in the face of two factors: Firstly, the joint venturers have decided to go ahead and want to get on with the project. Secondly, decisions were made yesterday within which Yeelirrie can be accommodated, provided the pressure goes on.

If the issue is allowed to drift, and no pressure is applied, it will be seen easily that Yeelirrie will not be accommodated, and the Lakeway project, which is some years down the track and admittedly has not been brought before this Parliament for consideration in the form of an agreement Act, will not be accommodated either.

We are now told how the commercial market for uranium will be supplied, whether or not Australia is involved. The market will not go away. In the last few months we have witnessed how the commercial market for uranium has increased considerably, and how it has reached a level at which not only can substantial economic decisions be made, but also jobs can be offered, projects can be got off the ground, and contracts can be signed. Buyers are available at the price offered; in other words, jobs can be provided, development can take place, and investment can be made in the eastern goldfields.

The question the Premier will raise in regard to export licences is a no-no. It does not arise unless the Premier does not want Yeelirrie to go ahead. Of course, we know it is in the province of the Federal Government to determine export licences, but I remind the Premier that that fact did not stop Mr Bannon from standing up against Canberra, and fighting for South Australia. It should not stop this Premier from fighting for Yeelirrie and for Western Australia, but it has. Western Australia should not be denied this opportunity or be penalised by virtue of the problems in the Labor Party. Whatever those internal problems might be in its approach to uranium mining, they should not be sufficient to deny the development of a project which would mean so much to the eastern goldfields and to this State as a whole.

Let us get on with it. Let the Premier and his Government clearly come out in support of the managers of Yeelirrie. Let the joint venturers get on with their sales programmes. It is necessary that they be concluded in a time-frame that will mesh in with the sales from Roxby Downs. The Yeelirrie sales can precede to some degree some of the sales from Roxby Downs. The sales from both projects could mesh in nicely, but no time is available in which to manoeuvre. I know the Premier and the Deputy Premier are well aware that unless they now get behind the Yeelirrie project, this State stands to lose it a second time.

They were rescued by the decisions made by their Federal colleagues, and they must grasp that fact and get on with getting the Yeelirrie project off the ground.

**MR COWAN** (Merredin) [3.27 p.m.] I convey my appreciation to the Government for its allowing me to make some comments on this matter at this stage, especially as my comments will support the motion.

There is no question that the matter before us is a serious constitutional one. I wonder why the Government has not commented about the privileges which apparently have been conferred upon the South Australian and Northern Territory Governments. There is no question in my mind, and certainly it appears there is no question in the minds of the managers of Western Mining, that the Yeelirrie uranium project is a viable commercial proposition. I question why it is the Government has not made an endeavour to ensure this project has been given approval to go ahead by this Government's Federal counterparts as have the projects such as Roxby Downs and those in the Northern Territory. For that reason it is quite reasonable that, unless the Government takes that action within the next day or so and announces it publicly, it can be condemned for not standing up for the State it is expected to govern.

Members of the Labor Party have their hands tied by party policy which is a subject in which I will not be involved. I have been through the personal experience of domestic political party troubles. I know how painful they can be. This is certainly something that organisation has to resolve for itself; nevertheless, the matter of uranium mining does involve some serious issues which must be resolved, not the least of which issues of course is the matter of the environment and the ecology. I suspect that in the near future we will see a trend towards the use of nuclear energy particularly for peaceful purposes. People will be prepared to accept that there is no relationship between nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and, of course, nuclear armament. One thing that will be increasingly important as more and more coal is used for the supply of the world's energy is the effect of that particular energy source on the world's environment. It has already been stated in newspapers that it is causing a great deal of concern to European countries in particular. I mention the effect of depleted oxygen supplies, and of increased gases going into the atmosphere and being absorbed by moisture-laden air and then returned to the earth in the form of certain acids. It has been claimed that it is destroying some of the forests of European countries.

Within the next 10 years we may well find the environmental issue which uranium itself does raise will be played down. People may very well argue that the storage or the disposal of nuclear

waste will be a much simpler task than cleaning up of the atmosphere or the atmospheric degeneration caused by coal-burning power plants.

**Mr Court:** Don't upset the member for Collie!

**Mr COWAN:** I guess I had better not because I would not like to have either his No. 1 or his No. 2 speech on Collie coal.

**Mr MacKinnon:** You would have developed No. 3!

**Mr COWAN:** I am certainly not a person who would suggest that I have the same ability as has the member for Collie to expound the value of Collie coal.

My point is that this Government should have been prepared to make a stand to support the Yeelirrie project as did the South Australian Premier on Roxby Downs, and as did the Labor members of the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly in support of their uranium projects. Those particular people, those Governments, and those members of Parliament, went to a lot of trouble to ensure those proposals went ahead. I have seen nothing in the Press and have heard nothing from this Government about any attempts made by it to allow Yeelirrie to go ahead. As the member for Narrogin has said, this is completely contrary to the policy proposals that were espoused prior to the State election.

I suggest, as has the member for Narrogin, that the Minister for Transport will have some difficulty rationalising his position and justifying the action this Government is now taking in contrast to the policy that was being espoused. I urge the Government to immediately ensure, when the Yeelirrie project is producing, that it is able to secure reasonable export markets, that the whole project is not thrown into jeopardy, and that the investment of something like \$35 million is not a complete waste of money.

**MR BRIAN BURKE** (Balgownie—Premier) [3.34 p.m.]: The Opposition has raised this matter on a number of occasions and we have attempted to seriously acknowledge the differences that persist in our attitude towards the mining and export of uranium compared with the attitude expressed by the Opposition in respect of the same area of economic activity. It is true that this State Government does not share the optimism that the Opposition appears to hold in respect of the export of uranium ore, for example, to France. We do not believe that any Australian producer—whether it is Roxby Downs or Yeelirrie, if that is to proceed—should export uranium ore to France because we do not believe that we should knowingly assist France in its programme of testing nuclear weapons, let alone assist that

country in its programme of testing those weapons on what amounts to our back doorstep. That is a serious difference between the point of view that has been expressed by the Government on numerous occasions and the point of view that the Opposition appears to hold.

Given that there is a serious difference, I suggest that leaving politics aside, the Opposition should accept, that we would not adopt a public face different from the point of view that we expressed in respect of uranium mining and its export, and that is exactly what we have done.

I have indicated to the Parliament previously that I have personally informed the Prime Minister on no fewer than four or five occasions and the Deputy Prime Minister on perhaps two or three occasions, that if Yeelirrie as a project conforms to the policy of the national Government, we stand for the exploration, development, and export of uranium ore from Yeelirrie. As I have said, that stand has been conveyed to the Prime Minister on a number of occasions and I understand that Western Mining Corporation is fully aware of the State Government's position.

Mr O'Connor: Have you seen the article in tonight's newspaper?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes, I have, and I understand Western Mining Corporation conceded that the State Government has made those representations to the Federal Government. I understand that Western Mining Corporation has no complaint against the State Government for its attitude in the matter, and that it acknowledges that the national Government has the responsibility to decide whether export licences are to be issued in respect of uranium ore mined at Yeelirrie, Roxby Downs, or anywhere else. That is the same and sensible position that we have tried to put publicly time and time again, and as far as the Government is concerned, that is the position with which we persist today.

The Opposition is saying that we should be at variance completely from the national Government in a political sense because, no doubt, that sort of situation would assist the Opposition's position. We have tried to point out to the Opposition that, firstly, we do not believe that that is the proper tenor in which we should carry out debate on this or on any other issue and, secondly, that that sort of spirit exhibited in the position that we put is unlikely to persuade anybody. Members of the Opposition can jump up and down as much as they like, they can insult people, they can carry out debate on a personal level, and they can tell Mr Hawke that he is a wastrel, and that he is going against my best interests, the Opposition's

best interests, and someone else's best interests, if they believe that is true, but what I have tried time and time again to put to the Opposition is that that is not a projection method or plan on which to carry out further debate in this country.

If what the Opposition seeks to do, as the member for Narrogin did, is to occupy 20 minutes of the Parliament's time, largely with gratuitous insults directed at me, I suggest that the Opposition will remain in Opposition for a long time. That era of Australian politics passed with Malcolm Fraser. If members of the Opposition want to look in a detached fashion at the period in this federation's history when Western Australia was most disadvantaged, they need not look at what Mr Hawke has done as they perceive it in respect to uranium at Yeelirrie; they should simply look at the nine years of the Fraser Government's distortion of the financial relationship between the States and the Commonwealth.

They should look at the nine years during which Malcolm Fraser quite deliberately drew to himself and to the national Government in Canberra, in a most unfair manner, the financial control that was rightly the State's. They should look at those nine years for the real example of the way in which the national Government acted to disadvantage a particular State and that particular State was Western Australia. They should look at the reaction during those nine years to the method adopted by the then Government led by Sir Charles Court to that massive disadvantage and to that blatant unfairness.

Firstly, Sir Charles Court aided and abetted Malcolm Fraser in his proposals. New federalism was something to which Sir Charles Court clung as being a co-author. It was only during the latter years of his Government when new federalism came to mean such a severe disadvantage to the State that Sir Charles Court started to volubly criticise Malcolm Fraser, and that criticism achieved nothing whatsoever. A Liberal Premier was attacking a Liberal Prime Minister and achieving absolutely no result for the country or for the State, in terms of any change to Federal policy.

The deprivations of the Fraser Government for nine years in the matter of financial relativities and fairness make anything that is happening in the minds of the Opposition, in respect of Yeelirrie, pale into insignificance.

Let us face the situation squarely and see exactly what the State Government's position is in respect of Yeelirrie. If the Federal Government's policy permits the mining, development and export of Yeelirrie uranium ore, the State Govern-

ment will certainly assist Western Mining Corporation in the development of the project. We have said that previously. We have made our position clear, but as far as the State Government is concerned, it does not attack the matter with the verve and the personal aspect with which the Opposition now attacks it when we are in Government; knowing that for five years the Liberal Government failed to get the project off the ground, and knowing that for five years it supervised the extension of the time in which the project could proceed, simply because it could not get it off the ground. We say that if the national Government's policy permits Yeelirrie to proceed, we will not stand in its way, but we certainly will not do what this Opposition appears to want us to do—that is, to embark on some internecine struggle with the Federal Government in an effort to label that Government as un-Australian because it adopts a certain policy. That may cause some pain to the Opposition, but that is the position of the Government. We do not share the Opposition's boundless joy or confidence in the prospect of supplying uranium ore to the French, the Libyans, the Iron Curtain countries, or the South American dictatorships. We do not share its joy or optimism in the good faith of those recipients of our ore in so far as the use to which it is put is concerned.

That is simply a difference in philosophy. That is simply an area in which we stand apart and we do not apologise for it. We do not say that it is somehow or other related to the sugar industry. We have not said about the production of sugar that there is the same sort of philosophical difference. I would suggest that we have been more aggressive in our statement of position in respect of the sugar industry than has the Opposition. There is no parallel and we do not stand in one place on both issues. As far as the Government is concerned, there is a difference, and it has been absolutely and scrupulously honest in the statement of its position concerning Yeelirrie.

I heard the member for Narrogin say that the Premier hoped that the Yeelirrie issue would disappear. I do not care whether it disappears and I suspect that it probably will not disappear for some time because it is an issue about which passions run very strongly.

I have simply stated our position and it is not a changing position; it is a position that has been consistent since the first statement on the subject. I do not understand that there will be any change in that position emanating from the Government benches in the predictable future. As far as we are concerned, Yeelirrie can stay as an issue, if it likes or it can go if it likes.

We cannot add anything to the debate except to repeat that which has been said. If the Federal Government is prepared to grant an export licence for the export of ore from the Yeelirrie uranium project, we will certainly support the project. That is something we have told the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister and it is something I have said previously in this Parliament. We have not changed our stand in any way whatsoever.

I understand politics as well as does any of those members on the Opposition benches, and, as far as I am concerned, I can see the political mileage to be gained by the Opposition in what is an embarrassing area for the Government. I understand that nearly as well as does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Bryce: Who is supported in the Chamber by only two other members.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: He is an acutely political person. I understand that perhaps not as well as he does, but I know exactly what the Opposition is doing. I have said previously publicly that it is an embarrassing issue for the Labor Party in its obscurity prior to the decision made by Caucus on Monday.

Is it of great consolation to the Opposition if I keep saying that? Does it somehow or other add fuel to the flames of its well-being if I say once again it is a difficult issue? Everybody knows that. I do not think it will add substantially to anything if I keep restating it. As far as we are concerned, the difficulty of the issue has been demonstrated by the publicity which has surrounded the matter in the past few weeks. We cannot deny that, and, as far as the Opposition is concerned, I guess that the pursuit on which it has embarked today is purely political.

Even *The West Australian* newspaper, the editor of which has a well-known proclivity to uranium, in terms of publicity, is reduced to saying in its report that in the third similar or identical statement "The Leader of the Opposition said this today". Because we do not rush to answer on a political basis, the Leader of the Opposition thinks, somehow or other, that we are seen to be less than enthusiastic.

If the Opposition thinks I am going to chase it up every hollow log in which it wants to lose itself, it should have learned in the last nine months that that is not going to happen. It should have learned that hollow logs do not lead to positive conclusions. The Opposition would be better served by trying in some positive sense to add something substantial to the running of the State rather than by occupying and satisfying itself with a mean political attempt to do something that the

Government recognises and has acknowledged previously is purely political.

I suppose the member for Floreat will now stand and go through all the things said by his colleagues who preceded him.

Mr Mensaros: I never do that. I never repeat things.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am very pleased that the member for Floreat is able to contribute without repetition. He would be the only person in this place capable of such a feat. I am sure that if he is capable of not repeating statements made by his colleagues, we can look forward to his contribution with some expectation.

As far as the Government is concerned, firstly, we have conveyed to the Federal Government a statement of our position that we are perfectly happy for the Federal Government to issue export licences in respect of Yeelirrie and to see that the project progresses; secondly, the statement that the Opposition previously conveyed to the Federal Government has been unaltered in the time that I am aware of, anyway; and, thirdly, there is a philosophical difference between the Opposition and the Government in this Parliament in the way in which each views the nuclear power industry. I think that is clear, but everyone—

Mr Clarko: It cannot be philosophical if you agree to Roxby Downs and reject Yeelirrie—it is pragmatic.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As far as the Opposition and the Government in this Parliament are concerned, I am sure that the member for Karrinyup has acknowledged that we have consistently said policy is a Federal Government matter. I am not speaking on behalf of the Federal Government and what it believes to be relevant to its decision in respect of Roxby Downs; I am simply saying on behalf of the State Government that there is a difference of philosophy which is evident in the Government's approach in this Parliament to this matter. I maintain that that is the case.

As far as the Government is concerned, the final degree to which the Opposition would have the Government extend its efforts is one we reject and that is that we should somehow or other embark on a campaign of anger, a campaign of politics, or a campaign of opposition to the Federal Government on this matter. We do not do that because on this issue the Government is being consistent in its approach to the national Government, but on other matters, as stated to the Opposition in this Parliament and to other groups outside the Parliament, the Government does not believe it is intelligent or politically productive to scream out in the headlines its personal abuse and

vilification of any political party whether in Government or in Opposition or of any group outside the Parliament connected with the Government's party or the Opposition's party. We do not believe it is politically productive to go down that path and we will not be going down it.

As far as the Government is concerned, it thinks that its present attitude is the proper way in which to conduct politics in this State and it will continue in this manner. The Government will not be goaded by the Opposition's challenges that somehow or other I am less a Western Australian than is any member sitting on the other side, or as the member for Narrogin says, that I do not have any guts. I do not think one goes very far by saying that sort of thing. However, the member for Narrogin can say it. I suspect the Opposition's saying that sort of thing is the reason it lost Government.

Finally, although the National Party has departed the scene, the Government was prepared to provide it with one of the Government's speaking berths in regard to this matter. The Government believes that it is time the Opposition looked at itself to ascertain how it will accommodate all Opposition parties on that side of the House. The Opposition continually criticises the Government about its lack of nicety or friendliness in the way it runs this place, but then it freezes out the National Party time and time again.

Mr Hassell: That is not accurate. If you read the letter that I sent to the Leader of the House, a copy of which was sent to the Speaker, you will see there was provision for the National Party.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It was made available to the National Party by making extra time—

Mr Hassell: It would not be unusual to have four speakers.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It would not, but the Opposition is in a position to solve this matter and we do not care how it sorts itself out.

Mr Hassell: We do not freeze the NP members out.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition made provision for the National Party to take part in this debate provided the Government made available an extra half an hour for the debate.

Mr Hassell: You choose to shorten the debate by giving one of your speaking berths to the National Party.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Government has permitted the National Party to use one of its speaking berths and the Opposition says the Government is wrong because it will not extend the debate. If the Government allocates a certain

amount of time to the Opposition, it must sort itself out and should make the opportunity available to every Opposition party to contribute.

**MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [3.55 p.m.]**: The Premier's response was very poor, painful and contradictory. The Premier said that because of the Mururoa Atoll exercises, he could not agree with the Opposition in its support of the export of uranium to France. He then said that he would not oppose mining at Yeelirrie and that he would assist Western Mining Corporation Ltd. provided the Commonwealth grants an export licence. Further on, the Premier said, "What is the good in any case to have a strike or an argument, or be rude to the Commonwealth because it would not achieve anything", and that was contradictory; the Premier may correct me if that is not so because he offered the same gesture in the case of the sugar industry and other business in the State's development. As a matter of fact, the Premier's Budget speech dealt with the prospect that he will continue to stand up to the Commonwealth in the same way as other Governments have stood up to it and that he will fight for the interests of Western Australia, but in this case he does not.

The only true statement made by the Premier was that there is a difference in philosophy between the Government and the Opposition and that is what this boils down to. Not long ago, the Premier made a statement in this House that he personally hoped there would not be development, exploitation, and export of uranium.

In spite of the Premier's saying that I would repeat what other members had said, I shall refer to the framework of this motion in order to explain to the Premier why his views and politics are absolutely wrong. Of course, I am sorry that I cannot speak after having heard the member for Esperance-Dundas and the member for Kalgoorlie because it would be interesting to learn their views on this matter.

The Government's views on this matter are wrong because Western Australia's economy is resource-development based and so far that has not been denied. A resource-based, particularly mineral resources-based, economy implies that it is not possible to put minerals on the shelf hoping for the demand at a later time. It may well be that in 20, 30, or 40 years' time there will not be any demand at all for certain minerals. In places like Russia, France, and the United States of America uranium is required for nuclear energy and we must take the opportunity now to encourage the exploitation and export of that mineral.

Earlier in this session, I asked the Minister in this place representing the Minister for Mines

questions concerning this matter and his replies were that there is no demand, so why does the member ask these questions?

It might well be that there has been a retardation of the demand, but only a temporary one. The reason for retardation in the western world has been the activities of Russia. The Soviet Union is encouraging anti-nuclear demonstrations throughout the western world by providing finance and organised sponsorship. Why does it do so, tongue in cheek?

**Mr Bryce**: Where do you get a skerrick of evidence for that statement?

**Mr MENSAROS**: It does encourage it; is the Deputy Premier saying it does not?

**Mr Bryce**: I was asking you where you get evidence to say the Soviet Union does that?

**Mr MENSAROS**: There is plenty of evidence. The Deputy Premier should ask people in the Reserve Bank whether any money brought to Australia by Russian performers went out of Australia.

Why do the Russians do it? It is not because they have kind hearts or because they are at all interested in or concerned about the health or safety of the people. The Russians want to ensure that they become rich and fat in the process and that they achieve world domination. They are succeeding to some extent in Europe, except in France where people are much more intelligent; they are succeeding in the retardation of nuclear power in the United States; they are succeeding in Austria where a nuclear power station was built, but did not commence operations; and they are succeeding to some extent in Sweden. If they are successful, they will have a ready-made market for their natural gas for which a pipeline already is being built. They will get hard currency for the exported gas which they need to strengthen their position.

That is the first aim. The second aim is that the western world, from the Russian point of view, hopefully will neglect to build up its nuclear energy resources which will enable the Russians to build up the same nuclear energy resources and power stations in their country at enormous speed. If the Deputy Premier needs any proof of this statement, I can give it in print because every paper in Russia and its satellite states is full of it. They all mention nuclear power stations that have been built. I will invite the Deputy Premier to go behind the Iron Curtain with me, and I will drive him around in countries where I understand the language. He will see large and proud signs saying, "This is the northern entrance of a nuclear

power station" and others saying, "This is the southern entrance".

They are proud to build up power for the simple reason that they have power and the western countries, particularly in Europe, do not have it. In that way, the Soviet Union can dominate the world.

Mr Bryce: That demonstrates it is not an ideological argument.

Mr MENSAROS: The Premier said it was.

Mr Bryce: No; he said it was a philosophical question.

Mr MENSAROS: He said, "This is the difference in philosophy". I agree with him.

Without repeating anything said before and leaving aside the ideological position, I come back to the position, that the Deputy Premier said by way of interjection that there was no demand, or insufficient demand, and that statement is wrong. He should read the various papers on the cost of energy production in France where the cost, including the operating expenses and the servicing of the capital—which is undoubtedly large with a nuclear power station—and taking into consideration the whole economic life of the power station, of producing one kilowatt of energy with oil is 41 centimes; with coal, it is 26 centimes; and with nuclear power, it is 19 centimes. Those are the statistics.

We can go further and see what are the opinions of intelligent people. It was interesting to read recently a public opinion poll, which was taken at the Japanese Kokushikan University and which showed that 57 per cent of the students were in favour of nuclear energy. They are not people who can be influenced by antinuclear power demonstrations; they are supposedly or factually much more intelligent. Only 19.8 per cent were against nuclear energy, and the remainder did not vote.

It is quite clear that the Government's duty is not to sit by, as the Premier said, and see what happens in Canberra and whether the Federal Government makes certain decisions and only if it does to assist the company. It is the Government's role in the interests of Western Australia and of the western world, irrespective of what happens in Canberra, to go in with the same energy as the Premier shows in purchasing various companies or shares in companies; with the same energy as the Premier counteracts the Commonwealth's policy when he claims it is taking away money from the smaller States and giving it to the more populous States; and with the same energy he shows when he says he wants to build up public sector corporations and that sort of thing. It is the

Government's duty to do everything it can to encourage this development.

Such a development would be in the interests not only of Western Australia and of the jobs that will be created, but also of the whole world which is energy hungry, and which for a long time will rely on nuclear energy, even after the fast breeder reactor is the order of the day. I know Labor Party members said it in Opposition, but, now that they have the knowledge through advice, they cannot say that nuclear energy can be replaced by solar energy, tidal energy, or anything else. They are nice exercises, but they will not produce one per cent of the energy required; nor can it be done with coal because there is not enough space in densely populated areas to convey the coal or enough room for railway lines to transport the quantity. In addition, coal creates pollution and people realise this.

The demand for nuclear energy exists. If one looks at the obvious demand not only by countries purchasing uranium today such as France and the United States, but also at the third world, one sees that these countries will need nuclear power. Why did the economy of South Korea skyrocket? It did so because that country built nuclear power stations. South Korea is still building and commissioning nuclear power stations. Why have the economies of some other countries such as Taiwan and Japan gone ahead? It is because they built power stations to cater for the energy required. Contrary to the sentiments of the Premier—and I said I did not accuse him, perhaps it is his conviction—

Mr Bryce: That proves that the countries you are talking about are resourceless.

Mr MENSAROS: They may be at the present time; but if the Government is saying that it is supporting the third world and its needs, it has to support its energy needs as well as its food needs. If someone stood up and said we should not export food to those countries, he would be called a villain. If someone said we should not export energy to those countries, he also would be called a villain. The third world needs that energy, and the Deputy Premier cannot say he has not heard that from bankers, development companies, and others in his travels during the short time he has been in office.

I want to refer to another tremendously important aspect in this Government's policy, or lack of policy, in its lack of support for the development of uranium projects in our State. The State must compete with resource development throughout the world. It was our policy to say all the time we would promote resource development—I said it



for six years, and the member for Narrogin said it for three years. We said we had a reliable system of Government. I thought the present Government would follow it through.

We need to establish that we have a reliable Government; that we have conditions which are not insecure. How can people be expected to invest if they see, on the one hand, that the sugar industry might be developed, but, on the other hand, that the uranium industry cannot be developed? The world's largest oil company, which was at one stage involved in the Yeelirrie project, had its reasons for getting out of the project. I talked to members of the company in New York even though by then I was not in charge of this portfolio. I know at least some of the reasons for the company's decision to pull out. It was not shortage of money because Esso is never short of \$10 million, \$100 million, or whatever sum is needed. The reason was that there are safer Governments in more reliable situations than are the expectations here.

**Mr Bryce:** That is absolute rubbish!

**Mr MENSAROS:** It is not rubbish at all. It is fact. It is the third, and perhaps the more important, of the indirect consequences of this policy of the Government. The Government has created an investment atmosphere, despite all the boosting and talk of investment opportunity—perhaps I should say lack of opportunity—which will be detrimental to anyone thinking of coming to WA and developing our resources. Nothing is more important than that this Government is able to prove and demonstrate that we have a stable and secure investment climate. This is one of the first requirements in order to attract development and its beneficial effects.

Finally, we not only miss the basic existing opportunities which are being given up because of the Government's attitude in not forcefully encouraging this development, despite the difficulties, but also miss further development in the same field. We miss downstream processing development.

You will recall, Mr Speaker, as spokesman for the previous Opposition in these matters, that only a few years ago we competed with the other States of Australia to not only exploit and export uranium in the form of yellowcake, but also to establish further processing and enrichment plants. We have negotiated with companies representing British, German, French, and combined European interests. A committee was appointed by the previous Federal Government consisting of business people whose job it was to look at the enrichment industry which would have come into Australia,

and to recommend to the Government which State should have the enrichment plant. Such a plant would be a tremendous boost for the economy, particularly in a sparsely populated State. They looked for security in the investment climate, at the comparative feelings of the Governments, at what they will give to the population of the State, and at how they will react.

Where is that Committee now? It has just disappeared. The people from those countries came to talk to the Government, or to anyone who was interested, but nothing has resulted from those approaches. Not only have we missed the opportunity to exploit the already discovered resources and to develop and export them in the primary form, but also we will miss the opportunity to further develop them and to have additional downstream processing industries. We possibly had the best chance of all the States to get this enrichment plant in Western Australia.

I think the motion is more than justified and the response of the Premier was very poor. It proved that this Government is not representing the interests of this State.

**MR BRYCE** (Ascot—Deputy Premier) [4.15 p.m.]: I do not think that anyone takes seriously the proposition advanced to the Chamber by the member for Floreat that there is a sinister Russian plot behind the actions of those people who express democratically-held views and concerns in respect of the problems which uranium development and export to the world may cause. I do not believe the proposition is serious. I am not surprised that the member for Floreat should postulate that theory, because he has postulated that theory in respect of a whole range of issues over a long period. However, it just does not wash in Australia in 1983. We live in a democracy and it is patently absurd to suggest—as the member for Floreat seemed to suggest—that people who are liberal in their outlook, people who are fundamentally conservative on a whole range of other issues, people who support democratic parties, people who support the Labor Party, and who wish to express their views are necessarily receiving financial support from the Russians. Such people would be horrified that the mere expression of their views would lead to such a suggestion. I do not believe anyone would take it seriously, and I am surprised the member has advanced the view in this debate.

**Mr Clarko:** Have you heard of the Ivanov affair?

**Mr BRYCE:** Yes, as a matter of fact I have.

The member for Floreat suggested that the withdrawal of Esso from this joint venture—

Mr Clarko: That happened in 1983.

Mr BRYCE: —was as a result of some kind of concern about the reliability of the WA Government. The reality of the situation was that Esso withdrew because it could not see any prospect whatsoever in this venture. The truth is that the world market for uranium and the price of uranium around the world at this moment is now, and has been for the last five or six years, about as soft and messy as the logic members of the Opposition have advanced.

Mr Peter Jones: You have to be joking. The price is about \$34 or \$38 a pound.

Mr BRYCE: Let me explain to the member for Narrogin that he owes me an apology for something he said earlier in this debate. The member accused me of withdrawing permission for the joint venturers to negotiate for sales contracts overseas. He referred to question 66 in *Hansard*. The member was my predecessor as Minister for Resources Development for a period of at least three years. I am absolutely amazed that he does not realise that express permission for these companies to seek out markets overseas is granted or is not granted by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government alone. In fact, it was the Minister for Trade in the national Government (Lionel Bowen), who a couple of months ago withdrew approval for the joint venturers to continue.

Mr Peter Jones: Not a couple of months ago.

Mr BRYCE: Well then, a few months ago. It was not this Minister in this Government, contrary to the suggestion in the member's contribution to the debate when he asserted most unequivocally that it was. The member for Narrogin owes me an apology.

Mr Peter Jones: Your answer did not identify the Federal Minister.

Mr BRYCE: What I am saying is that the member for Narrogin was the Minister for Resources Development for no fewer than three years—in fact, for close on four years—yet the member, knowing full well that approval for these joint ventures to seek out markets overseas is either granted or is not granted by a national Government, stood there today and asserted I had withdrawn permission. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the State Government.

Mr Peter Jones: I think you are wrong. You are talking about—

Mr BRYCE: I am talking about question 66. Do not seek to broaden it.

Mr Peter Jones: Does it refer only to uranium? Does your answer refer to Lionel Bowen?

Mr BRYCE: I suggest the member read the answer. It refers to the Commonwealth and to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr Peter Jones: It refers to approval being withdrawn for them to continue discussions, and you are the Minister in charge of this project in this State.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Narrogin is expected to know that the Minister in the State Government does not grant approval; yet he accused me of being responsible personally for withdrawing the permission to seek markets, and of course that is not true. I can see that no apology will be forthcoming—

Mr Peter Jones: None, because you are the Minister for the project.

Mr BRYCE: I thought I would register the point. Any man of honour would make an apology readily and say, "Yes, I was wrong".

Mr Court: Would you support seeking a sales contract?

Mr BRYCE: It is quite embarrassing for members opposite who had five full years in Government with regard to this project, in which they could have assisted the joint venturers to obtain markets and to find the partners necessary for the project to go ahead, to find that this Government has been in office for eight months and has done more for the State. Members opposite have the temerity to come to this Chamber and adopt an extraordinary double standard.

The reality is that whatever the Labor Party decides in respect of its national policy—whether this sort of project will go or will not go—during the last five years that the members sitting opposite enjoyed on the Treasury benches, if the Yeelirrie mine had been granted a single contract to sell yellowcake, the situation today would not exist because the mine would have existing contracts.

The situation is that members opposite had five long years—not five months—to do their thing; yet the dictates of their own approach to the State's development fell a long way short of doing so.

The Premier has indicated that we have a different position, and he has spelt it out perfectly. I can understand that for 15 or 20 years members of the Liberal Party were mesmerised by buckets of ore; but what they have forgotten and overlooked is that during that period they placed, in a second-class position, the importance of developing human resources and the technological base of our society.

Mr Court: I thought we would get on to "high tech" at some stage.

Mr BRYCE: I expected all of those smirks opposite. I know that I am as right now as certain members who sit opposite me were correct in the early 1960s. As the member for Nedlands and the member for Cottesloe know, we are about five years behind where we should be, all because of the simple cargo cult mentality pursued by members opposite when they were in Government. They simply pushed everything but buckets of ore to one side.

We are delighted to say that our economy is now developing in a balanced fashion, and that people in all corners of the land are beginning to recognise this.

The last diversion touched on by the Leader of the Opposition as he rambled through his discourse was his reference to sugar. It really is surprising and almost extraordinary that he would assert we are not supporting the sugar industry because of the interests of the sugar industry in other parts of Australia. Let us be perfectly clear about it: Members opposite know that a feasibility assessment of the industry will be brought down towards the end of this year. We have stated unequivocally that if there is a basis for a viable industry up there, it will have our 100 per cent support.

Mr Court: What about the Federal Government?

Mr BRYCE: What about the Federal Government?

Mr MacKinnon: That report will show we cannot do anything until the Federal Government determines the export quotas.

A member: What about the Queenslanders?

Mr BRYCE: The Queenslanders do not have the innovative ability, the skills, and the foresight that we have.

I said at the outset that the basis of this argument embarrasses members opposite when they reflect upon their five years in office during which this project at Yeelirrie did not get off the ground. The reality is that the world, in contradistinction to what the member for Floreat said, is hungry for energy, but it is not hungry for all sorts of energy irrespective of the problems associated with them. All that the member for Floreat really said in terms of substance was that the Communists were under the bed. I would have thought this Parliament was mature to the point—

Mr Court: What about selling Roxby ore to France?

Mr BRYCE: The essence of this debate—it has been quite a depressing experience—is that members opposite have attempted to gee up some fun and games when, in reality, the logic of their argument has been as soft and as messy as the world market for uranium is at this moment and has been for the last five years.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

## BILLS (6): ASSENT

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

1. Daylight Saving Bill.
2. Workers' Compensation and Assistance Amendment Bill.
3. Diamond (Ashton Joint Venture) Agreement Amendment Bill.
4. Northern Mining Corporation (Acquisition) Bill.
5. Stamp Amendment Bill.
6. Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax Amendment Bill.

## DAIRY INDUSTRY AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [4.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to achieve amendments to the Dairy Industry Act which are necessary to implement recommendations of the Honorary Royal Commission into Dairy Products and Market Milk or which are seen to be desirable as a consequence of 10 years' experience with the principal Act.

A joint Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council was appointed in October 1981 to inquire into—

- (a) future needs of dairy products and market milk over the next decade and the potential areas of supply;
- (b) the basis for and the extent of the differential between the price paid for milk/cream used for manufacture in Western Australia and Victoria including the effects of economics of scale, factory efficiency, pricing structure of WA products at retail level;
- (c) new technology related to dairy production and application or otherwise to WA;

- (d) future allocation and trading of quotas for the production of market milk;
- (e) the desirability or otherwise of vesting of all milk in the Dairy Industry Authority;
- (f) the potential impact of closer economic relations between Australia and New Zealand and the WA dairy market;
- (g) the scope and need for further rationalising the manufacturing processing sector and the geographic distribution of the producing sector; and

to make such recommendations in regard to the matters inquired into that would in its opinion ensure an adequate and reliable supply of milk to meet future requirements of the Western Australian community and to achieve a satisfactory return to all sectors of the dairy industry.

The Select Committee became an Honorary Royal Commission in February 1982 and as such presented its report and recommendations in November 1982.

The commission achieved a good exposure of the WA dairy industry's problems and made many recommendations. However, in subsequent discussion of those recommendations with the sectors of the dairy industry, it became apparent to me that some of the recommendations were impractical and others, if implemented, would not be in the best overall interests of the community.

The main thrust of the commission's recommendations was towards a freeing up of the industry under a situation of increased competition. However, until such a competitive situation could be achieved, difficulties and dangers were seen in relation to the complete adoption of many of the recommendations.

The amendments to the Dairy Industry Act sought by this Bill have resulted in the main from extensive discussion of the commission's report and recommendations with the various sectors of the dairy industry and the members of the Dairy Industry Authority. They are aimed at promoting efficiency and cost containment in the industry, an increased degree of streamlining, and a higher level of independent expertise in relation to the authority's operations.

A number of the amendments to the Dairy Industry Act which are included in the Bill relate to clarification and streamlining of the administration of the Act rather than having a significant effect on the content of the Act. For example, in a number of instances, references to matters as being "as prescribed" have been deleted. This has been found desirable in order to

avoid unnecessary drafting of regulations in relation to matters which can and should be determined administratively by the authority as part of its ongoing function. Requiring such details to be prescribed in regulations causes the added problem of inflexibility in relation to the administration of the Act and a too-frequent need to amend the regulations to take account of changing circumstances.

There are also a number of amendments included in the Bill which merely update the Act and delete matters relative to the initial formation of the authority which have now ceased to have any significance. Such amendments are regarded as machinery matters as they do not alter the powers or intent of the Act.

The provisions of the amendment Act are to come into effect on such day or days as are fixed by proclamation. It will be necessary to proclaim different dates for some different sections of the amendment Act, the earliest of these being 1 January 1984 in relation to those sections of the Act which have a bearing on the allocation and transfer of milk quotas because existing legislation covering this aspect ceases to have effect after 31 December 1983.

Other sections of the amendment Act may be proclaimed to come into effect in accordance with a programme which is seen to be convenient and feasible as soon as the Act has been assented to. This is expected to be during the first half of 1984.

Some new definitions are proposed in the Bill and some existing definitions are to be modified to meet the changed circumstances. As provision is made in the Bill to allow the authority to assume direct responsibility for the supervision of milk vending, provision has also to be made for the appointment of inspectors for this purpose by the authority. Such an inspector is referred to as an "authority inspector", whereas an inspector appointed by the department to attend to the department's obligations under the Act is referred to as a "department inspector".

It has been found necessary to redefine "dairyman" as the previous definition "the occupier of dairy premises or a dairy farm" was too wide and too vague to be of much use in the administration of the Act.

The principal Act does not provide separately for milk distributors—those persons who supply milk to shops—and milk vendors—those persons who supply milk to households. The authority found it necessary to introduce separate licences for these two classes of persons and at the time it had to achieve this by introducing new regulations

providing for a new class of milk vendor as a "milk distributor". The opportunity has been taken in the course of drafting the amendment Act to provide for milk distributors and milk vendors separately within the Act itself, as this is a more satisfactory way of providing for same than by attempting to devise suitable regulations when restricted by lack of appropriate definitions in the Act.

Section 9 of the Act covers its administration and requires to be amended to provide the authority with the power to administer those sections of the Act which relate to the vending and distribution of milk and which are currently administered by the department. The nature of the amendment proposed in clause 4 of the Bill allows the Minister to determine which body will in practice administer the supervision of the vending and distribution of milk.

The Honorary Royal Commission recommended that the DIA be replaced by a three-man authority, consisting of a full-time chairman and two part-time members. It further recommended that, in addition, an industry advisory group be appointed to represent the total industry.

The fact that the composition of the Dairy Industry Authority did not constitute one of the terms of reference for the commission may have prevented a full canvassing of opinions and receipt of submissions relative to this matter. As a consequence, it is possible that only limited views were presented to the commission in relation to this important aspect.

While it seems generally agreed that the authority's membership is larger than it need be, there is very strong industry support for a representative authority rather than for a completely independent membership. Overall it is a question of whether an independent group or an industry-representative group should assist the Government in the determination and application of policies for the WA dairy industry.

Independent groups consistently come under criticism for their lack of contact and involvement with the industry sectors whose livelihood and future they determine. The industry sectors tend to suffer the frustration of not being able to have a direct voice in the formulation of policy and its application. Although to some extent an industry advisory group assists in overcoming this aspect, it can also add to the frustrations if the independent authority does not follow the recommendations of the advisory group which is then seen as being ineffective.

A representative authority does tend to suffer from the delays caused by the need to allow the

various sectors represented to express and pursue the viewpoints as affecting their particular sector. However, the final result is more likely to lead to something which is acceptable to industry and is feasible in relation to industry operations than is a result which is achieved by an independent group removed from direct involvement in and experience with the actual activities of the industry itself.

Although much emphasis may be placed on the desirability of "streamlining" an authority's operations and of expediting its decision making, no less emphasis should be placed on ensuring that the decisions made are the correct ones as far as the industry's successful operations and the community's interests are concerned. Nevertheless, the advisability of reducing the influence of sectional interests on the authority and adding independent expertise in certain areas is recognised.

Clause 5 of the Bill provides for a reduction in the membership of the authority from nine to seven by reducing the number of producer representatives from four to two and the number of manufacturer representatives from two to one and adding one member with special qualifications. In relation to the last-mentioned the proposed amendments allow the Minister to make known the nature of the special qualifications which he has, for the time being, determined and to invite submission of a panel of names from those bodies which are entitled to submit a panel of names for the selection of members of the authority. However, the Minister is free to independently select a nominee for the position of member with special qualifications.

Mr Blaikie: I hope you won't be looking to put a member of the Transport Workers' Union on that authority.

Mr EVANS: I am not looking to putting anybody on the authority at this stage. It certainly has not been looked at or discussed.

In other respects the method of proposing and nominating members of the authority remains the same except that procedures have been simplified as much as possible. The members of the reconstituted authority would take office from a date to be proclaimed, on which date existing members of the authority would vacate their office but could be reappointed.

The lengths of the terms of the members of the authority are—

	Years
Chairman, who also represents consumers .....	five
Producer representatives and departmental representative .....	three

Manufacturers' representative and member with special qualifications..... two

Provision is made for the initial variation of the term of a member to achieve a rotation of appointments, thereby avoiding a large number of vacancies occurring at the same time.

There is no provision in the principal Act for the convening of authority meetings other than the first meeting of the authority. This matter has been attended to in clause 7 of the Bill by providing for the convening of meetings of the authority by the chairman or on the requisition of four members entitled to vote, or by the Minister's direction, or by the representative of the department, should the other avenues for convening a meeting not be observed.

It is also necessary to reduce the requirements for a quorum at a meeting from five to four, in view of the reduction of the numbers of voting members from eight to six.

Clause 8 of the Bill provides the authority with the power to assume direct responsibility for the supervision of milk vending operations from the time when the milk is received by the milk vendor or milk distributor. Supervision of processing operations and quality control up to that point remains with the department and the Minister may determine whether the authority or the department actually exercises the power to supervise milk vending.

The authority has always been responsible for policy in relation to milk vending requirements but officers of the Department of Agriculture have attended to the application in the field of these policy requirements.

When the establishment of the authority was first being considered, the decision was made to have the supervision of vending carried out by technically qualified departmental officers who would have the full backing of departmental laboratories and other more highly trained personnel in their work. The lack of such backup in what is essentially a clerical-administrative group at the authority was seen as a strong argument against locating the application of vending supervision with that group.

The supervision of vending is partly an administrative function checking of holding of appropriate licences, adherence to district boundaries, and times of delivery—and partly a technical function—condition of vehicles, condition and temperature of milk depots and trailers, and milk and dairy produce quality control. Initially advantages were seen to exist in placing the persons responsible for this activity where they would have

technical assistance as well as locating the responsibility with persons who were themselves technically qualified. However, this arrangement has at times caused some administrative difficulties or delays for the authority in dealing with vending matters.

The Honorary Royal Commission recommended that the supervision of the vending sector of the industry be the responsibility of the authority itself, with that body taking appropriate action when vendors do not fulfil their vending obligations.

Although the commission recommended that processors be totally removed from distribution—wholesale—and retail vending of milk this has not been found to be a practicable proposition. Processors will not be required to relinquish currently held household or milk distributor licences except where such have been issued unnecessarily in relation to country districts which may be covered by the issue of a milk wholesaler licence. However, the DIA will be instructed to give preference to private applicants in issuing any further licences and in transferring licences under normal trading conditions provided such applicants can sustain a satisfactory service.

The dividing of the metropolitan area in relation to milk distribution between the two companies presently operating will not be provided for in legislation. However, the authority may decide whether it wishes to underpin administratively any voluntary arrangement agreed to by the two companies with a view to rationalising milk distribution, increasing efficiency and containing costs.

Regulations relating to the "use-by" dating of milk and dairy produce will be strengthened with a view to ensuring legibility of date marks, in accordance with the intent of a recommendation by the Honorary Royal Commission.

The main purpose of the amendment proposed in clause 9 is to more distinctly relate the holding of a market milk quota to the use of specific dairy produce premises. This and subsequent amendments would enable the authority to effectively attach a market milk quota to a specific set of dairy produce premises, thereby assisting in the administration of the allocation of market milk quotas and the transfer of same. The amendment would enable the authority to insist on being provided with information regarding the identity of dairy produce premises or proposed premises before it determines the fate of applications for the grant or transfer of milk quota in relation to those premises.

Clause 10 of the Bill seeks to provide a clear power to the authority, in determining applications for the grant of a milk quota, to consider a number of relevant factors, such as the likelihood of continuity of production, the location of the dairy with reference to milk tanker collection services, the compliance of the dairy with physical requirements, and the nature of the interest held in the premises by the applicant—for example, lease or ownership—together with the general objectives of the Act and the directions furnished by the Minister.

The proposed amendment further provides for the authority to receive an application for milk quota from persons who are not already dairymen, but prevents the grant of that quota from being effective until the person becomes a dairyman and satisfies the necessary requirements for the milk quota supply. These powers and controls are necessary for the authority to effectively fulfil its function of ensuring the continuous availability of an adequate supply of milk.

The amendments proposed in clause 11 would clarify the power of the authority to issue a quota certificate in relation to either the grant of a quota or the transfer of a quota, and to stipulate within that quota certificate the identity of the dairy from which the quota milk is to be supplied. Provision is also made for the amendment of the quota certificate upon the transfer of all or part of the quota which it covers and for the issue of a new quota certificate covering quota which is transferred.

The amendments provide the authority with a clear power to allow a quota to be produced from a dairy other than that specified in the quota certificate, thereby enabling the authority to provide for such circumstances as the need to temporarily vacate a dairy while it is being renovated or rebuilt or to permit the amalgamation or combination of quotas where this is considered desirable.

Of particular significance is the proposed amendment which would permit the authority to grant a quota in respect of any specified dairy at which another quota is already being produced. However, not more than two quotas could be granted in respect of the one dairy. Furthermore, if the authority allowed more than one quota to be produced from the one dairy, it would be able to impose such terms, conditions or limitations as it sees fit and such terms, conditions or limitations would be set out in the quota certificate.

As a consequence, two dairymen could produce their quotas from the one dairy and a quota could be granted to a person who proposed to produce it

at the dairy of an existing quota holder, subject to whatever conditions the authority may determine.

The matter of amalgamation of quota milk farms and the combination of quotas has been a contentious issue among dairy farmers for many years. The Bill seeks to ensure, through the proposed amendments to the Act with regard to the production of quota at other than the dairy to which the quota originally related and the ability to allow two quotas to be produced from the one dairy subject to whatever conditions the authority may determine, that amalgamations of two farms and combinations of two quotas can take place if the authority judges this to be in the overall interests of the industry and the efficiency of its operations.

A specific condition of any approval by the authority of an amalgamation or combination of quotas will be that the land judged by the authority to be associated with the dairy must remain in possession of the quota holder. The Bill proposes amendments to section 30 of the Act dealing with transfers of milk quotas and these amendments include a requirement that the authority approve of the transfer of a quota where the quota is purchased together with the dairy premises to which the quota relates and such land as is judged by the authority as being associated with those premises, provided any directions issued by the Minister are observed and the objectives of the Act are not prejudiced. An amalgamation could then take place subject to the authority's conditions, including the maximum limit placed on individual quota holdings, and the two quotas could be supplied from the one dairy. There is no intention at this stage to remove the current limit on a quota holding.

It is intended through the proposed amendments to the Act to allow for greater efficiency in the use of dairy premises and some reduction in capital requirements but to prevent excessive amalgamation of quotas as such could be detrimental to the overall interests of the industry and consumers of milk as it could result in the location of too much influence with too few dairymen. Unrestricted negotiability and amalgamations of quotas could also react adversely against the smaller quota holders who are less likely to have the financial backing to compete for quota and/or property compared with the holders of large quotas.

Clause 13 of the Bill proposes a new section 30A to provide more clearly for matters which the authority must consider before approving the transfer of milk quotas. The authority will be enabled to ensure that a so-called walk-in-walk-out sale is genuine and not merely a paper exercise to

achieve the negotiation of the quota only. The amendment also makes it clear that the authority can approve of the transfer of a part of a quota between members of the same family and that it can approve of the withdrawal from a partnership which holds a quota. In all these matters, the authority is subject to any directions given by the Minister.

The proposed amendments would also provide the authority with power to differentiate between quota-holding dairymen when reselling surrendered quotas. For example, small quota holders may be allowed to buy more surrendered quotas than the larger quota holders would be permitted to buy.

It is intended that the existing pool of surrendered quotas will be allocated, as near as practicable, equally between existing quota holders and successful applicants for new quotas. Existing quota holders will be offered quotas for sale at \$63 per litre under a distribution schedule providing for those with fewer than 300 litres of daily quota to be able to purchase three litres for every six litres available while holders of 300 litre to 600 litre quotas are to be allowed to purchase two litres and holders in excess of 600 litres may purchase one litre of every six litres available.

Successful applicants for new quotas will be allocated 245 litres daily, free to the applicant, but purchased by the dairy assistance plan fund from approximately half of the existing pool or surrendered quotas made available for that purpose.

In future, dairymen surrendering their quota to the authority will be compensated at the rate of \$100 per litre and, from time to time, the surrendered quotas will be entirely offered for sale at that price to existing quota holders. Until otherwise varied as a consequence of review by the authority, the offer of surrendered quotas will continue to be in the proportion of 3:2:1 relative to holders of fewer than 300 litres, of 300 litres to 600 litres, and of over 600 litres of daily quota.

The authority has a responsibility to ensure that market milk quota holders are paid for not less than 100 per cent of their quotas on an annual basis, unless exceptional circumstances arise. This is to be achieved by ensuring that the total milk quota issued closely reflects the market demand for milk. Within each year, the quota holders will be paid for the actual market milk off-take on a monthly basis.

Commencing with the 1985 quota year, the estimated market milk sales in excess of quota on issue—market growth—will be allocated free and, as near as practicable, on the basis of 50 per cent to existing quota holders, in equal amounts per

quota holder, and 50 per cent to successful applicants for new quotas in 245 litre quota lots.

No changes are envisaged in relation to the present special milk products milk quota arrangements.

Clause 17 proposes an amendment to permit the authority to enter into promotional arrangements whereby it may register a trademark, symbol or slogan and subsequently gain a commercial benefit by way of payments from the users of such trademarks or slogans. This power is relevant in relation to the authority's membership of the Australian milk authorities conference and the endeavours by that body to unify the promotion of milk and to extract commercial benefit from the development and use of trademarks and slogans, such as "Milk it Instead" and "Live on Milk".

However, it is intended that the major source of funding of the authority will continue to be the operating margin derived from sales of quota milk. In this regard, the authority will need to adjust that margin to take account of necessary expenditure that would no longer be covered by the dairy assistance plan contribution which will cease as from the next price adjustment.

The amount of authority funds spent on the promotion of milk and dairy produce has been subject to annual approval by the Minister after consultation with representatives of the Primary Industry Association. This has prevented the authority from making longer-term plans and entering into promotional arrangements extending beyond the one year as it was not able to know from one year to the next what amount of money would be available for promotion. The amendment proposed in clause 18 of the Bill provides for an initial consultation and approval of a certain expenditure on promotion in each successive financial year and this amount would remain the same until varied by the Minister. Such a procedure would be simpler and more efficient than the annual consultation and approval required by the existing Act.

The failure of some milk vendors to provide household customers with deliveries five times a week has been of concern to the vendor organisation and milk producers as well as to the authority. The amendments proposed in clause 20 would enable the authority to vary the money margin received by milk vendors having regard to the frequency with which they deliver milk to households. The vendor would be required to notify the authority of the days on which he delivers milk and the addresses to which it is delivered so that the authority could determine whether he is effectively providing a service on the required five



days of the week. If the authority was not satisfied that he was providing this frequency of service, it could reduce the money margin paid to him. This approach is seen as being potentially more effective than threats to suspend the vendor's licence for failure to comply with the required frequency of delivery.

Section 46 of the Act already provides for the variation of prices paid to dairymen for milk in accordance with the time of the year in which the milk is supplied. The Honorary Royal Commission recommended that a seasonally variable price should be paid to producers of market milk and the authority is able to move to seasonally variable pricing should it decide that such a move is in the interests of the industry and consumers.

Clause 21 provides for an amendment which would allow greater flexibility for the authority to use the services of persons or organisations other than the marketing and economics branch of the Department of Agriculture in having the triennial survey of the costs and incomes structure of the dairy industry carried out. This is considered desirable as there may be advantages in using other organisations which could have more resources available for the task than could be provided by the department.

The amendments proposed in clause 23 provide for the changed definition of "dairyman" and for the introduction of the new licences previously dealt with only within the regulations relative to milk wholesalers and milk distributors. The milk wholesaler licence allows the authority to control the distribution of milk to country areas and to prevent the collection of milk direct from treatment plants by supermarket operators and shopkeepers, thereby preserving control of the total milk vending operations.

New subsections (5) and (6) proposed in relation to section 52 of the Act clarify the status of lessees of milk vendors and milk distributors and ensure that the authority is able to apply the same regulatory requirements to these as it applies to the licence holder. The amendments permit the continuation of the longstanding practice of leasing out many milk rounds, but such operations are brought under control by requiring the licence holder to keep the authority informed of the identity of persons carrying on the business on the licence holder's behalf as well as ensuring that the supervisory requirements in relation to milk vending can be applied equally to either the lessee or the licence holder. The operations of lessee milk vendors have proved difficult to supervise in the past because the powers of the authority were in the main limited to dealing with only the licence holder.

In providing for the authority to take direct control of the supervision of milk vending should such action be decided upon, it is necessary to also provide for the appointment of inspectors by the authority. Such authority inspectors would have powers limited to matters relating to the supervision of the vending and distribution of milk and dairy produce whereas department inspectors would continue to have powers to fulfil their broader and more technical role in relation to the control of the quality of and the supervision of the production and supply of milk and dairy produce. Clauses 32, 33, 34 and 35 propose amendments seeking to provide for these changes, as well as modernising the Act in relation to the power of inspectors to be accompanied by an interpreter or adviser and the requirements that inspectors respond to reasonable requests in relation to their activities which might otherwise prevent conduct of some operations by persons with whom they are dealing.

Clause 37 of the Bill is essentially aimed at clarifying the power to make regulations requiring certificates of competency to be held by dairy factory operatives who are employed as makers of whatever dairy products are prescribed from time to time as requiring certificated operatives. However, it is intended that the general power to make regulations requiring the holding of certificates of competency by such other classes of persons as may be prescribed may be used to require intending milk vendors and milk distributors to attend an induction course and achieve a certain qualification before being issued with a licence. This is a possible alternative approach to placing a condition on the licence requiring attendance at such a qualifying course as recommended by the Honorary Royal Commission.

It will be noted that the Bill proposes to increase the penalties provided for in the Act and permitted as a maximum in relation to regulations, to a level more in line with the real money value relative to when they were first set in 1973. In the main this has involved a multiplication factor of approximately three. Experience has also indicated that the potential monetary gain derived by persons committing a breach of the Act or regulations has been greater than the penalty that could be imposed. As a consequence the penalties failed to have an adequate deterrent effect.

Amendments proposed in the second schedule of the Bill are of a machinery nature, mainly concerned with deleting sections of the Act which are historical and no longer necessary.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Old.

## TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 11 October.

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.15 p.m.]: The Opposition has examined this Bill and the second reading speech made by the Minister. It has also sought the views of people who are likely to have an interest in the matter. Having taken these actions the Opposition has reached the conclusion that the Bill should not be opposed. I think there may be points which could be questioned if one wanted to be pernickety. However, I do not intend to raise those points and I clearly indicate to the Minister that having made our inquiries, we are satisfied that the Bill is as described by the Minister and it should receive our support.

I take the opportunity in this debate to invite the Minister to comment on a matter he raised in his speech where he indicated as follows—

... the first statement of planning policy concerning the residential planning codes is due for ratification in the near future.

I would be interested to hear the Minister's advice on that point and also whether other statements are likely to be made. I ask him to advise what differences those residential codes will mean in practice when it comes to dealing with some of the problems. I am aware that we have some knowledge of that already, but I wanted to bring the matter up to date.

Subject to that, I indicate that the Opposition will not oppose the Bill.

**MR RUSHTON** (Dale) [5.16 p.m.]: I wish to raise a couple of items with the Minister. He has been making statements recently about a full review of the Town Planning and Development Act and other Acts relating to town planning. All that needs to be done has been done, and the Minister has no great need to spend a year in examining the Act. He has the results of reviews available to him. He can refer to them, and see what suits him.

The main thing is that the Minister should become fully acquainted with the delays that take place in planning, and why they take place. The only person who will learn why they take place is himself, and he will do that by observing, inquiring, and testing, and then taking appropriate action.

I raise these matters with him because the only advantage in doing another review and then another one is that another point of view comes forward from good people; but the responsibility

still rests with the Minister to make a determination. While it might put off the evil day a little longer, the Minister will eventually have to face up to some of the matters being asked of him, maybe by developers and the people interested in the Town Planning and Development Act and the structure of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. Those things will not be changed by waiting and reviewing.

In dealing with planning, it is interesting that the Minister or the Government has yet to face up to the Servetus Street issue—the Rochdale Road issue. The Government must face up to the bridge across the Swan at Burswood Island—

**Mr Parker**: A decision has been made on that and announced some time ago.

**Mr RUSHTON**: Is the Government fully committed to proceeding?

**Mr Parker**: As far as the bridge is concerned, yes. The Minister for Transport made an announcement in April originally, and it has been supplemented by subsequent statements which he made. The funds have been provided in the Budget before the House.

**Mr RUSHTON**: There is also the question of what can work and what cannot work.

**Mr Parker**: I will deal with that later.

**Mr RUSHTON**: The issues raised in the legislation are basically routine ones. Different points of view will always be expressed. The aspect worrying me is the one relating to local government. One does not need to put more restrictions in the way of local government authorities. Whatever changes are applied at the local government level in relation to town planning should be introduced to speed up the process. During my time, I used to insist on the observance of time limits, but I am aware that my successor allowed a little more time. This is one area in which delays take place.

A constant tension exists between the interests of the various parties, and social interests are involved. The Minister is already learning this and having to find a solution.

The Minister ought to recognise local government as having a high responsibility in the area. It is better to leave those responsibilities to local government authorities, because they relate to the local people and we should not have a centralised system which removes authority from local government. Whatever the Minister does, and whatever any of us does, should assist local government specifically in the planning process.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, the Opposition supports the legislation. I join with him in that.

**MR PARKER** (Fremantle—Minister for Planning) [5.20 p.m.]: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Dale for expressing the support of the Opposition for this legislation.

In response to the query raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about the residential codes and the planning policy in respect of those codes, I am advised that it may be one or two months before a statement of policy is available. The history of the residential codes is a long one, and it predates this Government by a long time. It may even predate my immediate predecessor. I am not sure whether the member for Dale knows anything of them.

**Mr Rushton**: They got started in my time.

**Mr PARKER**: It is a complex question, and various difficulties have been encountered. I hope to bring this matter to finality; and I congratulate the Chairman of the Town Planning Board, Mr O'Meara, for whom I have the greatest respect. When he came into the position, although much work had been done, he did a lot of work on putting it all together. One of the problems with the residential codes is that the people who work in the building industry have completely different views as to what should be incorporated. For example, many of the original people on the committee working on the codes were architects; they had particular interests in terms of trying to ensure that as many architects as possible were employed in the construction industry. The people in the private development industry have different points of view, as do the project developers. They all see the "R"-codes as serving a different purpose.

All of these matters have been under constant review, and many areas of the "R"-codes are nearing finality. I receive deputations, hold meetings, and discuss the matter on more occasions than I care to think about in regard to the "R"-codes, the operation of the industry, and the betterment of the board and the department generally.

It has been the policy of the board for some time to issue policy statements, with the approval of the Minister of the day. Those policy statements do not have any statutory effect, except that they enable developers, local government authorities, and other bodies seeking to operate in the area, to know the sorts of things that the board will look favourably on in terms of making recommendations on zonings or district schemes,

and as to subdivisional design and control. The aim of the statements of planning policy, apart from the "R"-codes, is to have some statement which will be distilled and have statutory effect, and which may be referred to in planning schemes as such, rather than each and every planning scheme having to incorporate into its text the detail of the planning policy which is currently in force. It is intended that, firstly, this will make uniformity in general terms much more widespread throughout the State. In this way, we will have greater uniformity, although there is a great distinction between the "R"-codes in the metropolitan area and those applying in country towns.

The "R"-codes will provide greater local flexibility in terms of their general requirements. It is intended that they will be referred to in local government schemes, with any local variations that may be necessary being detailed in the scheme's context, which means that it applies throughout the State.

Authorities will have a much clearer idea of the directions in which they should be moving. It is not envisaged that we will have an early production of other planning policies beside the "R"-codes because of the time that has been taken to develop the "R"-codes. Planning and policy statements will be few and far between because they have been troublesome in their gestation. Nevertheless, it is hoped that we will be able to develop some of these issues. I trust that that satisfies the inquiry of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The member for Dale dealt firstly with the proposed review. While I know that reviews have been undertaken, and they have made valuable suggestions, the point made by the member for Dale is that there is no need for another review. In the planning industry, people, whether they be in local government, developers, or anyone else, take the view that a review is required and that provides them with a rational look at the planning process, and what has happened within that process over many years. The review is intended to consider the question of planning, and the role of the MRPA, and whether we should see an extension, for example, of a State planning authority to cover more than the metropolitan area. The review should consider statutory planning; it seems to me that they are more than the administrative details to which the member for Dale referred.

In many cases, the statutory delays are unnecessary and we will move to have the legislation changed. I hasten to add that I do not believe one has to await the outcome of a review before undertaking any necessary amendments to existing legislation, and the legislation can be amended in the meantime. Consideration has

been given to appeals on approvals of town planning decisions with a view to speeding them up. I have had discussions with Councillor Kyle, who is the President of the Local Government Association. He has some very sensible suggestions in that regard. It is my intention, on many of the minor matters such as the one we are dealing with, to have them dealt with as quickly as possible before the outcome of the review.

Administrative delays do exist, and I am glad the member for Dale mentioned that. They do not take place only in the Town Planning Department and the Minister's office; the member would be aware that many delays occur in the area of local government. The point he made about that is quite correct.

If we were to listen only to the developers, we would probably remove from local government the ability to make town planning decisions. If we were to listen to local authorities only, one would remove the ability from the State, and give it to the local authorities. Obviously there are areas where it is better that the State have control in the interests of the State as a whole, and there are areas in which local government consideration should apply, and where local government should be given much greater flexibility than it has. Of course, that is one of the matters which will be the subject of the review. Whatever is the case, I have demonstrated I am prepared to give greater flexibility in the planning area. One of the problems in planning is that it is almost impossible to satisfy everyone involved in a matter. By definition, that is an impossibility.

In relation to the Burswood bridge, I said by way of interjection that the Government had agreed to the construction of the bridge. This falls within the province of my colleague, the Minister for Transport, who made an announcement about it in June or July. Since that time, the Perth City Council has come out strongly in support of the construction of the bridge, and it has said that it does not want it to be relocated. So far as the western side is concerned, we are in the process of forming a committee to plan the use of the land in the reservation. As it is not likely that a freeway will be built in the next 20 years, the best use of the land should be achieved.

I thank the Opposition for its support of the measures contained in the Bill, and I commend its second reading to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 p.m.*

## AGRICULTURE AND RELATED RESOURCES PROTECTION AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 26 October.

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Leader of the Opposition) [7.15 p.m.]: The Opposition has indicated its support for this Bill. There have been some difficulties, but they have been explained in another place.

The Opposition generally agrees with the views expressed by the Minister that "an inspector or an authorized person may, if he is satisfied that an occupier of private land is not making all reasonable endeavours to comply with that section, . . .". This has caused some concern for some individuals, but not for our shadow Minister and I will now hand over to him.

**MR OLD** (Katanning-Roe) [7.18 p.m.]: I utilised most of the material I wished to cover the week before last when time ran out at question time, but I did want to indicate to the House that the Opposition generally is in accord with the concept of the Bill. The most important part of the Bill was the system of rating and valuations in the Kimberley. This has been very well covered in the Bill and in the Minister's second reading speech.

However, I did express some concern about the point within the Bill which is a proposal to increase the upper limit of rating to 8c in the dollar. This causes me some concern because originally a rate of 3c was decided and then later, by arrangement, increased to 4½c. I have talked to the Pastoralists and Graziers Association about this and I did talk with the pastoralists last year and I realise that the upper limit had nothing to do with the actual rating. I can recall the present Minister expressing the same concern at times as I am expressing today.

I realise that any change would have to be by regulation and that it would have to run the gauntlet of the House, and that there could be some objection to an increase.

We have no quarrel with the Bill because it is necessary and the subject matter has been under discussion for the last 18 months to two years.

The only other cause for concern within the Bill relates to the entry of seeds into Western Australia and the endeavours made to regularise the method by which seeds are allowed to come into the State.

The Act specifies fodder and machinery. Seeds have been restricted, but in the past the onus has been placed on the exporter or the seller of the seed to ensure that the seed is free of any declared plant which might cause some problems.

It is now proposed to place the onus on the purchaser of the seed. While I agree that this is a reasonable thing to do I do not believe there is a need to quarantine or inspect it. It does seem a little loose that we have to rely on someone to say, "The seed I have purchased is completely free of noxious or declared weed". I understand the problem and I am also an admirer of the work done by the Agriculture Protection Board and our quarantine people. They ensure that noxious weeds do not enter this State. It is a tremendously difficult job in a State such as ours which has so many points of entry.

Provision exists within the Act to allow an importer of seeds which contain a weed which may be declared in one area, but not in another, to be allowed into a particular area where the declared plant is already a problem and the import will not add to the problems of the area.

All in all, we have no objection to this Bill.

Mr Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr OLD: The member is an intelligent fellow. It is a pity he does not use a bit of his intelligence at times. Apart from the rating for the Kimberley, most of the clauses in the Bill are machinery clauses. We support the Bill in general.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [7.22 p.m.]: I would like to add some comments because of the importance of this Bill to the pastoralists in my area. Since the original Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Amendment Bill was introduced into the Parliament we have seen a tremendous improvement in the relationship between the Government and the industry. Also, there has been a great effectiveness in dealing with the problems of vermin in pastoral areas.

The Bill as it was originally introduced by the member for Katanning-Roe is one of which we can be proud because of the results that have been achieved by the organisation set up under the Act.

The amendments before the Chamber seek to do a number of things, one of which is to increase the maximum rate payable; my colleague, the member for Katanning-Roe has already mentioned this subject. I am sure the Minister handling the Bill will recall that when this legislation was originally introduced the industry was careful to ensure that a maximum rate be written into the Act. It did not want the rate to be controlled by regulation. At that time, I think it had doubts as to what was intended under the Act and, as the

Minister will recall, the industry was suffering the worst drought for something like 30 years. While the pastoralists were experiencing tremendous problems with vermin they were not in a position to contribute large sums of money towards eradicating that problem.

It was of great credit to the previous Government that it was able to keep the costs of the vermin control programme down, and to operate without increasing the maximum rate for many years. In fact, while it was supposed to be a matching contribution between the pastoralists and the Government, the Government found that it had to contribute more than its share in order to keep down the impact on pastoralists.

We have been given an assurance that the new maximum will not be the minimum and that it will allow for flexibility in the future. I know the Minister concerned would expect me to say, "Please go easy on them and do not reach that maximum too quickly". While the industry is in a better position now than it was in the second half of 1970, it certainly has not recovered to the extent we would like to see and any costs imposed on the industry by way of rates for vermin protection is something that weighs heavily on it.

I would like to pay tribute to the pastoralists for the way in which they have responded to this relatively new organisation which was set up as a result of the Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act. It brought in a completely new structure for the administration of agriculture protection and the pastoralists have responded very well indeed. There are various levels of administration which come under the Agriculture Protection Board and there are zone control authorities and regional committees, but it also gets down to a more localised level. Local committees have been formed and have made a breakthrough. I know that the Minister would be well aware of this because he has had involvement with the committees in his capacity as a previous Minister for Agriculture and again on this occasion. The local committees comprise pastoralists from a number of stations and they have been given the authority to employ contract doggers—I am referring to dingo control—who are responsible to the committee.

This represents a breakthrough in Government funding because normally the doggers would have been employed by the Government. However the funds are made available to the local committee which has the responsibility for expending the funds and employing the doggers. This has been tremendously successful and the member for Katanning-Roe, who was the Minister at the

time, should be congratulated for introducing this type of funding.

I pay tribute to these local committees because they have been dedicated and have risen to this challenge. They have expended the money wisely at a regional level and have managed to conserve funds in the best way possible, and to budget responsibly. It is fair to say that these committees have looked after the funds as if they were their own. In fact, they are their own because they contribute to the scheme and they are taxpayers in the ordinary sense. The moneys made available are only the taxes coming back to them. The work of these committees has had an impact on the problem of vermin in the pastoral areas and it is an appropriate time, while debating this Bill, to pay tribute to those pastoralists.

Like the member for Katanning-Roe, who is handling the Bill on behalf of the Opposition, I support this measure.

**MR EVANS** (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [7.29 p.m.]: I thank the members for Katanning-Roe and Gascoyne for their support of this measure. The measure was initially introduced in the interests of the industry and the amendment before the House is one that is designed to overcome some of the problems that have arisen since the original Bill became an Act.

The member for Gascoyne has very appropriately indicated the degree of co-operation between pastoralists, the pastoral industry, and the Government. As he said, it is great to see, because without that level of co-operation the intention of the Bill could not be implemented.

The member for Katanning-Roe can take quite a deal of satisfaction from seeing the way in which the Bill he introduced, which amalgamated previous pieces of legislation, has taken effect and has operated successfully. Both members expressed some apprehension with regard to the increase in rating; I expressed that apprehension once with a previous amendment. It will be noted, of course, that this is the maximum rating. The setting of a maximum in that way means it will be some time before such an amendment is required to be brought before this House. It gives flexibility to allow the differentiation in rating between the Kimberley and the rest of the State. To that end, it serves a necessary purpose.

One other point was raised by the member for Katanning-Roe in relation to the declaration of seeds and the manner in which the purchaser now becomes involved. I would like to draw the House's attention to two problems which have arisen in recent times; one is the appearance of striped rust in the Eastern States. That has hap-

pened only in the last couple of years and it has occurred because someone has evaded the quarantine laws. As a result, a potential hazard exists to the grain-growing industry not only of the Eastern States, but also of Western Australia. It means that plant breeders will have to start looking around and build an immunity into the varieties we have.

Similarly, Noogoora burr along the Fitzroy created a very real scare; and when an outbreak was discovered in the mid-part of the Fitzroy it involved a number of employees walking that river for a number of weeks. If it became established, it could mean a line might be drawn across that area. Once again, that was as a result of somebody's evading quarantine regulations and bringing stock in from the Territory in an improper manner. As a consequence, we face a major problem.

For that reason it is necessary not only to ensure that existing regulations are maintained, but also where possible to block a loophole that permits such pests as striped rust and Noogoora burr to gain a hold. Everybody would agree that while this Bill might not be the complete answer, it is a step in the right direction. It is an attempt to deal with the problem, and it can be further adjusted and strengthened at some future time if it is inoperative or if it can be seen that an improvement is possible.

I thank the two members who supported this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Barnett) in the Chair; Mr Evans (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 11 put and passed.

Clause 12: Section 75 amended—

Mr OLD: I rise to make a couple of observations following the remarks of the Minister. I thought he raised a very good aspect which emphasised the point I made during the second reading debate; and I refer to the problem of noxious weeds.

I do not know that there is any way in which we can better inspect the fodder and seed coming into this State, but when the Minister illustrated the problem of the Fitzroy, he raised a matter of great concern. Obviously a lot of weed comes in in hay imported from the Territory as fodder for horses and cattle. At one stage there was an outbreak of Noogoora burr outside the pub at

Kununurra. That was tracked down to the fact that a load of horses had been parked there for a period while their owners were getting a little sustenance. Some of the hay was kicked out of the truck, and that is the only explanation we have had for that problem.

It points out the difficult problem faced by the Agriculture Protection Board; and hearing the Minister mention that problem on the Fitzroy prompted me to say it needs to be watched continually. It certainly is watched by the staff stationed at Kununurra and generally in the Kimberley because they are well aware of the problem. We in Western Australia are very lucky that we do not experience more problems in regard to noxious weeds. Whether it is a matter of luck or of surveillance is open to debate. I always like to think it is as a result of surveillance because the people involved in quarantine and in the protection board are very conscious of the necessity to keep this country as free as possible of noxious weeds. It is a problem that must be looked at at all times, and I know the department and the protection board are very conscious of it. I do not think it hurts to raise the matter occasionally.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 13 to 17 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Evans (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

## **MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (FINANCIAL INTERESTS) BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**MR BRIAN BURKE** (Balga—Premier) [7.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill for an Act to require members of this Parliament to publicly register their financial interests.

Public disclosure of members of Parliaments' financial interests is a longstanding commitment of the Labor Party both at a State and Federal level. It is an important part of the Government's parliamentary and electoral reform programme. The Labor Party and the Government believe that

members of Parliament, as trustees of the public confidence, ought to disclose their financial interests to demonstrate to the electorate that they have not been, nor will be, influenced by considerations of private personal gain. In the exercise of their duties, legislators should place their public responsibilities before their private interests. The disclosure of interests by members of Parliament is a desirable and necessary step if the public are to be confident that their elected representatives are discharging their public duties without bias or the influence of private interests or personal gain. That public confidence is an important part of a healthy parliamentary democracy.

It is not just the Labor Party or this Government which has seen the need for the public disclosure of the interests of members of Parliament in order to make members more accountable to the public. Disclosure has increasingly been recognised as a necessary part of parliamentary democracy, both internationally and in Australia.

Let me briefly outline the position in the United Kingdom and the United States. Since the mid-seventies, members of the House of Commons have been required to register specified financial interests. A Select Committee of the House supervises the register to which the public have access.

In the United States, the Ethics of Government Act 1978 requires disclosure of specified financial interests by members of Congress. The register is supervised by the Office of Government Ethics and is open to the public.

The above two examples relate to national Parliaments. In addition, internationally, State or Provincial Parliaments have seen the need to require public disclosure by members of Parliament. For example, in 1973 the Parliament of the Province of Newfoundland, and in 1974 the Parliament of the Province of British Columbia, required the public registration of the interests of members of Parliament.

In Australia, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and the Northern Territory all require disclosure of the interests of members. Briefly, the position in the other States is as follows: In 1978, the Victorian Liberal Government, prompted no doubt by the Liberal land scandals, legislated in this field. I understand the present Victorian Government is reviewing the operations of that legislation with the aim of strengthening it. As members would be aware, the 1978 legislation does not grant public access to the register of interests.

In 1982, the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly enacted the Legislative Assembly (Register of Members Interests) Act which requires disclosure of a member's financial interests to the Clerk of the Assembly. The Clerk maintains a register to which the public have access.

In May this year, the Government of New South Wales, pursuant to the New South Wales Constitution Act 1902, gazetted regulations which require public disclosure of members' financial interests. The regulations took effect from 30 June this year.

In South Australia, legislation was assented to in June and the first lodging of the interests of members in South Australia was required by 30 September 1983. Members will be aware that the South Australian legislation requires disclosure not only by members, but also by members of the MPs' families.

This is not the case in the Bill before the House, which follows the New South Wales model. The opportunity, however, is taken to adopt certain provisions from the other States. I shall come to precise details of the Bill in a moment.

So far as the Australian Government is concerned, the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) has recently made public the financial interests of his Ministers. I understand that the Federal Government is considering legislation to require disclosure by members of Parliament.

It is clearly the case that the accepted norm, both in Australia and in other appropriate western democracies, is that the public disclosure of members' financial interests is a necessary part of parliamentary democracy. Enactment of legislation in this State will leave Queensland and Tasmania as the only Australian States without such legislation.

Before dealing with the details of the Bill, let me answer an assertion commonly made against such legislation: that to require members of Parliament to publicly register their financial interests is an invasion of privacy. If a member of the community voluntarily seeks public office, he or she must take the responsibilities which go with that office. Part of that responsibility, and one of the requirements of public life, is that one's private life is open to more detailed public scrutiny than would otherwise be the case. Part of the acceptable public scrutiny which can and should take place so far as a member of Parliament is concerned, is that of his or her financial interests. This allows the public to ensure that decisions made are motivated by the public good and not private gain or profit.

The Bill is based on the New South Wales regulations which require members of Parliament alone to disclose their financial interests. Disclosure is initially by a primary return and subsequently by annual returns lodged not later than 31 August, in each year. Returns are lodged with the Clerk of the member's respective House, who maintains a register to which the public have access during office hours. There is no requirement on the part of the member to lodge information in a return which has previously been disclosed by him; nor is there a requirement that the value of any financial interest be lodged. Disclosure must simply be as to location or source.

Members will note that clauses 6 to 14 require disclosure of wide-ranging financial interests. These include real property; sources of income; trusts; gifts; contribution to travel; interests and positions in corporations, trade unions, and professional or business associations; and dispositions of property. Important exceptions are provided for. There is no requirement to disclose real property which the member holds in a capacity as executor or administrator of an estate, provided that the member was not a beneficiary of that estate. Gifts under \$500 are not required to be disclosed, nor are gifts from a relative of the member. Likewise, contributions to travel by a relative need not be disclosed, nor contributions of less than \$250. Members will note that contributions to travel relate only to travel beyond Western Australia. Contributions to travel from public funds are excluded.

Clause 15 provides that a member, in his discretion, may disclose any other interests which appear to the member to raise a conflict between his private interests and his public duty as a member.

Members will note that clause 18 provides that the Clerk of each House shall furnish to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly or the President of the Legislative Council, as the case may be, a copy of the register for laying before the House, and subsequent publication as a parliamentary paper by the Government Printer.

Important provisions in the Bill place restrictions on publication of information contained in the financial interests register. Clause 19 provides that a person shall not publish, either in Parliament or outside Parliament, any information derived from a register unless that information constitutes a fair and accurate summary of the information contained in the register, and is published in the public interest. Any comment on the register must be fair, in the public interest, and without malice. Clause 19, in addition, provides for sanctions where those restrictions are breached.



These provisions will ensure that information contained in the registers will not be used other than in the public interest.

Clause 20 provides for the failure of a member to comply with the disclosure provisions. Sanctions imposed are a monetary penalty not exceeding \$2 000 or, in certain circumstances, vacation of the member's seat. A failure to pay a fine imposed on a member results in vacation of the member's seat pursuant to clause 21.

The clauses I have referred to above are the major provisions of this Bill. As I have indicated, the Government regards this Bill as an important part of its parliamentary and electoral reform package. The Bill will ensure that members of Parliament are more accountable to the public and will provide the public with the confidence that members of Parliament are making decisions in accordance with the public interest and benefit rather than being motivated by private gain or personal profit.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Leader of the Opposition).

## LAND DRAINAGE AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 29 September.

**MR MENSAROS** (Floreat) [7.50 p.m.]: The Bill before the House is enabling legislation only. It does not deal with the main point of interest; that is, the proposed new drainage rating system. It is only to amend the existing Statute to enable the Government to introduce this new system. Consequently, we must turn our attention—as indeed the Minister did in his second reading speech—more to the merits or demerits of the new rating system than to the technical machinery of the Bill itself. In other words, we ought to examine in greater depths the end result of the Bill, rather than the text of it.

The proposed drainage system is described in detail in the report on country drainage rating published by the Public Works Department in July 1983. That is a very good, comprehensive report, and I appreciate the Minister's decision to send me a copy in answer to my request of some time ago. I would like to emphasise that this should become a common practice when we are dealing with complex legislation or legislation to introduce new systems. The philosophical difference in approach of members on both sides of the House is known and recognised. Nevertheless, I believe all members want good legislation; so we should approach debates in this Chamber with as

much knowledge as we can muster. Members who are interested in a particular subject should be able to obtain a good understanding of that subject. In order to do so, it should be common practice to make available to the Opposition explanatory notes, reports, etc.

As I said, the report is a very good and comprehensive document. It is not the first document of this type prepared by the PWD. During my time as Minister, when reports were to be prepared I always asked that they should be able to be read by laymen so that interested people could have more than the legalistic terms of the legislation with which to deal. These explanatory reports were prepared in the past to accompany much new legislation.

My only criticism of the report is that it does not deal in any detail with the consequences of the new system in regard to urban properties within the drainage districts. After all, 11 711 urban properties will be affected by the new system as against 5 985 rural lots. Although the advantages and disadvantages of the new system are spelt out in regard to rural lots, that is not the case for urban lots.

The Opposition supports the proposed drainage rating system in principle, and consequently we will support this amending Bill. However, we point out a few of the shortcomings of the system and we criticise some of the actions—or perhaps lack of actions—on the part of the Minister leading up to the Bill's introduction.

The present rather complicated and tangled system developed over the years as drainage facilities were established in different parts of the south-west. These facilities were not established in a co-ordinated way—they were the result of the needs of the people. As more settlement took place, and as some individuals in certain areas had more initiative than others, the conditions of paying for these services were negotiated individually in each district. Conditions varied even in broad principle, let alone in detail.

Sometimes the drainage rate was based on the value of the property served, and sometimes it was based on the size of the property. Sometimes the rate was arrived at by combining such matters with the anticipated benefit expected to be achieved through the drainage facility. This is the reason for the present situation where there are as many as 11 variations of the ratings system in the 13 drainage districts. So there is plenty of scope for permutations and combinations, but little help for someone seeking to understand the system.

Over the years conditions have changed, and as they have changed, the ratings have become more

and more inequitable so that some property owners pay several hundred per cent more than others for the same service provided in another district. To mention but two examples of this, in the case of the valuation-based rating system, some properties acquired a disproportionately high value because of their close vicinity to the towns and the expectation that they would be rezoned and consequently increase in value. Where the proximity of land to the drainage facility was one of the dominant factors in the rating itself, the beneficial effect changed with the common use of bulldozers and trench diggers which have replaced the horse and plough. Trenches can now be dug with apparently little effort and at a low cost; and so the properties which are further away from the drainage facility can now reap the same benefits as those much closer to it.

Another curiosity of the development of our present system is that the parent Act was designed for more or less autonomous boards for each of the 13 districts as they developed. It is my understanding that not one of these boards is left. Although someone said there may be such a board at Benger, I believe that it is an irrigation board and not a land drainage board. Accordingly, the reserve provision of the Land Drainage Act—if one may refer to it in that way—is that the Minister acts on behalf of every board. This makes the divergences in the rating system even more anomalous; and it could be said, without the slightest ill will, that the local ratepayers virtually cried out—although not in so many words—for a unified system, by not seeking to maintain the respective drainage boards.

Another very desirable and commendable aspect of the proposed new system is that, at least in one facet of water-related services, it takes a big step towards the implementation of the pay-for-service pay-for-use principle. However, it is only a step, because the newly-designed rating system has no direct relationship to the cost of services. Rather it charges according to the benefits expected to accrue to the property owner.

Theoretically it could be argued by strong believers in the unadulterated, pay-for-service pay-for-use principle that charging for benefits is the same as if, for instance, a cool drink factory or a laundromat had to pay more for the same quantity of water than, say, an estate agent because the former derived higher benefits from the use of the same quantity of water.

Commendable though the new system appears to be, every change is looked upon with considerable suspicion, and frequently it is disliked by most people. It is looked at with suspicion because change itself is never popular, and with dislike be-

cause, as a result of rates being adjusted, some ratepayers will obviously pay more. Therefore, if the Government wants popular general acceptance of its policy, in my opinion it must do two things: Firstly, it must ensure the broadest possible consultation with all interested ratepayers; secondly, it must allow the longest possible phasing in of the changes.

The Government conducted consultation through the Public Works Department. Meetings were held with all the districts affected. However, the Government should have gone the whole way with consultation; not only should it have invited consultation with members of Parliament representing drainage areas who happen to be members of the ALP, but also, because those areas are represented by about a dozen non-Labor members of Parliament in both Houses, it should have consulted them also. However, those members were ignored in the consultations, not because the officers of the PWD forgot about them, but because Cabinet decided to ignore them.

I refer to page 22, paragraph 12 of the report of the PWD under the heading "Consultation and Discussion", as follows—

On April 6, 1983, State Cabinet agreed that the decision to implement the proposed new drainage rating system would be made following consultation and discussions with:

Urban and rural ratepayers or their associations.

The Members of the Legislative Assembly seats of Mitchell and Bunbury.

Other affected parties.

Not only was that attitude a blatant mistake, but also it was unwise, as events have proved. The attitude was uneconomical and, indeed, it was in contempt of Parliament. Are we not all elected to represent our constituents regardless of the party for which they vote? The Minister for Water Resources who, when wearing his other hat, preaches electoral equality and the need for electoral reform, in this case ignored non-Labor members of Parliament and explained the new system to Labor members only. That appears in the PWD's report. Cabinet decided that the members for Mitchell and Bunbury ought to be consulted and, to this time, no other members of Parliament have been asked for their opinions.

Mr Tonkin: Do you know how many times your Government consulted with me when we were in Opposition? Not once.

Mr MENSAROS: Whenever my department was dealing with important issues, full consultation took place. The time of top public servants

was placed at the disposal of members of Parliament in order that they could be informed on these matters.

Mr Tonkin: I was refused permission to see public servants by your Government—consumer affairs. Successive Ministers refused to allow me to speak to public servants.

Mr O'Connor: I certainly did not in my department.

Mr Tonkin: I will tell you who did—Mr Grayden and Mr Shalders.

Mr Barnett: And Mr Masters.

Mr MENSAROS: The Minister explains the Cabinet's decision to consult with only two Labor members and not to discuss the matter with a dozen non-Labor members by alleging the previous Government adopted that practice. My response to that is twofold: Firstly, I could not vouch for the Minister's experience, but I can state categorically that never has any member been refused consultation by departments for which I was responsible. In fact, members of Parliament were invited to consult with officers of my departments when complicated matters like this were dealt with.

Mr Tonkin: Whom did I refuse? Who asked for consultation?

Mr MENSAROS: I am saying the Minister did not consult them. How would these people know what was going on? Secondly, if the Minister says that the previous Government adopted wrong practices—

Mr Tonkin: I am not saying they are wrong; I am saying they are in the hallowed traditions of this Parliament.

Mr MENSAROS: Well, I do not think they are traditional, either in this Parliament or in the mother of Parliaments.

Mr Tonkin: That is a very different situation. Let us have the situation which exists in all respects in the United Kingdom. We would not recognise the place!

Mr Clarko: Do you mean voluntary voting?

Mr MENSAROS: The lack of consultation shows how much the Government cares for country people and their representatives.

Mr Tonkin: What are you talking about? We had meetings all over the country. We had 13 meetings.

Mr MENSAROS: It shows the Government's contempt for the Parliament. Perhaps it does not show the Government's contempt for the people, but rather its contempt for the Parliament.

We are dealing with a non-political matter involving ratepayers. Everyone would concede that.

When I was the Minister, not only did I never refuse to consult with people, but also meetings were offered to Opposition members of State Parliament with the highest ranking, professional public servants. Two or three examples of that come to mind. The Point Peron waste water outlet was explained fully, with illustrations, to all interested members. The Harding River dam and related options and problems were explained, especially to Opposition members. Members were invited to look through the facilities of the Metropolitan Water Authority. There are only a few examples of the level of consultation when I was the Minister.

Not only is this behaviour on the part of the Government in contempt of the Parliament, but also it is blatantly unwise and uneconomical. The Bill could have been passed much earlier and the Minister could have avoided receiving a full deputation had he consulted originally with all members, rather than only with Government members.

The report of the PWD referred to consultation "with other affected parties" and I wonder, for instance, whether the Valuer General was consulted. He is deeply involved in the present system, in the transition, and in the resulting new system, because he must reorganise his tasks accordingly. I wonder whether the Minister knows whether consultation with the Valuer General took place. If the Valuer General was not consulted, I suggest he should be, in the interests of good Government and good legislation.

I have said that acceptance of this matter not only requires full consultation, but also the longest possible phasing in of the new system. The Minister could say, "But phasing in will occur, because the maximum increase per year is limited to 40 per cent". However, although only 26 per cent of the slightly less than 6 000 rural assessments will increase, and large increases will be experienced only by property owners who pay a comparatively small amount at present, people still do not seem to like this arrangement. If they did like it, we would not have had problems. Therefore, the Government could have—indeed, it still can do it without amending this Bill one iota—lowered the ceiling of 40 per cent in cases where increases occur and applied a gradual reduction where decreases occur so that a limit is applied on both ends.

If no increase or decrease of more than 33 1/3 per cent, 25 per cent, or even 20 per cent were allowed in one year, the transition or phasing-in

period would be much longer. Such a system would not affect greatly the required aggregate and would reduce considerably, if not eliminate altogether, the painful increases experienced by some ratepayers.

Everyone knows the proposed 40 per cent ceiling is an arbitrary one. The figure could have been higher or lower; it is a matter of judgment. However, that does not mean it is necessarily bad. Apparently the Minister arrived at that percentage based on the figure applied successfully by the previous Government for valuation-based water rates and affiliated service charges. However, it would be a rarely, if ever experienced kindness—which is seldom the name of the political game—were I not to remind the Minister and those on his side of the House of their attitudes and reactions to the very same ceiling of 40 or 50 per cent when I first applied it and, indeed, the second time when I arbitrarily chose 50 per cent.

Let me remind the Minister and his followers of the attitude of the ALP to such an arbitrary ceiling when applied by this side of the House. On 11 August 1981 the present Premier, then the spokesman on water resources for the Opposition, at page 2640 of *Hansard* said, amongst other things—

... we will be giving the Minister and his party the opportunity to make bigger men of themselves by suggesting to the Parliament and to the public that, in the absence of any justification for a 50 per cent ceiling on valuation-based charges, a limit of 20 per cent be made.

On page 2641, he went on to ask—

Is it reasonable that any Parliament should tolerate a Minister who cannot identify the truth? Is it reasonable that any Parliament should tolerate a Minister who gives his word without the ability to maintain it?

Further on he said—

Does the Minister guarantee to the public of this State that, next year, at about this time, we will not be considering again legislation for this exercise?

Finally on page 2646 he had this to say—

... we have supported our contention that 20 per cent is appropriate, which would be slightly more than twice the rate of inflation.

How does that entirely irresponsible attitude of the Government, the then Opposition, compare with our responsible approach of offering objective, factual, and positive criticism?

The Opposition then did not even understand what a "ceiling" meant. However, the Govern-

ment now seeks to do the very same thing and suggests that, as long as the individual ratepayer reaches the total assessment figure according to the new system, a ceiling of 40 per cent should be applied. Consequently, if the ratepayer's total increase from the present rate to the new rate is, say, 160 per cent, it will take about four years to reach that ceiling. Therefore we will have a repetition year after year.

The system the Labor Party fiercely scolded when it was in Opposition has suddenly become the right system when the Labor Party is in Government, yet that does not alter the fact that we introduced it and that it was successful.

I must emphasise the point that the Bill aims only to clarify the existing legislation to enable the implementation of the proposed drainage rate system and to implement the Public Works Department's recommendation at page 33 of its report. The Bill will permit differential urban and rural rating which so far has had to be in line with the system as proposed. The Bill will apply a ceiling on the increase in rates, and will possibly clear up some provisions and definitions in the Act. It will validate some hitherto applied practices, and will combine rural land use for the purpose of assessment. Transitional provisions are included. As enabling legislation the Bill is acceptable, but it will not achieve what it aims to achieve according to the Minister's second reading speech and to the report of the Public Works Department. It will leave the anomalies which in my view already exist.

I will mention these matters briefly so that the Minister will have an opportunity to consider them and, during the Committee stage of the debate, correct me if I am wrong. The Bill makes no provision for uniformity of rates in the 13 drainage districts, yet it is contended that is the main purpose of the Bill. It will not prevent the desired uniformity, but it does not provide for it either. It will retain and aggravate the anomaly in regard to maximum and minimum rates.

The existing provisions could be interpreted as being upside down. It appears that the statutory maximum rate—I emphasise the word "statutory"—is lower than the prescribed minimum rate and has been for quite some time. If those words seem to be Chinese, I ask members to bear with me. Subsection (2)(b) of section 88 of the Act, as amended by Statute No. 38 in 1978, limits to \$10 per hectare the maximum rate where the rates are assessed on an area. The Bill will not change this section. Section 90 of the Act states, "A minimum rate of such amount as is prescribed may be levied". As far as I am aware, the minimum rate is presently \$10.80, which is 80c higher

than the statutory maximum. Members should not worry because the regulations will override the Statute. Section 90, as amended by Statute No. 14 of 1977, says, "... the restrictions imposed by subsection (2) of section eighty eight of this Act do not apply to any such minimum rate".

The present situation is confusing, and merits some clarification by amending legislation. Indeed, that legislation was introduced to tackle the problem, but I ask members to watch how. Section 88(2) referring to the \$10 per hectare maximum will stay. However, proposed new section 90A says, "For the purposes of section 88(3) of this Act, the Board may, by notice published in the *Government Gazette*, determine the maximum amount of the rates". What does the referred section 88(3) say? It says, "Drainage rates shall not be imposed on any land in any financial year in excess of the maximum amount determined under section 90A of this Act in respect of that land for that year". Yet the new provisions regulating the maximum sum seem to be quite superfluous, when section 88(2)(b) still stands with the statutory maximum of \$10. Of course, that amount, as I said before, is smaller than the present minimum.

The main lesson to be gained from these comments—I had nine years of administrative experience in this field—is that instead of patching up the Act with enabling legislation, we should have a new Act brought in after full and exhaustive consultation and examination. When in Government, I intended to do that, despite my being told by the member for Vasse that, when he led the deputation, the officers of the PWD had intimated my intention was not that a new Act be drafted. That was not so at all, because my instructions were that full consultation should be had with everyone in order that an entirely new Act might be drafted. I had already consulted some people as to how it should be drafted roughly.

I know the Minister will say in response that the capacity of the Crown Law Department drafting section does not allow for this redrafting. I know that only too well from my own painful experience. Indeed, the present Government is aggravated by its obsession to extend its power through so-called electoral reform. I do not suggest that the Crown Law Department should be utilised full time to draft a new Act, but instead of enabling legislation being brought down, a new Act could have been drafted, even though that might have meant that the new rating system would not be introduced for a year or so. This matter could have been dealt with in a much more professional and orderly manner.

Mr Blaikie: Your intention would have been to seek consultation and co-operation and to have an indication of the general aims of the people concerned.

Mr MENSAROS: I said that before. I am not complaining about consultation with ratepayers. I understand they were invited to the meetings, but I do object to members of Parliament not having been consulted unless they belonged to the Government parties.

Although the parent Act from 1925 as amended allows for drainage boards, there are no such boards in any of the districts.

Mr Tonkin: What about Benger?

Mr MENSAROS: I thought Benger had an irrigation board. There may be none or there may be one. According to the Act, the Minister can act on behalf of the board, which of course has led to more complaints than otherwise would be the case. Inevitably, complaints would not be directed to the Minister or his department, but would be sorted out at the board level. Experience has shown that a locally composed responsible body shapes the local attitude to inevitable changes. The attitude to charges is quite different under that situation, because the local representatives are fully aware of the situation and are capable of explaining it to their neighbours, so that they understand the necessity and importance of the charges. I had that experience when certain areas had to be declared and bore water use was restricted in the interests of users. Hence I very much hope the Minister, even if he does not recreate these boards, at least will create and make use of advisory committees in the interests of ratepayers and, I think, in his own interests. Such local bodies might create one difficulty for the Minister and his Government, a difficulty which will be the subject of my final comments.

Rates for the current financial year have not yet been struck, but according to the statements in replies to parliamentary questions I have put to the Minister, the aggregate revenue from land drainage rates in the 13 districts this year will be 18 per cent higher than the revenue of last year, which means that the aggregate increase will be 18 per cent.

The importance of this increase has not been explained to the ratepayers concerned. Replies to parliamentary questions reveal that the total operating and capital charges will not be absorbed. Therefore the amount which equals the Government's subsidy, which last financial year was \$1 200 155, this year will be \$1 334 057. A mere glance at those figures indicates that the latter

represents a 10 per cent increase on the year before. Perhaps it is 10.1 or 10.2 per cent.

If the Government wanted to follow the policy of the previous Governments of subsidising country water undertakings, it would have followed a different course. I am not saying that the subsidies are the right course, but if the Government wanted to give a benefit to country people similar to that which previous Governments provided, it would have increased aggregate charges by this 10 per cent no matter what system was introduced. The increase would have reflected the loss to the Government. If the charges were increased by 10 per cent, the subsidy would have been equivalent to that which was provided last year. But instead, the subsidy has increased by 10 per cent and the charges by an average of 18 per cent.

The members for Bunbury and Mitchell were consulted, and obviously agreed to these provisions. Probably they did not just sit in on the briefing, but asked relevant questions. They would have found out, although earlier, as I did from my parliamentary questions, that the total cost will rise by 18 per cent, but the Government subsidy will rise by only 10 per cent. Yet they agreed, after consultation. I say that because if they had not agreed they would rise in this debate and say, "I do not agree". It must have been agreed that it should be 18 per cent. The countrymen will be hit by almost twice as much as the cost increase.

I think the silence from the Government on this matter of the complaints from ratepayers is contemptible. I would very much like to hear from the member for Bunbury and the member for Mitchell as to how they view this situation. I know the new rates will be lower than the present ones in their districts. Surely if they were responsible members they would have queried this increase. Why has the Government suddenly restricted the subsidy, the rise of which should be equal to the cost rise?

I repeat that we do not oppose the legislation but are critical of the lack of consultation by the Government and for its lack of action in not striking individual rates, and reducing the subsidy.

**MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [8.32 p.m.]:** First of all I commend the member for Floreat on his address in relation to this Bill. I regard it as one of the best addresses on an extremely difficult subject that I have heard any member give. I compliment the member for Floreat for the manner in which he has explained the nature and workings of the Bill. He has explained also the shortcomings of the Government's actions.

The member indicated that the Opposition would support the Bill but it seeks a number of clarifications which we trust the Government will explain.

Having given a bouquet to the member for Floreat, I can only say that I am disappointed with the Leader of the House who is the Minister in charge of the Bill.

**Mr Tonkin:** The Minister for Water Resources!

**Mr BLAIKIE:** The Leader of the House who happens to be in charge—

**Mr Tonkin:** I am not the Leader of the House for this, I am the Minister for Water Resources.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** He also happens to be the Minister for Water Resources. He has treated the House with his usual contempt.

**Mr Gordon Hill:** Oh.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** It is all very well for the Government Whip—

**Mr Gordon Hill:** To sigh.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** —to cackle like a crow.

**Mr Gordon Hill:** This is so boring. It is the same attitude you have on each piece of legislation.

**Mr Tonkin:** I received a deputation and I have a very busy schedule. That is how political I am.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** I would have expected the Minister at least to have been in the House to hear the comments of the member for Floreat.

**Mr Tonkin:** I have been.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** The member for Floreat has raised a number of points which are very important.

**Mr Tonkin:** They will be answered.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** I will be seeing that they are answered.

**Mr Tonkin:** Will you? It makes me tremble.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** It ill-behoves the Minister and his colleagues to carry on in this vein. This Bill proposes to change the system of rating and its contents have been explained by the member for Floreat. The intention is to simplify the current rating system for drainage as it applies in Western Australia. Thirteen districts exist and within them are five different forms of rating. It is a complex system and needless to say the purpose of the Bill is to simplify it.

Tied in with this is the intention of the Government as announced on 1 July this year, to increase revenue raised from drainage rates by 18 per cent. Those are the two principal areas dealt with by this Bill.

As the member for Floreat has said, the Land Drainage Act has been in existence since 1925 and prior to that a number of private drainage systems operated throughout the State. At the commencement of the group settlement scheme work was found for a number of people to construct the drains in those settlement areas.

The district I come from had its drains constructed in the 1920s and 1930s, but most have been filled in. The question of rating and rates has always been a contentious issue with primary producers and the people in the district of Busselton, which I also represent. It is not uncommon for land drainage rates to be as high as shire rates, so it is a matter of grave concern to the producers in drainage areas.

As I have said, we support the principle of simplifying the system but I believe that its implementation, if carried to the full letter of the law as proposed, will prove to be a bureaucratic nightmare. It is interesting to note that the work on this change to the drainage rating commenced in June 1982. During June of this year a series of meetings were held throughout country drainage areas and those meetings were provided with an explanation of the new system. One of the recommendations made was that the implementation of the new system should take place as from 1 July and that is the reason for this legislation before the House now.

The member for Floreat said that during the initial discussions on this proposal the Government saw fit to include the members for Mitchell and Bunbury and gave them prior information on the alternatives that were to be included in the Bill. I believe that is not only a gross discourtesy, but also is an example of politics at its worst.

The members for Mitchell and Bunbury were privy to that information. Surely with a Bill of this nature it should have been more properly discussed with a far broader range of members of Parliament.

Mr Parker: Are you seriously suggesting that your party did not provide general briefing by departmental officers.

Mr BLAIKIE: I make the point that far from trying to seek political advantage, it would have been of far greater benefit to all concerned if a far wider spectrum of other members of Parliament in the drainage area were included.

I pose the question to the member for Mitchell and the member for Bunbury: Do they support the legislation as it is before the House?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLAIKIE: The meetings took place after Cabinet made a decision on 6 April this year to proceed. On 13 May this year department officers met with the member for Mitchell and the member for Bunbury to discuss the matter further. I have no idea what they discussed but obviously those two members were satisfied with the proposal which was put forward on 27 May this year to all ratepayers.

The ratepayers within all the drainage districts were then notified and in June of this year a series of meetings were conducted throughout the drainage districts of this State. Of all those meetings the Minister said that only two areas indicated opposition to the Bill and they were the areas of Busselton and Vasse.

It is my view that the results of other meetings will prove to be far from conclusive because of the 11 000-odd rating assessments that are available, less than 400 people attended the meetings; the meetings were very poorly attended, to say the least.

I believe the Minister's officers may have had an indication of attitude from those who attended the meetings but they did not have a mandate from the total number of people in the districts. It is all very well for the Minister to say that, but he is a person who talks about one-vote-one-value.

Mr Tonkin: Don't be stupid. We called meetings throughout the State and if people did not turn up, whose fault is that?

Mr BLAIKIE: The Minister has talked about one-vote-one-value and bases his information on 350 people out of a total of 12 000.

Several members interjected.

Mr Tonkin: You are stupid. Why don't you sit down.

Mr BLAIKIE: The member for Mitchell and the member for Bunbury have obviously advised the Minister about this legislation. I ask the member for Bunbury whether he has had any complaints about it.

Mr P. J. Smith: I have talked to quite a few of the farmers in the district and have had no complaints.

Several members interjected.

Mr BLAIKIE: These people in the east Bunbury drainage districts had high ratings previously, and what did the Government do to relieve them? It abolished the drainage district and no doubt the member for Bunbury is delighted.

Mr Tonkin: It was an election promise.

Mr BLAIKIE: It was not only an election promise; it was also a political gimmick.

Mr Tonkin: It was an election promise.

Several members interjected.

Mr BLAIKIE: It was done in order to meet an election promise and all I can say is that is the pathetic way this Government is run. I want to continue—

Mr Tonkin: More is the pity.

Mr BLAIKIE: —speaking about the meetings that were conducted.

Mr Tonkin: You are mucking up the great contribution made by the member for Floreat.

Mr BLAIKIE: I indicate to the Minister that it is my view that the officers of his department conducted themselves with all propriety. I have the highest praise for them for the way in which they explained to the meetings the reasons for the new system. They obviously had put a lot of work into it, and I want to give those officers full credit for their efforts.

A total of 357 ratepayers were present at the meetings the officers attended. In relation to that total were some 117 000 assessment holders in the total drainage districts for Western Australia. That is the information I wish to give to the Minister and to the House.

Mr Tonkin: What are you conveying?

Mr BLAIKIE: I am conveying to the Minister that his officers may well have had an indication of tacit support for a proposal, but it was not a mandate for an absolute right to proceed forthwith.

Mr Tonkin: We were not seeking a mandate.

Mr BLAIKIE: The Minister says the Government was not seeking a mandate, but it has certainly proceeded.

Mr Tonkin: Of course we have, as your Government would have in the same situation.

Mr BLAIKIE: Some 17 people attended the meeting held at Harvey. Of those 17, 11 voted in the affirmative and three voted in the negative, with three abstentions. One could go on to other meetings. I refer to a meeting I attended at Vasse where it was reported by the officers that the meeting agreed the proposed two benefit rating is too simplified and to be equitable it should be expanded to three or four categories to give greater variation to the benefit received. Of those people who attended the meeting, seven voted for the motion and 12 voted against it, with 17 abstentions. A further vote was then taken and of those who voted on the new question, which was that the old system be retained, 21 voted in the affirmative and four in the negative, with 11 abstentions.

I want to make a point to the Minister that notwithstanding the fact that I have given credit to his officers and commended them on the way in which they carried out their work and gave explanations, those explanations were made only to a certain point.

Mr Tonkin: You are just a knocker. You knock everything.

Mr BLAIKIE: The Minister should settle down and stop frothing; it does him no justice.

The officers did not explain the actual cost which would be borne by the areas and the ratepayers concerned. There was great confusion on this point at the meetings I attended at Busselton and Vasse. People wanted some idea of how the changes would affect them. At those meetings the officers commented that if they told the people how it would affect them, they would vote according to the state of their hip pockets. I see nothing wrong with people voting in that accord. While there is need for a more simplified system, considerable concern was expressed at the meeting held at Vasse.

As far as the Busselton meeting was concerned, it carried the following resolution—

This meeting does not accept the proposals explained to the meeting and requires 12 months to consider same.

That resolution was carried by 30 votes with four voting in the negative. It was my view that the resolution came up at the meeting because when the officers were pressed on a particular point requiring further explanations, they said they were under some degree of haste to get their country meetings together because the legislation was to be introduced so that it could be operative from 1 July. The officers said they had not had the time to do all of their sums and supply the answers. Those attending the meeting replied that if the officers had not done their sums, they would wait a further 12 months for them to do so. Further consideration would then be given to the question. I believe that decision was fairly reasonable.

The Minister said there were two areas which opposed the legislation. I refer to a further meeting held at Bornholm in the Albany district which was well attended by some 71 ratepayers. A series of resolutions were carried, one being that the meeting was in favour of changing from a UV drainage system to one based on an area system. Thirty-nine people voted in the affirmative and 18 in the negative, with 14 abstentions. The meeting then proceeded to a further resolution: That the ratio of direct benefit to indirect benefit be 5:1. That motion was lost because the voting was 15 in



the affirmative and 37 in the negative, with 19 abstentions.

A further two resolutions were put to the meeting, the first being that the ratio be 3:1, and the voting was 35 in the affirmative and 16 in the negative, with 20 abstentions. The second was that there be two categories of rating and the voting for that was 24 in the affirmative and 11 in the negative, with 36 abstentions.

I have taken the trouble to quote the results of the voting at these meetings to emphasise the points made earlier and also so that the Minister has an indication from those who attended the meetings of the general support for the principle of simplifying the system. However, there were still many people who were concerned about what the full ramifications would be. Certainly in the Bornholm area, many people will be anxiously awaiting receipt of their assessment notices. At this stage, I anticipate the Government will be receiving much attention from the people of that area.

I have already indicated that departmental officers at those three meetings did not give individual details or information on how the districts would be affected with the introduction of this rating proposal.

I have been fortunate enough to receive a copy of the department's publication, for which I thank the Minister and his officers. That publication sets out in detail the percentage advantage or disadvantage applying to the drainage districts of the State. Some very astute people attended the drainage meetings at Vasse and Bunbury because, although they were not provided with the information, they were able to understand that their drainage districts would be disadvantaged in comparison with the old system.

As far as the State is concerned under the new proposal, 26 per cent of assessments for the whole of the State will show an increase in charges. That increase in charges will range up to a figure of over 150 per cent for one per cent of the assessments in the State. I refer to some specific drainage districts where it is important for the percentage increases to be recorded. In the Myalup drainage district, 90 per cent of the assessments will have an increase of over 150 per cent. Although only nine assessments in that district will be affected, I am quite certain that those people will be concerned as to the full impact of this new legislation which will simplify the rating system. However, these people will be asked to pay extra in order to achieve the Government's wishes.

I refer to the Busselton drainage district which is of particular concern to me. Of 1 232 assessments, 47 per cent will have an increase in their rates. In the Wilson-Torbay drainage district, of a total of 495, 39 per cent will show an increase. In the Capel-Boyanup drainage district, 65 per cent of all assessments will be subjected to an increase. Of that 65 per cent, 20 assessments will be increased by over 150 per cent. It interests me that the member for Mitchell represents that area and is one of two members who have been privy to the information that has led to the Government's introducing this legislation. Obviously he does not see this as being a burden on the ratepayers in that district.

In the West Harvey drainage district 60 per cent of assessments will pay an increase under the Government's new system.

The departmental officers provided information, but only to the point of explaining the system. They did not go into details of how it would affect the drainage district or individual landowners. That was one area that certainly concerned me, and the officers refused to provide such information.

Some two weeks ago, the Minister received a deputation from the Busselton district, for which I was most appreciative. One of the important factors to emerge from that deputation was that although the Minister did not give the deputation the opportunity to understand the new rating assessments which would apply if this legislation was passed, he gave an undertaking that should there be any anomalies as a result of this system, he would investigate them when they became known to him. I thank the Minister for that, but I do not really believe it was good enough. A little more time should be given to ensure smooth introduction of the system, and then the anomalies of which I have spoken should not arise.

I raise another point of concern with the Minister which is that the Government has already announced it is seeking an 18 per cent increase in the amount of money it takes in for land drainage rates. It is also changing the rating system and has said that with the introduction of the new system, any increase will be limited in each year to a maximum of 40 per cent. Future increases will be made until the property so affected will eventually reach the level of rates which should apply and this may well take two or three years. While the limitation is placed on the properties at the top of the scale, I suggest to the Minister that those at the bottom of the scale will pay an amount substantially higher than the 18 per cent

by which the Government is seeking to increase the total land drainage rates.

I ask the Minister to give an explanation of this in his reply to this debate. On the assessments I have been able to make, the indications are that the assessments at the bottom end of the scale, with the changes to the rating system, could well be in excess of 25 per cent. That being the case, it is absolutely scandalous for the Government to impose increased costs of 25 per cent and more on any section of the community—certainly on the rural community—in order to bring about a new system.

The member for Floreat went into very great detail when he explained this point and the comments made by the Premier about this matter some 12 or 18 months ago, when he was the Leader of the Opposition. I would be interested to hear the Minister's explanation of the level that people will pay and to know whether it will be in the order of the 26 per cent or 27 per cent I believe it will be. These figures are available to the Minister, and he should provide them to the House so that members know and have an understanding of what the charges will be.

One of the other aspects of the Bill causing me concern—I ask the Minister to respond to this—is that when the amendments were being proposed, why did he not include in the interpretations those of “direct benefit” and “indirect benefit”? The Bill proposes to establish a new system of rating that will be common to all the areas of the State. The principle of the new system of rating hinges upon a system of direct rating benefits and indirect rating benefits. I would have expected that, when the legislation was drafted, the interpretation clause would include the precise form, giving assessment holders the opportunity to mount a legal challenge, if need be, at some later stage, or at least to clarify the term.

Another area of concern is that while it may be claimed that land is drained, in fact it may have been overdrained and could be damaged agriculturally as a result of the works carried out within the drainage district. When land is drained onto other land, although the excess drains from a property, it poses another critical agricultural factor. I ask the Minister to indicate why the interpretations of “direct benefit” and “indirect benefit” were not included in the Bill now before us.

A very important need exists for local advisory committees. Appeal committees already operate in the various drainage districts, and they have carried out their work reasonably; but my request is for advisory committees in drainage districts

comprising a local Public Works Department officer, representatives of the local authorities, farmers, and potato growers—whoever the assessment holders are. I suggest a committee of five or six people who would assist with the formulation of policy on drainage problems, and assess the need to extend the drainage areas. The work of such a committee would be to assess the benefits to be applied and whether the proposals would be of benefit to the people in the drainage areas. Such a committee would be of great assistance, not only to the PWD, but also to the Government generally. I can see such a committee taking much of the flak that flies around now over new drainage proposals.

As I said before, the Bill is designed to simplify the rating system. It will lead to a substantial increase in the rates paid by a number of people. It will mean that in all the drainage districts something like 74 per cent of the assessment holders will have either no change or reduced rates. However, in some districts the increases will be quite substantial.

What also must be taken into account is the Government indication that it intends to raise a further 18 per cent, to be brought into the PWD drainage budget. This will substantially increase the minimum amount to be paid by the lower end rate assessment holders. As I have said, my understanding is that that could be in the order of 26 per cent or 27 per cent.

I request the Minister to answer my questions on this complex and contentious issue. The principle of what the Government is attempting to do is deserving of support; and I trust that the Minister will give the undertakings for which we have asked.

I support the Bill.

**MR BRADSHAW** (Murray-Wellington) [9.07 p.m.]: After learning earlier this year about the rural land drainage rating system, it seemed strange to me that something was not done a long time ago to make the rating system a little simpler. After attending a couple of meetings in my electorate, I discovered that some blocks in it have about seven different rates imposed upon them. I imagine it would be quite a headache for the assessor to work out what the drainage rate should be if he had to work out whether it was a direct, an indirect, a partially direct, or whatever rate.

I am sure the system will result in a much more uniform rating for blocks throughout the drainage areas in Western Australia. Whereas we had up to seven different rating systems for one block, with the direct and indirect benefits it will be

made simpler to understand when there are any objections to the rating assessment.

The problem with this amendment is that many people in my electorate will have considerable increases in their assessments, and I am sure they will not be happy, because the increase for many of them will be more than 100 per cent. In the Minister's second reading speech, he explained that no rate would increase by more than 40 per cent in one year. However, the proposed new section 90A merely empowers the board and the Minister to limit the increase. As I said, in the second reading speech, the Minister said that it would be no more than 40 per cent per year.

Mr Tonkin: That is our intention.

Mr BRADSHAW: It does not say that in the Bill. I could not imagine its being lower than 40 per cent. It is all right for the Minister to say that he does not intend to increase it by more than 40 per cent, but Ministers come and go, and boards come and go. Therefore, this policy should be explicit in the legislation.

The continued existence of boards is summarised in the Bill; and in a letter to me earlier this year, the Premier said that the Benger Drainage Board will be going, one way or another. I am not sure why it should have anything to do with the drainage board if, as is the case as far as I know, this is the only drainage board in existence.

Mr Tonkin: The Minister is the drainage board, in all other cases.

Mr BRADSHAW: In the Minister's second reading speech, he said that the purpose of the Bill was to permit the introduction of a new uniform drainage rating system in country areas. He outlined that the new method would be based on three factors, including direct and indirect benefit. It seems that, under section 89 of the Act, such a rating system could already exist, and therefore we do not need this amendment.

Although I support the Bill because it will provide a much more simplified drainage rating system, as section 98 allows for changes in the rating system, I am not sure that we need the amendment.

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Minister for Water Resources) [9.13 p.m.]: I do not intend to reply in detail at this stage, but I will reply during the Committee stage to the comments made by the three members who spoke on the Bill.

As the member for Vasse said, I have undertaken to get rid of anomalies if any appear, but I point out that the Bill is intended to get rid of the anomaly which is the very complex, hard-to-understand system that we have at present. We

also have the anomaly that some landowners have been paying too much, and other landowners have been paying too little. The Bill is before the House in an attempt to be rid of an anomaly.

This is a bipartisan procedure, not only because the Opposition has supported this Bill, but because I believe the member for Floreat, if he had remained as the Minister for Water Resources, would probably have brought in a similar Bill at some time during the life of this Parliament.

The new system will shift the incidence of rate bearing. If it did not do that, it would not be a new system. If the Opposition accepts that the new system is fair—that is a big condition, and some members opposite may not accept it, although none of them has been able to say that it is not fair—it follows that the people who have been paying the lower rates until now and who will be paying an increase from here on have been paying too low a rate in comparison with that paid by their neighbours and other ratepayers; in other words, they have been receiving relief perhaps at the expense of others—unwittingly on their part because they have had no choice. So, if there are increases for some people, and if we accept that the new system is fair, we must realise that the increase will mean they will now be paying a fairer rate, which they have been able to escape heretofore.

Mr Blaikie: That is a very flimsy argument.

Mr TONKIN: It is interesting to hear the member for Vasse call it a flimsy argument. It is really called plain deductive logic. There is no doubt that that is a logical argument. If the basic premise is accepted—members opposite may not accept it, but I did not hear anyone argue against the basic premise—the logic is impeccable.

The member for Vasse said that we did not have a mandate for this because we had only a few hundred people turn up to these meetings. But we were not seeking a mandate; we were consulting. We called the meetings, yet the member for Vasse wants to criticise us because they were not well attended. If we had not called the meetings, he would have criticised us. So we see that the member for Vasse is merely, to use an old-fashioned Australian expression, a knocker. That is why it is very difficult to respect his kind of argument, and the contrast is very stark of the contribution of the member for Vasse on the one hand, and the contributions of the member for Floreat and the member for Murray-Wellington on the other hand.

Concerning briefings of members of Parliament, I would like to know from members opposite when the previous Government ever sought

to have on its committees members of the Opposition. A tradition in this Parliament was established most firmly by Sir Charles Court over many years that a Government does not co-operate with members of the Opposition, that it does not consult with them, that it does not inform them, and that it does not allow them to have access to bureaucrats.

I have mentioned before that two different conservative Ministers for Consumer Affairs forbade me to speak with their officers, and I refer to Mr Shalders and Mr Grayden. The Leader of the Opposition interjected and said that when he was a Minister he did not do that, but when I informed the Leader of the Opposition when he was Premier that Mr Shalders had acted in that way, the then Premier took no action. I raised the matter in this House, yet the present Leader of the Opposition was silent and so condoned the Minister's actions. Members opposite suddenly talk about consultation; they suddenly learn about the virtue of consultation when they find themselves on the Opposition benches. We would have a lot more respect for members opposite if they had shown a desire to consult when they were in Government.

I thank members for their contributions, to which I will not reply in detail at this stage, but I will do so later on.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### **TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT BILL**

*In Committee, etc.*

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

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Parker (Minister for Planning), and transmitted to the Council.

### **DOG AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 13 October.

**MR CLARKO** (Karrinyup) [9.22 p.m.]: The purpose of this Bill which amends the Dog Act is to ensure that a person who is bitten by a dog when on a highway does not have less redress against the owner of the dog than he would have if he had been bitten when away from a highway.

I note that the Government amended this legislation in the Legislative Council in response to a

query from the Hon. Phillip Pandal. I commend him for his suggestion and I commend the Government for accepting his proposition. The Opposition supports this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### **SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNALS AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 19 October.

**MR THOMPSON** (Kalamunda) [9.24 p.m.]: The Small Claims Tribunal came into existence just after I came into Parliament during the life of the John Tonkin Government. It was introduced into the Parliament on the basis of its being an inexpensive and easily availed of opportunity by which people might obtain redress when they would not otherwise have been able to afford it in a normal court situation. The experience of the legislation in the 10 years or so it has existed indicates that people regard it as good or bad, depending on their points of view. Some people in the community feel they have received satisfaction from it, while others have felt no satisfaction has been obtained for them.

It is clear from the Minister's speech when he introduced the Bill that this is one of a package of the Government's proposed measures dealing with consumer legislation.

For nine years, we allowed the legislation to exist and therefore we can hardly be in a position now that we are in Opposition to cavil at the proposition that a Small Claims Tribunal should exist. Considering the fact that we have given that sort of approval to it, we must address ourselves to the question of where we stand on these particular proposals.

There can be no argument from our side, nor from anyone else I suggest, that the sum involved in a small claim should be increased from \$1 000 to \$2 000, because clearly, in the period that has elapsed since the Tonkin Government's introduction of the principal Act, there has been movement in prices. It is therefore just that the amount should be increased to \$2 000.

One part of the Bill with which we do have argument relates to the time in which it will be possible for a person to lodge a claim. Up to this time, it has been open to a person who felt aggrieved to take a case to the Small Claims Tribunal within the two-year limit. The Bill proposes to extend that time to two years after any dispute arises in the case of a business transaction.

I suggest that is totally unfair because there could well be a situation where a person has bought, for example, a swimming pool, has had it installed, has used it for a considerable time, and then has raised a claim. There could be some argument about it, but after two years from the commencement of the dispute, a claim could be lodged with the Small Claims Tribunal. So, that is one aspect to which we are opposed.

Mr Tonkin: Can you explain why you are against that provision?

Mr THOMPSON: It is totally unfair that a person who sells something in good faith to a person may find that two years later the buyer discovers there is something about it he does not like.

Mr Tonkin: It is not a question of a person not liking it, but a question of there being a difficulty.

Mr THOMPSON: Some people might consider some things a difficulty while others will see them as a normal quirk of the particular item. Take, for example, an aboveground swimming pool built to satisfy a market. They contain some fairly flimsy components; a failure can occur and, indeed, the life of this type of pool would not be more than a few years anyway.

Mr Tonkin: It would not apply in that case. You have to remember that the referees are not fools, surely.

Mr THOMPSON: We are not saying that the referees are fools; we are saying it is unacceptable to expand on such a period of time within which people can lodge a claim under this Bill.

To return to one of the conditions we agree with, we see nothing wrong with the provision in the Bill that requires the tribunal to give reasons for its decisions. In fact, we think it is just and proper that that should occur.

The Bill provides also that the tribunal can agree to transfer a case to a local court, and one could find no fault with that proposal.

Mr Williams: They should all go to the court and have a right of appeal.

Mr THOMPSON: If I had my way, such matters would be dealt with in the courts. We have allowed the Small Claims Tribunals legislation to remain and have therefore given our approval to it. We can hardly suggest to the present Government that it should abolish that legislation. We can only make a contribution to this proposal to ensure that the Small Claims Tribunals operate effectively.

The Bill provides that a matter that is placed before a Small Claims Tribunal, but which also becomes the subject of action taken in the local court, should be first dealt with by a Small

Claims Tribunal. That seems to remove from an individual his right to pursue the matter in the local court up until that time.

I ask the Minister to further elaborate on that aspect of the Bill.

Mr Tonkin: Perhaps you should raise that point when in Committee.

Mr THOMPSON: I will. The Bill provides for the fixing of an age limit on referees of the Small Claims Tribunals. At the time this legislation was enacted, the Tonkin Government had in mind a particular person for appointment to this position. I do not think anyone who knows anything about the Small Claims Tribunals would not agree that that person who, although, in excess of the age of 65 years, did a good job. Very few arguments suggest that a person of 65 should not be able to be appointed as a referee in a Small Claims Tribunal. Wisdom does not cease at age 65. In the case of a lot of people I know, it does not start until then.

Mr Tonkin: There are a lot of unemployed youngsters about. You could give some of those 18-year-olds a job.

Mr THOMPSON: There were a lot of unemployed persons at the time the Tonkin Government enacted that legislation, but it had no compunction about putting into that position a person well in excess of 65 years of age. The Government is unnecessarily restricting the opportunities by imposing the age limit of 65.

Mr Tonkin: What is the age limit now for judges?

Mr THOMPSON: I cannot tell you.

Mr O'Connor: There is not one.

Mr Bertram: Sixty-five for judges and 70 for the Chief Justice.

Mr Tonkin: The High Court has somebody who is 92 years old. Is he still going?

Mr Bertram: No, he has just about retired. He named his successor and his conditions of retirement!

Mr Old: Is it Lionel Murphy?

Mr Bertram: Not a bad arrangement.

Mr Davies: His successor is 86!

Mr THOMPSON: In summary, we support the Government's proposals, although we question one or two aspects of them. It is my intention during the Committee debate to seek some further clarification on those points from the Minister. I will not repeat those areas mentioned during the second reading debate.

With those remarks, we support the second reading of this Bill.

Mr Tonkin: You have two-and-a-quarter hours to go.

Mr THOMPSON: No, the Minister can have that time.

**MR TONKIN** (Morley-Swan—Minister for Consumer Affairs) [9.35 p.m.]: I was sure we would have had more speakers on this most important Bill. Some of the matters raised by the member for Kalamunda will be best dealt with in the Committee stages. So I can examine his remarks fully, I will move that the committee stage be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## PAINTERS' REGISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 26 October.

**MR THOMPSON** (Kalamunda) [9.36 p.m.]: A few weeks ago this Parliament was required to address itself to the question of amending the Builders' Registration Act. The Bill now before us undertakes similar provisions in regard to painters. The Bill contains six or seven provisions.

Before I address myself to the general thrust of the Bill, I point out that philosophically I am opposed to the existence of a painters' registration board, not because I do not think some protection should be afforded to people on the receiving end of some shoddy work done by painters, but because I think the Painters' Registration Act is a clumsy way of providing that protection. Frankly, there should be, as there is in the case of the Builders' Registration Act, a system of insurance that affords protection to people who have had work done by a tradesman where that work proves to be defective. Clearly, work could be undertaken by a person registered under this Act, and, although defective, it may not be rectified. This could happen particularly in the case of a registered painter who may not have the financial ability to provide the services necessary to undertake the correction.

The Minister will recall that I made similar remarks on my presentation on the debate on the Builders' Registration Act. Indeed, I informed the Minister and the House that when next we return to Government—

Mr Bertram: When will that be?

Mr THOMPSON: I would anticipate at the next election. That will depend on when the Government calls it or, at the very least, 1986.

Mr Bertram: Until now I have always regarded you as a good judge.

Mr Carr: I always knew you were an optimist.

Mr THOMPSON: It is our intention to have a good look at legislation such as the Painters' Registration Act, with a view to repealing it and replacing it with a system that provides better protection for the community while, at the same time, not creating a closed shop situation as this legislation does.

We can find no argument with many provisions of this Bill, bearing in mind that the Act was in existence. We can hardly not support the provisions in this Bill which will make it a more workable piece of legislation.

Mr Tonkin: I am interested in the precision of your remarks. You say you are going to have a good look at the Act. That is all you did in the last nine years. You had a good look at a lot of things and did very little.

Mr O'Connor: I thought you were trying to be co-operative tonight. Do not be difficult.

Mr Old: It is too hard.

Mr THOMPSON: When we take over Government, we will do more than have a good look at it.

Mr Bertram: I hope so. You could put it "under active consideration"!

Mr THOMPSON: One of the proposals of this Bill is to more clearly define and extend the area of jurisdiction of the Painters' Registration Board to bring it into line with the amendments to the Builders' Registration Act.

Another provision of the Bill is to extend from \$100 to \$200 the value of work that comes within the jurisdiction of this legislation, and we find no argument with that provision.

Another proposal is to widen the representation on the board, and this seems to be in line with a number of other things the Government is doing. It is obviously looking for a wider consumer base as exists with other boards—for people serving on this board.

The Government's intention is to have submitted to it a panel of no fewer than three names from which the Minister will make a selection, and we have no quarrel with that.

Another provision in the Bill gives the board the opportunity to order that payment of money be made by way of compensation for unsatisfactory work. That is a commonsense proposal. In one case in particular, a person in my electorate had some work carried out. It proved to be defective and the Painters' Registration Board attempted to get that work rectified by the painter

concerned. It was a one-man business, and so much animosity was generated that the painter and the consumer could not face one another without having a violent argument. I accept that this is a reasonable proposition, because I am sure that, in this case, both the painter and the customer would have been far better situated if there had been an order for a sum of money to be paid by the painter in order that the work could be done by some other person. We do not argue with that provision.

Another provision of the Bill will increase the penalties. Acknowledging the fact that penalties were set in 1965 and that there has been considerable movement in the Consumer Price Index since that time, we find no argument with extending the penalties as proposed in the Bill.

With those remarks, I indicate our support for the second reading.

**MR TONKIN** (Morley-Swan—Minister for Consumer Affairs) [9.44 p.m.]: I thank the member for Kalamunda for his contribution, such as it was, to the debate.

**Mr Thompson**: You were being co-operative. Don't get chewey.

**Mr TONKIN**: This cheap licorice puts one on a high.

I want to make it clear that the Government does believe in regulation. It does not mean to say that it is the best kind of regulation. The member for Kalamunda talks about broadening the base of the boards; I can tell him that some of the boards have not been in action in the area of consumer affairs and this has caused the Government concern.

We do not see these boards as a place to which to send some old party hack who has long since stopped being very active and is content to sit there and go to sleep. We believe there should be a far more active participation than in the past and for those reasons we are altering the basis of the composition of the boards. We believe there should be consumer representatives on these boards. After all, the boards were brought into being largely for the protection of the consumers and it is wrong for the consumers not to be represented. It is also wrong for the consumers not to be represented by someone who is active. We make no apologies for the way in which we are trying to improve the composition of the boards which have operated for many years. The personnel of the boards will be rejuvenated, something not dreamt of last year.

I believe this Government is a Government of action and it is interesting to hear the remarkable proposition to which the member for Kalamunda

referred. He said that when the Liberal Party was returned to Government it would have a hard look at the Act. That is what the Liberal Party did for nine years. It had hard looks at things; there was no activity. It did very little for consumer affairs. Those days are gone and I can assure members that all this Government wants is positive action which will benefit not only the consumer, but also industry itself.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Barnett) in the Chair; Mr Tonkin (Minister for Consumer Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 7 amended—

**Mr THOMPSON**: This clause deals with appointments to the board and it contains a defect. When a person is appointed to the board because he represents a particular organisation, but then he ceases to be a member of that organisation, there is no machinery in the Bill to remove him in that sort of situation.

I can recall a situation—not with the Painters' Registration Board, but with another board in this State—where a person was appointed as a member of a board. He was appointed as a nominee of a particular organisation of which he was a member. He served as that organisation's representative on the board for some considerable time, but then a dispute arose and he resigned membership of the organisation and continued, to the embarrassment of the organisation, to serve on the board.

This appears to me and to the Opposition to be a defect in the Bill and I would seek the Minister's comments on this matter.

**Mr TONKIN**: That matter has not been raised with me before and I think it is an interesting point. One should make a comment that although the Minister appoints people from certain organisations in order to get a good spread of representation, perhaps that person could be a good member of the board if he ceased to be a member of the organisation. It is a philosophical point. However, if it is intended that that person is merely appointed in order to get a wide spread of interest and expertise, I do not think that it is the situation that he represents the organisation.

Of course, it could be argued that he should cease to be a member once he ceases to belong to that organisation. It is an interesting point and I am happy to look at the whole question, but it is

important we do not hold up the passage of this Bill. However, I undertake to give the matter consideration and if it is desirable, we may well take action next year.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 20 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading*

**MR TONKIN** (Morley-Swan—Minister for Consumer Affairs) [9.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

**MR THOMPSON** (Kalamunda) [9.53 p.m.]: I would like briefly to make a contribution to the third reading debate and say to the Minister that he misunderstood my intention, and the intention of the Opposition, when he responded to the second reading debate. I want to make it clear to him that legislation such as the Painters' Registration Act will be abolished—

**Mr Tonkin**: It is going to be abolished?

**Mr THOMPSON**: —and replaced with a more effective means of providing consumer protection when next the Liberal Party is in office.

**Mr Pearce**: We do not have to worry for many years in that case.

**Mr THOMPSON**: Do not be too sure about that because things change and although the Government seems—

**Mr Tonkin**: Well in charge!

**Mr THOMPSON**: —fairly confident at this particular stage, a week is a long time in politics and it has a lot of weeks to go—

Several members interjected.

**Mr THOMPSON**: —by which time—

**Mr Parker**: You might have a new Leader of the Opposition!

**Mr THOMPSON**: —the State will come to recognise that this Government is a froth and bubble Government which does not provide—

Several members interjected.

**Mr THOMPSON**: I want to make it clear to the Minister that that is the action that we, when next in Government, will take.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## **TRADE ASSOCIATIONS REGISTRATION REPEAL BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 26 October.

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.55 p.m.]: The Opposition supports the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee, etc.*

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

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by **Mr Tonkin** (Minister for Consumer Affairs), and transmitted to the Council.

## **LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 27 October.

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.58 p.m.]: The purpose of this Bill, as I understand from the Minister and from examining the Bill, is simply to remove from the Liquor Act some restrictions on the display in hotels of material related to racing. I understand these provisions were originally placed in the Act to assist in the enforcement of and to supplement the law on illegal SP bookmaking. There does not seem to be any basis on which the legislation is now necessary and from my understanding of what the Minister has told me both in the second reading debate and from a number of discussions I have had with him, the provisions cause some inconvenience. The Opposition is not opposed to the removal of these provisions.

**MR PARKER** (Fremantle—Minister for Employment and Administrative Services) [9.59 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill the second reading of which I commend to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee, etc.*

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



### Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Parker (Minister for Employment and Administrative Services), and transmitted to the Council.

### APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

#### Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from 27 October.

**MR OLD** (Katanning-Roe) [10.02 p.m.]: Having regard to the overall Budget and in particular that part affecting agriculture, one could only describe this as the louisiest Budget seen in this House for some years.

**Mr Barnett:** We expect that from you.

**Mr OLD:** The member is getting it. Blessed is he who expecteth nothing for he shall not be disappointed!

**Mr Parker interjected.**

**Mr OLD:** I am not whingeing like the Minister.

The agricultural industry has been short-changed in this Budget, and I believe the Government should sit down and take stock of what it has done. It has not only brought more Commonwealth money and research money than before into the Budget this year, but also, in real terms, it has provided far less to the agricultural industry than in the past few years. The fact that the Treasurer, in delivering his Budget speech, did not make one mention of agriculture is indicative of the importance he places on this industry.

**Mr Burkett:** Wrong.

**Mr OLD:** I suppose the member wrote the Treasurer's speech?

**Mr Burkett:** No, I did not write it.

**Mr OLD:** The fact that the Minister for Agriculture in this Government is ranked number eight in the Cabinet indicates the great importance the Treasurer places on agriculture. I have heard the Treasurer at functions talking about the great work that is done by the agricultural industry in Western Australia and the fact that this State only has 10 per cent of Australian farms and yet produces 16 per cent of the gross product in agricultural exports.

That is all very well and it is nice to be able to stand up and say it; but it would have been a nicer gesture to have supported those remarks by paying due respect and having due regard to the department's necessity for a decent Budget. Approximately 45 per cent of Western Australia's export income comes from the agricultural industry. In 1980-81, it was \$1.6 billion, rising in 1982-83 to about \$2 billion. That is not inconsiderable,

and I believe members of this House would recognise it is an industry which needs to be supported, and one which needs to have a continuing amount of money, not only to run the department, but also to enable the department to undertake the necessary research.

Even Mr Keating in his Federal Budget gave agriculture a great boost because he gave it one minute of his time, and I thought that was pretty grim.

**Mr Parker:** There were supplementary statements by the Minister.

**Mr OLD:** Yes, written statements; but this Treasurer did not see fit to give agriculture even one minute. That indicates what this Government thinks of agriculture. The Treasurer will rethink this matter. When he looks at the figures and sees exactly what the contribution is to agriculture from the CRF, he will go away and do some homework, and do something about it.

Much has been written about this Budget in the rural press, and especially in the *Western Farmer and Grazier*. Some of it is quite factual and the comment made by Mr Kronborg recently indicates the feeling of the farming community; that is, one of great disappointment.

I was very interested to find out exactly what happened to Commonwealth extension service grant money which nowadays is pretty well buried in the Budget. That is no fault of the Government, because the Federal Government has taken the step over the last two Budgets of allocating a global sum to the States, included in which it says is an amount for CESG. It is then up to the various departments in the States to stake their claim for the share of CESG to which they believe they are entitled.

I asked questions of the Minister and he was kind enough to give replies today, to find out where we stood with regard to research funds, and where they show up in the Budget. It is interesting that some research funds are placed in a trust account at the Treasury and are drawn on by the department as required. Others are placed in the Budget and Treasury naturally is rather keen to see as much of the Commonwealth grants and industry research funds put straight into the CRF Budget, which pads that out and takes some of the strain off the CRF.

I asked for the comparable amount between 1982-83 and this year's Budget. I asked how much of the \$49.122 million allocated to the Department of Agriculture was provided from Consolidated Revenue, Commonwealth extension service grants, industry research funds, and other Commonwealth funds. The answer was that

\$40.481 million came from Consolidated Revenue, \$658 000 from CESC, \$3.111 million from industry research funds, and \$4 872 million from other Commonwealth funds. I assume the other Commonwealth funds would include the money provided for quarantine services, etc. Of the total Budget allocation to the Department of Agriculture, 82.4 per cent was provided by Consolidated Revenue, 1.3 per cent by CESC, 6.3 per cent by industry research funds, and 10 per cent by other Commonwealth funds.

For last year's Budget, of a total of \$45 million, the amounts allocated were as follows: \$38.048 million from Consolidated Revenue, \$621 000 from CESC, \$1.688 million from industry research funds, and \$4 662 million from other Commonwealth funding. Last year, 84.5 per cent of the Department of Agriculture's budget was provided by the CRF. That is a difference of 2 per cent on a budget of \$50 million, in round figures.

That is, \$1 million extra was budgeted from CRF last year compared with this year. Of last year's Budget, 1.4 per cent came from CESC and 3.7 per cent from industry research funds. It is significant that 3.7 per cent came from industry research funds last year compared with 6.3 per cent this year. That is a very significant rise in percentage terms on the amount of money provided to the department. The amount from other Commonwealth funding was 10.3 per cent, which was comparable to the previous year.

I believe when the Budget has been analysed by producer organisations they will express great disquiet because it is a fact that the amount of money being provided is falling in real terms, and when all is said and done, that is the only way one can gauge the value of a Budget. When one takes into account an inflation rate of about 11 per cent over the past 12 months one realises there has to be a pretty lively increase in the Budget figure for it to be of any use whatever to the department concerned. If one looks at the Budget allocation for welfare and medical services one sees they have fared pretty well. I believe we are probably getting our priorities wrong.

Mr Hodge: I hope you tell the member for South Perth that.

Mr OLD: I will tell him anything the Minister likes.

I believe the amount of money going into welfare services and education is increasing at a greater rate than that going into the producing parts of this Budget. I do not think that is a fair crack of the whip. To give some idea of what is happening, I indicate the total Budget figure for the Department of Agriculture increased by 9.6

per cent over the last year. When we take into account an inflation rate of 11 per cent, it gives a negative growth of 1.4 per cent. We are that far behind the eight ball when starting a new year. I reiterate, it is indeed a very poor reward.

Some of the figures show fairly high growth rates although I must admit they are not great figures. The national energy research development and administration programme has gone from \$59 000 to \$78 000, an increase of 31 per cent. That looks very good, but it is such a small amount of money that it does not matter. If we took the increased amount attributable to research funds out of that Budget, it would be down to about a 7 per cent increase over last year in real terms, which would be a deficit of about 4 per cent. Those are the sort of figures at which we are looking.

I know times are tough and I know that the Commonwealth Government has cut down greatly on the money made available for agricultural industries. However, given the importance of the industry, we must have some regard for its productivity and reflect this regard in the Budget. Incidentally, the actual overall increase over last year's Budget expenditure is 13.8 per cent, so, if we take into account the increase of 9.6 per cent to the department, members will see that the department is well behind the eight ball.

It is interesting to note that the overall budget figure has risen consistently since 1980-81. The percentage increase in the various years has been as follows—

	per cent
1979-80.....	13.4
1981-82.....	10.3
1982-83.....	13.5
1983-84.....	13.8

If that 13.8 per cent had been a general increase in the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the various departments, we would have seen a real growth somewhere in the order of 2.8 per cent to three per cent. That would have been a matter for commendation rather than condemnation. I would have been very happy to commend the Government if it saw fit to make a contribution to the industry.

One must be very competitive for money within the Cabinet in times such as these. I know that generally Ministers are keen to snap up any morsels of money that come along. However, such actions must be taken with a fair amount of enthusiasm if a Minister is to serve his department well. I exhort the current Minister to do his best to try to have that position rectified because there will be a great deal of reaction from the industry. As I say,

when the Premier looks at this matter, I am quite confident he will agree that there must be some reallocation of the money.

That is about all I need say generally at this stage. Certainly I will have more to say when we discuss the Budget during the Committee stage.

I would like to touch on a few problems that are experienced throughout certain parts of the State. The greatest problem we are experiencing today in the southern part of the State—and I am referring to the south-eastern agricultural regions around the Lakes area, Ravensthorpe, Munglinup, Jerramungup, Ongerup, and Borden—is water. I do not profess to know the answer to the problem. It is not a problem that has arisen just this year; it has been with us for many years. Successive Governments have recognised the problem, but as yet there has been no solution. It is a problem to which we must address ourselves as a Parliament. We must all try to contribute to its resolution. The situation in the Lakes areas at present is quite drastic. Not only are the residents short of stock water, but also they are very short of domestic water.

Mr Davies: Is the salt spreading out there?

Mr OLD: No, the underground water is salt, but the spread of salt in the agricultural areas is no worse than it is anywhere else. It is not a bad problem at all.

The only way to obtain domestic water is by roof catchment. It has been suggested that the residents of the district are not pulling their weight by providing tank storage and utilising the roof catchment. A study was undertaken by Mr Tim Negus of the Department of Agriculture some time ago. The report indicated a shortage of storage for rainwater, but nothing was done about it.

In the last week or two I attended a meeting in the Lakes area and a number of people raised this matter. The residents are of the opinion that the actual storage and catchment is being utilised to a greater degree than previously. In fact, they believe it is completely utilised and have suggested an updating of Mr Negus's study. I intend to write to the Minister requesting such an updating. It certainly would not be a very big job, and if done properly, it could demonstrate that the rainwater storage is being used to the fullest extent possible and that it is therefore incumbent on the Government to look at the policy of providing stock water. The policy of the previous Government and the policy of this Government is that, where a district is water deficient, stock water is provided to within 40 kilometres of any farm. It is a very good policy, but the problem is that the

only water storage in the area is from rock catchments. The quality of the water in the above ground tanks from the rock catchments is excellent, but the water is for stock use only. This seems to be quite a pity. Water could be carted in, and although probably not potable, it could be suitable for stock. Probably we have to reassess our values in regard to livestock versus human beings to try to work out a rationale.

I refer also to the Jerramungup water supply. I asked the Minister some questions with a view to raising this matter during the Budget debate. When I was in the area recently, I took the opportunity to inspect the catchment area. I probably broke the law by doing this, but I believe it is my job to do so. The storage is good, but it is not being utilised.

Although the storage is good, it is not really adequate for the growth of the town and district, even if the dam is full. However, at least if the dam were full, the residents would have some water to go on with. As it happens, Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe have been on water rationing throughout the winter period, so members would be able to imagine what the situation will be like during the summer.

At Jerramungup there is a bitumen catchment area and a roaded catchment area. I am no expert on roaded catchment areas, but I would say that this is one of the worst such areas I have ever seen. Not only does it have vegetation on it, but also it is not compacted. I do not know whether the type of material used is correct or not, although I doubt it. If a roaded catchment area is not compacted, one loses the advantages of the so-called "road" because the water soaks into it.

In reply to my questions, I was told that there are 12.5 hectares of bitumen catchment and 11.3 hectares of roaded catchment—a small difference only between the two. One would therefore expect that the bitumen catchment would give a little better run-off than the roaded catchment. I asked what the catchment would be with various falls of rain ranging from five millimetres to 25 millimetres. The bitumen catchment area would catch 400 cubic metres of water with five millimetres of rain, while the roaded catchment area would catch 100 cubic metres of water. With 20 millimetres of rain, the bitumen catchment area would catch 1 900 cubic metres and the roaded catchment area would catch 900 cubic metres. The figures with a 25-millimetre rainfall would be 2 400 cubic metres of water from the bitumen catchment area and 1 500 cubic metres from the roaded catchment area.

Members can see a marked lack of efficiency in the roaded catchment area *vis-à-vis* the bitumen catchment area. The people of Jerramungup quite rightly are concerned about the fact that they are facing a summer of water restrictions—after having been on short rations for the past four or five months.

Much the same situation applies in Ravensthorpe. When I was in Ravensthorpe the other day I took the opportunity to look at the catchment area. It covers a large area, but there is not much water in the dam. I would like the Minister to seek a report on the catchment area. I believe part of this area was laid during the last 12 months, but obviously it was laid on very bad material. It is cracked already, and a hump has appeared. This happens when bitumen is laid on clay; it is absolutely useless—like a parachute in a submarine. I believe the whole area will have to be lifted and relaid and that will cost a great deal of money. However, until it is done there will not be a satisfactory run-off into the Ravensthorpe dam. I walked across the catchment, and I believe it is the first time I have ever left footprints in bitumen. That is how bad it is. I make a plea to the Minister to look into these matters. I believe an engineer could sum up the situation and put forward suggestions to remedy it.

Another matter I would like to raise was brought to my attention by the Cranbrook Shire. Some shires have been affected by the catchment area clearing restrictions. These shires got together and suggested to the Government that they were losing rates where the Government had resumed land for the purpose of soil and water conservation and where an application to clean land had been refused. It was thought that the compensation payments carried a built-in factor to cover rates, but while this is so in regard to a farmer who has been refused the right to clear his land, it does not happen where the Government has resumed the land and either put it to forest or under revegetation. In these cases no rates are paid.

The affected shires have for some time been trying to get this anomaly rectified by having an *ex gratia* payment made by the Government. The Cranbrook Shire estimates approximately 17 000 hectares would fall into the clearing bans area. If that cost averaged out at about \$1.20 per hectare, which is the approximate figure used by the shire,

it can be seen it is down the tube to the extent of roughly \$20 000 a year. That is not much money from the State Government's point of view, but it is a great deal of money to a local authority.

The shire had virtually accepted the fact that it could not get Governments of either persuasion to bend in this regard. However, on Wednesday, 27 July last the Premier made a statement in the Press which read, in part, as follows—

The State Government will compensate country shires for revenue lost in rates when the Forests Department buys land for pine plantations.

The Minister assisting the Minister for Forests, Mr Evans, said yesterday that the payments would begin this financial year.

Towards the end of the article the following statement appears—

Mr Evans said that the Government's decision would allow it to continue its policy of increasing the area planted to pines for the timber industry.

The Government would offer the shires *ex gratia* payments equal to the rates that would have been paid on land bought for pines by the department.

The Government's actions on this occasion are exactly what the people in the clearing bans areas have asked to be done and it appears to me to be discriminatory. I am surprised the Minister for Agriculture has been able to get away with a statement like that when his own shire and his home town are in one of the areas affected. Indeed, the shires within the Minister's electorate would probably be among the worst of those affected.

The Government should take a good look at this matter and try to explain why it is good enough to placate the people of Manjimup by saying, "We will stop your timber industry, but don't worry about that; we are going to plant some pine trees, but don't worry about that, because we are also going to pay your rates for you", when in another industry—that is, the agricultural industry, where a similar set of circumstances exist—the Government has flatly refused to make any *ex gratia* payments.

I reiterate that the attitudes of both the previous and the present Governments are the same.

I am not saying that the previous coalition Government was any purer than this Government.

I compliment the Minister for Police and Emergency Services on providing the money for a new police station complex to be constructed at Cranbrook.

Mr Carr: Thank you.

Mr OLD: During the Address-in-Reply debate, the Minister was very cagey and would not indicate whether that money would be supplied in the

Budget. I was very pleased to note that it is to be one of the two new police station complexes to be built in Western Australia. I assure the Minister that the people of Cranbrook are appreciative of the fact that the police station complex has been budgeted for.

I shall save any further remarks until later.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House).

*House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### DRAINAGE

#### *Rates: Preston River*

1711. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has some of the area along the Preston River been taken out of the drainage rating?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) why; and
  - (b) does the Public Works Department still intend to maintain the levy system along the estuary?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) The Preston drainage district is being abolished as the result of an undertaking given by this Government prior to the last election.
- (b) Yes, until the Land Drainage Act is revised and a decision is reached concerning the financing, construction, and maintenance of flood mitigation works throughout the State.

1774. *This question was further postponed.*

### LIQUOR: ALCOHOL

#### *Swan Special Light: Delicatessens and Milk Bars*

1783. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Government been requested to stop the sale of Swan Special Light low-alcohol beer from delicatessens and milk bars?
- (2) If so, what action is anticipated in respect of the request?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) No. However, several members of Parliament have approached me and expressed some concern about sale of Swan light through delicatessens.

I understand the brewery is keen that Swan light should be retailed through licensed premises only.

## BUSINESSES: SMALL

### *Development Corporation*

1834. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology:

- (1) Since the establishment of the small business development corporation is a Government priority, how will the \$722 000 be used?
- (2) How much did the small business advisory service cost in 1982-83?
- (3) In what way will the small business development corporation differ from the small business advisory service?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) As previously answered, it is not appropriate to supply this detailed information, because it is the subject of legislation.
- (2) The total audited expenditure for 1982-83 was \$335 775.
- (3) This is outlined in the Bill currently before the House.

1835 and 1836. *These questions were postponed.*

## EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

### *Election Promises*

1837. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) As he was reported in the Press recently as having stated that the Government had broken its promises concerning the "pre-school" area, especially for children two years before the start of formal schooling, what part of the Government's promise did he keep?
- (2) What parts have not been kept?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government has not broken its election commitments to phase in universal pre-school education for four-year-olds. Indeed, our first Budget contains an allocation of \$500 000 for this purpose. Four hundred four-years-olds have already been admitted to vacant places in pre-schools and pre-primary schools.

I have never stated that the Government has broken its promises in this area. In fact, as will be clear from this answer, the Government has acted as quickly as was possible to begin implementation of this policy.

## EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

*Warwick: Extensions*

1838. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is construction due to begin on the extensions to Warwick high school?
- (2) Is the work to be undertaken by private contractors or by day labour?
- (3) Are any steps being taken to advance the completion day which has been indicated as being October 1984?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) Construction of the extensions to the Warwick high school will be undertaken by Public Works Department day labour which expects to commence site establishment in about 14 days.
- (3) The anticipated date of completion has been advanced from October 1985 and given a building period without delays it is now expected that students will be using the new facilities from February 1985.

1839. *This question was postponed.*

## EDUCATION

*National Anthem*

1840. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Education:

What direction or recommendations have been given by the Education Department to—

- (a) Government;
  - (b) private,
- schools in relation to the singing or playing of—
- (i) the national anthem;
  - (ii) the national song?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (a) and (b) Guidelines in relation to the singing and playing of the national anthem and the national song have been published in the *Education Circular* on page 18, February 1979, and page 65, April 1982. The guidelines do not differentiate between Government and non-Government schools.

Copies of the published guidelines are hereby tabled.

*The guidelines were tabled (see paper No. 427).*

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

*Community Employment Programme: Conditions*

1841. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

- (1) Is he aware that the conditions applied under the community employment programme prevent some local authorities from taking advantage of available funds?
- (2) Has he received complaints or correspondence about this matter?
- (3) What action has been taken?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (3) The conditions which apply under the community employment programme would not prevent any local authority from applying for funds, although some may have difficulty in providing the required 30 per cent sponsor contribution. However, this requirement can be totally or partially waived for projects considered to be worth while and where the sponsor can demonstrate an inability to raise all or any of the 30 per cent. I have not received any complaints about this matter.

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

*Community Employment Programme: Jobs on Local Roads Scheme*

1842. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

- (1) Is the jobs on local roads scheme part of the community employment programme?
- (2) How is JOLOR funded?
- (3) What rules and qualifications apply to the expenditure of funds?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$7.118 million has been earmarked for JOLOR from the total allocation to Western Australia under the community employment programme of \$22.986 million. \$3.416 million from the \$7.118 million is required to be distributed to local authorities according to the roads grant Act formula.
- (3) JOLOR projects are subject to the same rules and qualifications that apply under the community employment programme generally. They are clearly set out in the printed guidelines for the programme

and I will arrange for a copy to be forwarded to the member.

### MEAT: INDUSTRY

#### *Government Involvement: Inquiry*

1843. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In regard to his earlier announcement that a private consultancy firm had been commissioned to study and make recommendations on the Government's future role in processing, trading, and control of the meat industry, what is the firm of consultants involved?
- (2) What is its terms of reference?
- (3) By what date is it to report?
- (4) What action has been taken to facilitate an input into the inquiry, from all sections of the trade so as to ensure a comprehensive report covering all aspects of the industry?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) As announced by the Premier on 19 September 1983, the inquiry into Government involvement in the meat industry will be in two phases. Submissions will first be invited on the terms of reference and after considering the submissions, the committee of inquiry will recommend to the Government where further inquiries might be undertaken. It is in this second stage that consultants will be involved.

No consideration has been given to which consultancy firms will be involved.

- (4) Draft terms of reference have been circulated to industry groups for comment. When finalised the terms of reference will be widely publicised and submissions invited.

### MEAT

#### *Statutory Acquisition: Referendum*

1844. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Can he give an undertaking that the Government will not move for statutory acquisition of meat, other than lamb, without a poll of the producers concerned?

Mr EVANS replied:

Yes.

### LAND: RESERVE

#### *Jarrah Park: Roads*

1845. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the proposed northern jarrah reserve, is he aware of the state of the roads?
- (2) Does he intend to provide funds to upgrade the area, roads, and any other facilities required, to cope with the increase in visitors?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) It is understood the reference to the northern jarrah reserve relates to the System 6 study report No. 8 of 1981 and in particular to area C73 Murray Valley management priority area.

The roads in this area are the responsibility of the respective local authorities and the Forests Department. From time to time funds are provided from the Main Roads Department to assist these bodies on approved road improvement projects.

If the member indicates specific roads which are causing concern, I will have further inquiries made.

### CULTURAL AFFAIRS

#### *Museums: Country*

1846. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) Has an inquiry been conducted or being conducted into funding of country museums?
- (2) If "Yes", when will the results be available?

Mr DAVIES replied:

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

### MINERAL SANDS

#### *Industry: Cover-up*

1847. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Regarding the article in the *Daily News* of 26 October 1983 headed "Unions Back Sands Move", did the health department clear the mineral sands indus-



try last year of unsafe levels of radioactivity?

- (2) Has the Government found any cover up by the former Government over the dangers involved in the production of monazite?
- (3) Does the Government support the unions mentioned in the article in calling on the shutdown of the mineral sands industry?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) to (3) The department has detected unsafe levels of radioactivity from time to time.

The Government is concerned with the adequacy of, and compliance with the codes of practice, regulations, and legislation regulating radiation protection in the mining, processing, and transport of heavy mineral sands and the disposal of tailings.

As a result, it has established a committee of review consisting of Professor Murray Winn of Sydney University, Dr John Mathews of the ACTU occupation health and safety unit, and Mr Alan Tough, Managing Director, Allied Enceabba Ltd.

The committee is currently conducting its review.

In addition, the interim mines radiation health board has been established and is responsible for ensuring continued radiation safety.

## AGRICULTURE

### Department: Research

1848. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture: Adverting to question 1772 of 1983, what proportion of the amount of—
- (a) \$49 122 000 for Department of Agriculture;
- (b) \$8 417 000 for Agriculture Protection Board,
- provided in the 1983-84 Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget originates from—
- (i) Consolidated Revenue Fund;
- (ii) Commonwealth extension services grants;
- (iii) industry research funds;
- (iv) other Commonwealth funding?

Mr EVANS replied:

		\$000
(a)	(i) .....	40 481
	(ii) .....	658
	(iii) .....	3 111
	(iv) .....	4 872
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>49 122</b>
		\$000
(b)	(i) CRF 100 per cent .....	8 417
	(ii) .....	Nil
	(iii) .....	Nil
	(iv) .....	Nil

## RAILWAYS

### Katanning

1849. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many crews are currently stationed at Westrail, Katanning?
- (2) Are there any plans to reduce the number of crews in Katanning?
- (3) If so, what reductions are planned and over what period?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Five drivers, 5 firemen, 6 guards and 2 shunters.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Planning is only in the preliminary stage at present but it indicates the progressive elimination of all the positions by 1988. Westrail will be following up preliminary discussions with the railway unions to ensure all concerned are fully informed on what will be taking place.

## RAILWAYS

### Katanning

1850. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Are there any plans to by-pass Katanning with grain trains from the Nyabing line?
- (2) If so—
- (a) when is it envisaged that this will occur;
- (b) what upgrading of the Katanning-Nyabing line is planned;
- (c) what is the estimated cost of upgrading?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) 1984-85;

- (b) The line will be upgraded to allow the operation of trains carrying heavier loads;  
 (c) \$551 000.

# HEALTH: CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES (KWINANA) PTY. LTD.

## *Waste Disposal: License*

1851. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Have Chemical Industries (Kwinana) Pty. Ltd. met the conditions required by him for disposal of chemical waste?
- (2) If so, what disposal method is being employed?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) No, but work is proceeding.
- (2) The firm has temporarily ceased manufacturing 2,4-D and is therefore not producing any process effluent that requires special disposal facilities.

# RAILWAYS: WESTRAIL

## *Deficit: Amount*

1852. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Referring to question 1737 of 1983, will he please list the significant items under headings "goods" and "other income" actually received for the year 1982-83 and estimated to be received for year 1983-84 to show the increases and decreases?
- (2) Under expenditure, will he please explain the reasons for the increases in—
  - (a) maintenance of rolling stock which is inconsistent with expectations resulting from introduction of five-year upgrading programme at Midland Workshops;
  - (b) maintenance track structures when increased efficiency and reduced numbers of people are involved;
  - (c) administration and general expenses when there has been a reduced number of people employed and Total West is not using Westrail's accounting system;
  - (d) salary and wages to \$6 million, equating this to the reduction of employees through retirements and resignations this year and men-

tioning why it is listed as a special item?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) Goods

	1982-83 \$m	1983-84 \$m
grain	68.08	67.27
ores and minerals	41.02	36.30
intersystem	20.64	20.86
coal	14.19	16.47
bulk oils	15.55	15.80
fertilisers	6.56	6.82
woodchips	3.91	3.81
timber	2.09	1.98

Other Income

rents	3.36	3.20
MTT—Recoup of cost of operating suburban services	19.07	25.29

- (2) (a) The increase of \$5.54 million on maintenance of rolling stock is mainly due to an anticipated inflation rate of 8.5 per cent and changes in the work programme. There will be a substantial increase in the number of units handled in 1983-84.
- (b) Maintenance of track structures will increase by \$4.52 million due to an increase in activity. Additional expenditure is required for the upgrading of the south-west mainline and the first year of a new four-year cyclic maintenance contract.
- (c) The increase of \$2.7 million in administration and general expenses mainly arises from a contribution of \$0.75 million to the railway accident and fire insurance fund (there was no contribution in 1982-83) and an increase of \$1.7 million in leveraged leasing charges.
- (d) The \$6 million for salary and wages is a provision for future variations to industrial awards and is based on the current staff levels. The equivalent figure in 1982-83 was \$10 million. This amount is distributed to the other headings of expenditure as the actual variations occur.

## RAILWAYS

*"Light Rail Bus Vehicles": Study*

1853. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport?

- (1) Referring to question 1652 of 1983 respecting the Westrail report on light rail passenger vehicles, since his answer appears inconsistent with fact as it relates to the study initiated by me into the evaluation of the light rail vehicles and the efficient running of our suburban rail system, will he table the report by two Westrail officers who travelled overseas and reviewed a wide range of light rail vehicles?
- (2) As there have been a number of comprehensive overall reviews to plan the public transport system for metropolitan Perth, both by private consultants and inhouse, will he apologise for attempting to mislead the Parliament?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The fact is that the study commissioned by the member when he was Minister for Transport was into the feasibility of diesel-powered low-cost light rail vehicles of which the only example in service is the British Rail Engineering-British Leyland railbus.

The overseas visit referred to formed part of the study and was the subject of an internal report in December 1982. The member had ample opportunity to table it himself. I do not intend to table that report since it is expensive to reproduce, with hand mounted photographs. However, I quote the summary in full here—

Late in 1981 Westrail was directed by the State Government to conduct a feasibility study into the possible use of light rail vehicles on the Perth-Armadale and Perth-Midland lines.

As part of the study it was determined that two senior officers of Westrail should travel overseas to collect information from manufacturers and operators of light rail vehicles.

In October-November 1982 the authors of this report visited Britain, Germany, Canada, and the United States of America.

The team gathered information on operational and technical features of the BRE—Leyland Railbus.

The indicative initial capital cost of a 2 car 141 class railbus is of the order of \$M1.1 with a minimum design life of 15 years. It seats approximately 124 passengers. A conventional power car and trailer costs approximately \$M1.8, has a minimum design life of 30 years and seats approximately 138 passengers.

Preliminary indications are that with some reservations, the narrow gauge version of the railbus could operate on Westrail's Urban rail system. The financial evaluation of the railbus will be undertaken by the Steering Committee.

Operational practices of various urban transport systems are recorded in this report.

As indicated in my answer to question 1652, the Westrail report on feasibility of introducing light rail passenger vehicles into the Perth metropolitan rail system is tabled.

- (2) There has been no comprehensive plan on the future rolling stock needs of Perth's suburban railway within the context of an overall plan for public transport in Perth. I do not propose to apologise for the member's apparent inability to comprehend English.

## RAILWAYS

*Midland Workshops: Budget Allocation*

1854. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Referring to question 1736 of 1983, what is the estimated cost of constructing 60 grain wagons at Midland Workshops this year?
- (2) What is the source and amount of funds to pay for items listed in (1)(a) and (b) of question 1736 respecting railcars and wagons?
- (3) What wagons have been retired or scrapped by Westrail this year?
- (4) Referring to part (4) of the above question, and knowing that private workshops are having a tough time in maintaining employees—

- (a) how is this work to be done at Midland Workshops without prejudicing the jobs from private workshops;
- (b) how can private enterprise compete with the workshops which have a large surplus of employees and resources;
- (c) what is the extent, expressed in value, of the private work to be attracted to the workshops?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) \$4.1 million.

- (2) (1) (a) Capital works are funded mainly from three sources; General Loan Fund, public borrowings and railway asset purchase fund. Individual assets, such as the 62 wagons in question, cannot be identified against any individual source of funds. The total cost is estimated at \$4.2 million.

(b) These wagons are being constructed under private contract and funded by the company concerned.

- (3) For the year to date approximately 200 old wagons have been scrapped.

- (4) (a) The majority of work Westrail is competing for is railway orientated, which the organisation has a special expertise and capacity to perform. In some cases Westrail would be competing for work which would otherwise be done outside of Western Australia.

(b) Westrail is generally competing in an open tendering situation for which its quoting-tender procedures are structured on normal commercial practices based on current capacity to carry out this type of work.

(c) This will depend on how successful Westrail is in attracting such activity.

## AGRICULTURE

### Department: Funding

1855. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture: What amount expended in the 1982-83 Budget on—

(a) Department of Agriculture—\$45 018 551;

(b) Agriculture Protection Board—\$8 242 018,

was allocated from the—

- (i) Consolidated Revenue Fund;
- (ii) Commonwealth extension services grant;
- (iii) industry research funds;
- (iv) other Commonwealth funding?

Mr EVANS replied:

		\$000
(a)	(i) .....	38 048
	(ii) .....	621
	(iii) .....	1 688
	(iv) .....	4 662

Total \$45 019

		\$000
(b)	(i) CRF 100% .....	8 242
	(ii) .....	Nil
	(iii) .....	Nil
	(iv) .....	Nil

## WATER RESOURCES

### Sirotherm Plant

1856. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

(1) How much is the Commonwealth and State Government funding regarding the Leederville Sirotherm plant?

(2) How far have the works been completed?

Mr TONKIN replied:

(1) \$1.113 million from the Commonwealth Government for the plant and its installation.

\$0.160 million from the Metropolitan Water Authority for ancillary site works.

(2) 90 per cent.

## SEWERAGE: POINT PERON

### Project: Progress

1857. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

(1) What is the general progress with constructing the Point Peron ocean outlet project?

(2) In particular, what percentage of work has been completed on the—

- (a) onshore pipeline;
- (b) onshore installations such as pumping stations, etc.;
- (c) programming the collection and diverting of waste water to serve the plant;
- (d) offshore pipeline and ancillary work,

and how do they compare with the estimates?

(3) How do the moneys expended on parts of the construction which is done by day labour compare with the 1982 estimates?

(4) Has the proportion of work to be done by contract and day labour respectively changed since the 1982 plans?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Very satisfactory.
- (2) (a) Approximately 80 per cent;
- (b) approximately 50 per cent;
- (c) work will be completed this month;
- (d) approximately 65 per cent.

All components are on or ahead of schedule.

(3) Slightly below the 1982 estimates.

(4) No.

## WATER RESOURCES

### *Installations: Disposal of Material*

1858. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

What is the approved procedure by the Metropolitan Water Authority for the disposing of material which is no longer used in Metropolitan Water Authority installations?

Mr TONKIN replied:

When the estimated value is between \$50 and \$800, the authority calls quotes for the purchase, accepts the highest bid and notifies the Tender Board of the disposal. Items of a value less than \$50 are sold direct by the authority on receiving an offer.

When the estimated value exceeds \$800, disposal is arranged through the Tender Board.

## WATER RESOURCES

### *Reservoirs: Alarm Systems*

1859. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

What is the aggregate all inclusive cost of upgrading all the alarm systems of Metropolitan Water Authority service reservoirs which he reportedly instructed the Metropolitan Water Authority to complete?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Overflow alarms, utilising telephone connections leased from Telecom, have recently been installed on 11 service reservoirs at a capital cost to the MWA of \$3 065.

Work is proceeding on alarms for reservoirs at Lake Thompson and Tamworth Hill which are remote from the telephone system. This work is estimated to cost a further \$6 000.

## GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

### *Professional Consultants*

1860. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

Has there been any progress made towards the consideration to include all Government departments and instrumentalities when considering the appointment of private professional consultants particularly architects for procuring Government buildings so that the very fair method of the Public Works Department's job procurement be extended and a more even spread of allocations of jobs to professional firms be achieved, instead of over using some firms and not providing others with Government jobs?

Mr McIVER replied:

This matter is currently under review.

## BRIDGE

### *Burswood: Cost-benefit Analysis*

1861. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has there been any cost benefit analysis study undertaken or is it proposed to be undertaken regarding the announced plan to construct Burswood Bridge-Swan River Drive?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) Swan River Drive is not part of the project that has been announced by the Government to construct a bridge over the Swan River at Burswood Island with connecting road links to Great Eastern Highway and to the Hamilton Interchange on the Mitchell Freeway.

The most recent study of costs and benefits of the project was carried out just over a year ago and confirmed it as an economic project.

## INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

### *Occupational Health, Safety, and Welfare: Legislation*

1862. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Regarding the recently published public discussion document on occupational health, safety, and welfare legislation, has there been a cost benefit analysis undertaken to ascertain the increase in the cost of goods manufactured and produced and/or services provided as a result of the proposed provisions of the legislation?
- (2) If not, is there going to be such an analytical study?
- (3) Has it been generally considered that excessive cost loading on employment has undoubted propaganda value, but without real improvement of conditions could create further disincentive of enterprise, decrease of competitiveness against other countries and consequent further decrease of employment?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No. There is no simple index of performance in the field of occupational health, safety, and welfare: cost benefit analysis is not necessarily a good indicator of performance, as many costs are hard to quantify.
- (3) The question of the member is not understood.

## TAXATION

### *Property-related*

1863. Mr MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What single uniform and property related rate of tax would provide roughly the same aggregate revenue from land tax as would the present owner-related progressive rates of tax?
- (2) If there are no figures easily available to answer (1), would he facilitate for me to have discussions with officers of the State Taxation Department in this matter of genuine concern to see the system, with the view of arriving at the nearest estimation for a property-related uniform tax rate?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) I assume the member is referring to the existing land subject to land tax and on this basis a uniform rate of 1.2 c per dollar of value would have to apply based on values for the 1982-83 year.
- (2) Not necessary.

## HEALTH

### *Asbestos: Controls*

1864. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Could he give information about any policy or rules pertaining to the exposure of asbestos dust arising from the use of asbestos in the building and other industries?
- (2) Are there any controls (such as exist in the United Kingdom by the health and safety commission) in existence, or are they envisaged to clarify alleged and usually exaggerated hazards and allow the unhindered manufacture, construction and use of this material in its different applications when it is within the prescribed controls?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) There are regulations under the Factories and Shops Act and regulations will shortly be enacted under the Construction Safety Act. The National Health and Medical Research Council has recommended a number of codes of practice for the safe handling of asbestos and consideration is being given to enacting these in legislation.
- (2) Yes, as I have just outlined.

## EDUCATION

*Non-Government School: John XXIII*

1865. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) What is the size in hectares of the land in my electorate proposed to be transferred for the purposes of the John XXIII College?
- (2) Is it a condition of the transfer that the whole of the land should be used, either immediately or in the future, for direct purposes of the college?
- (3) Who is going to be responsible for the planning and construction of the access road to the college site?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Negotiations are still proceeding between the John XXIII College and the Mental Health Services to determine the fine details of the boundary for the college site. The detailed arrangements regarding its future use and provision of an access road have not yet been finalised.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

## FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

*North-West Shelf: Royalties*

1866. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) With regard to the North-West Shelf project, what royalty sharing arrangement will prevail in relation to the project?
- (2) What administrative arrangement relating to royalties have been agreed with the Commonwealth?
- (3) What level of royalties will be paid and how is it calculated?
- (4) What royalties will be payable to the Federal Government?
- (5) What is the estimated royalty income to Western Australia from the project from 1 July 1984, through to 30 June 1989, from the domestic gas phase?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) See the Commonwealth Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act and the Commonwealth Petroleum (Submerged Lands) (Royalty) Act.
- (3) 12.5 per cent of the well-head value of the petroleum produced.

(4) 32 per cent.

(5) This cannot as yet be estimated.

1867. *This question was postponed.*

## TAXATION

*Resources Development*

1868. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology:

- (1) In view of the statement made by Federal Minister Walsh to the Securities Institute of Australia luncheon on Friday, 14 October, that Canberra would proceed to introduce a resource rent tax, and that Canberra would use its power to remove the States from the offshore royalty sharing arrangements, what steps has he taken to protect this State's income from the North-West Shelf project and Bowan Island oilfield?
- (2) Is the State Government strongly objecting to the current review of the administrative arrangements applying under the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act which is designed to withdraw responsibility from Western Australia, and remove it to Canberra?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government will take appropriate action to protect the State's position during the course of consultation with the Commonwealth Government.

## RAILWAYS

*Bowelling-Wagin: Reopening*

1869. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the Wagin-Bowelling railway line, how many submissions were received supporting the reopening of the line?
- (2) Were there any submissions advocating closure of the line?
- (3) Apart from local government authorities, and those persons nominated in the Press release announcing the Government's decision, did he receive any other approaches regarding the future of the line?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Seven.
- (2) One.
- (3) Yes. All were in favour of re-opening the line.

## RAILWAYS

*Bowelling-Wagin: Upgrading*

1870. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the Wagin-Bowelling railway line, when is it intended upgrading and repair works will commence?
- (2) Is it proposed to call tenders for all or any of the work involved?
- (3) If not, how will it be undertaken?
- (4) What is the division of costs for—
  - (a) labour;
  - (b) materials?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Restoration of this railway line will commence on 14 November.
- (2) and (3) Earthworks will be carried out under existing plant hire contracts, quotations will be called for hire and track machines, and the balance of the work will be done using Westrail resources.
- (4) The latest estimates are—

	\$
(a) labour .....	43 500
(b) materials .....	29 500
(c) other (contract work) .....	63 000
	<hr/>
	\$136 000.
	<hr/>

## TRANSPORT: ROAD

*Road Train Services*

1871. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the discussions which were held regarding the possible extension of road train services in the great southern and south-eastern areas, what discussions were held with local government authorities?
- (2) Has a report on the road situation and possible road damage resulting from any increase in road train operations, been received?
- (3) As an increase in road train operations will greatly assist transport activity in the south-eastern areas, when is a decision going to be made?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) There have been discussions between officers of the Main Roads Department and officers of the Wagin and Katanning Shire Councils with particular regard to possible routes through Wagin and Katanning for road trains carrying livestock.
- (2) No. I expect to receive a report later this month on the Albany Highway trial involving road trains carrying livestock.
- (3) Decisions regarding on-going road train operations will be made following consideration of the Albany Highway trial report.

## MINING: DIAMONDS

*Equity Purchase: Marketing Arrangements*

1872. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) With regard to the Government's purchase of equity in the Argyle diamond venture, is the Government aware of discussions between Arslanian Freres and the central selling organisation regarding future diamond sales and marketing arrangements?
- (2) Does the Northern Mining Corporation Ltd. marketing arrangement with Arslanian Freres involve any commitment to a minimum price per carat?
- (3) If not, what is the basis of the marketing arrangement?
- (4) Was the Treifus organisation asked to advise on the Government's purchase and marketing projections?
- (5) If so, did the Treifus advice support the Government's contention that its 5 per cent share would maintain a 12-15 per cent margin over the diamonds sold through the Central Selling Organisation?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) This information is confidential for commercial reasons.
- (4) and (5) The Treifus organisation's regular market reports were consulted in Government's consideration of the purchase and marketing projections. Those reports commented favourably on the sales methods used by Northern Mining in obtaining a margin over diamonds sold through the Central Selling Organisation.



## MINING: DIAMONDS

### *Equity Purchase: Reports and Projections*

1873. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) With regard to any reports and projections used by the Government to support its acquisition of equity in the Argyle diamond project, by whom were the reports and projections prepared?
- (2) Who advised the Government on appropriate persons or companies to assess the worth and benefit of the purchase?
- (3) Were any of the reports or projections made available to any person or company outside of Government?
- (4) If so, to which person or organisation?
- (5) Is it intended to make available for public consideration any of the reports and projections prepared for the Government?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) I refer the member to my answer to part (1) of his question 1777 of 26 October.
- (2) The decision as to appropriate advisers was made by the Government. The Government did not need to seek advice as to who would be appropriate.
- (3) and (4) L. R. Connell and Partners commissioned the accounting firm, Price Waterhouse, to carry out an assessment of that company's report and the reports and projections would have been available to that firm.
- (5) No. The reports and projections contain information which is of a commercial nature and needs to be kept confidential.

## TOWN PLANNING

### *Nedlands*

1874. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) On what date was the City of Nedlands town planning scheme submitted to him for preliminary approval to permit advertising and progression of the scheme?
- (2) When is it likely that the scheme will receive his consideration?
- (3) What is the reason for the delay?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The scheme was first submitted for preliminary approval in September 1979, and at that time was not granted preliminary approval, as some of its proposals were considered by the previous Minister to be unworkable. A revised scheme was then submitted for preliminary approval in December 1982, and after examination by the Town Planning Department and the Town Planning Board involving further consultations with the Nedlands City Council and its consultants, the board submitted its recommendations to me in June 1983. My decision made in the light of the board's recommendations, was to require certain modifications to be made before preliminary approval would be granted. The council has since requested my reconsideration of some modifications and the board made further recommendations to me in September 1983.
- (2) The scheme is presently receiving my consideration.
- (3) It is not considered that there is a "delay". The Nedlands district planning scheme is a complex and important document which necessitates a careful examination and proper consideration. It is likely that the council will be advised of my further decision within a few days.

## ROAD

### *Curtin Avenue: Widening*

1875. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When is road widening of Curtin Avenue between Jarrad Street and Salvado Road to be carried out?
- (2) What is the total cost?
- (3) What are the sources of funds and in each case, how much will be applied to meet the total cost?
- (4) Is it fact that the road widening will encroach upon the existing strip of land between residences and Curtin Avenue?
- (5) Is it fact—
  - (a) that there is an established reserve adjacent to the railway to the east of Curtin Avenue for the development of a north-south road;

- (b) that the reserve is currently occupied by the Cottesloe Police Station and a pedestrian overpass?
- (6) Why is it considered desirable to make expensive short-term improvements to Curtin Avenue, when it will be necessary in the years ahead to establish a new north-south road in the reservation east of Curtin Avenue?
- (7) If it is considered necessary to widen Curtin Avenue would it not be preferable to widen it on the east side rather than towards the residences?
- (8) Will he intervene, at my request, on behalf of the residents of Curtin Avenue to reconsider the widening of the road until in conjunction with the Main Roads Department, and as part of the plans for a north-south road, the widening can be effected on the east side of Curtin Avenue?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) I understand that Cottesloe Town Council intends to carry out the work during November-December 1983.
- (2) Estimated by council at approximately \$80 000.
- (3) Metropolitan councils' road programme (urban pool) \$80 000.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) (a) Reservation has been made in the metropolitan region scheme for an "other major highway" partly on the existing rail reserve and also on other Government reserves. Previous uses continue which currently preclude the use of much of this reservation for a new highway.
- (b) Yes.
- (6) \$80 000 is not considered expensive to cater safely and efficiently for existing traffic volumes as an extension to similar widening work already undertaken by council north of Jarrad Street. Such efficiency and safety is essential in the interim period prior to finalisation of proposals for a new north-south route and the subsequent construction of sections of that route having higher priority.
- (7) Council's maximum intended encroachment upon the existing strip of land between the residences and Curtin Avenue is 2.6 m. This was necessary in order not to affect the existing police station, the

pedestrian overpass, and railway embankments along the eastern side of Curtin Avenue. Wherever possible council has concentrated widening on the east side.

- (8) Council's proposals appear reasonable and under the circumstances they should be allowed to proceed.

## WATER RESOURCES

### *Rates: Surf Lifesaving Clubs*

1876. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is a surf lifesaving club liable for payment of water rates in respect of its premises used as headquarters for its surf lifesaving operations?
- (2) If so, does this liability arise if the club is situated on Crown land which is vested in the club?
- (3) Has he received legal advice to the effect that the liability of such a club in these circumstances cannot be questioned?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) In both the metropolitan and country areas, any land used solely or principally for the normal activities and purposes of surf lifesaving clubs is exempt from rates.
- Where such land is connected to scheme water or sewerage services it is liable for annual fees for services provided and charges for any water consumption beyond allowance.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### TOURISM

#### *Country Organisations: Funds Formula*

453. Mr D. L. SMITH, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government recently changed the funds formula for country tourist organisations?
- (2) If so, will he give details?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) Yesterday I announced a significant funding boost for country tourist organisations in Western Australia. The improved funding arrange-

ments will provide country towns and regions with an incentive to promote and encourage tourism in their localities.

Regional travel associations have received a 150 per cent increase in funds, their base grant rising from \$2 000 to \$5 000. The regional travel associations have a major role to play in the country tourism network and I believe the increase in funds will act as an incentive for them to get properly organised.

Under the new funding formula, country tourism bureaux can now qualify for a maximum of \$10 000, a jump of \$2 000 on the previous grants. The base grant has been increased from \$4 000 to \$5 000 and the matching \$1 for \$1 subsidy on local authority contributions has also risen from \$4 000 to \$5 000.

Tourist information centres can now qualify for a maximum of \$1 000 where previously the most they could receive was \$600.

The new arrangements will operate as from the start of the 1983-84 financial year and all country tourist organisations which have already received their grants will be entitled to the extra funding.

The Government is keen to encourage and foster a strong country tourism network. We have provided an additional \$73 000 for the three levels of country tourism organisations this financial year and we propose to maintain proper funding in an ongoing manner.

However, the operations of the country tourist organisations will in future come under closer scrutiny. There will be greater accountability and monitoring of results if such funding is to be maintained.

Tourism is already the major industry for many country towns and it is becoming increasingly important for many others. It is essential for the development of our tourism industry that country towns provide facilities and amenities for travellers. Again, at the regional level, the travel associations have an equally important function in promoting their regions as tourist destinations through such avenues as brochures and exhibitions. The increased funding enables the country tourist organisations to widen their activities and

demonstrates the Government's commitment to fostering tourism in the country regions.

## MINING: URANIUM

### *Yeelirrie: Federal Inquiry*

454. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Will he give the House an undertaking that the Government will make a submission to the Federal Government's inquiry into Australia's involvement in nuclear energy for the purpose of getting approval for development of the Yeelirrie uranium deposit?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I have not had any notice of the question and on that basis I would not think the Leader of the Opposition would expect me to give him an undertaking of the sort he has requested.

Mr O'Connor: I am asking whether you will stand up for Western Australia.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I understood the question required an undertaking that we make a submission to the Federal Government's inquiry with a view to ensuring that Yeelirrie proceeds.

Mr O'Connor: Correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I did not necessarily understand that to mean that, translated, the question was, "Will we stand up for Western Australia?" If that is the question, undoubtedly we will always stand up for Western Australia; but I did not understand that to be the question. As I indicated, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition expects a detailed answer to his question on that basis; however, I am prepared to give him a detailed answer if he places a question on the Notice Paper.

## AGED PERSONS

### *Home Support Scheme*

455. Mrs BEGGS, to the Minister for Health:

On 27 October the Minister advised, in answer to a question, that a special allocation had been made in the Budget to implement the Government's policy in respect of its programme to encourage and assist elderly citizens to remain in their own homes for as long as they are able. In that answer, he listed four services which provide home support and which had received funds and indicated that further allocations may be made.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member should ask her question.

Mrs BEGGS: I am about to ask—

Can he advise now whether any further projects have been approved and, if so, which ones?

Mr HODGE replied:

I am pleased to be able to advise the member that in addition to the four projects which have already been funded at a total joint cost to the State and Commonwealth Governments of \$219 600, a further three projects have now been approved under the State Grants (Home Care) Act for home-care services. A further amount of \$5 000 each has been allocated to the following three projects: Bayswater Elderly Citizens Help Organisation; Busselton Elderly Support Services; and Nedlands City.

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Community Employment Programme: Guidelines*

456. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

It is reported in today's *Daily News* that he has associated himself with the Federal Minister for Finance (Hon. John Dawkins) and the State Minister for Local Government (Hon. Jeff Carr) in an effort to help local authorities to get money from State and Federal sources to create jobs. I ask—

- (1) Does he agree that most country local government authorities are facing great difficulty in meeting the guidelines which now apply; for example, many small country shires never record high unemployment statistics because their unemployed

usually move to either a large rural town or the metropolitan area as soon as they lose their employment? This is aggravated by the fact that accommodation is often associated with the job—lose the job and lose the accommodation.

- (2) Will he seek to modify the existing guidelines so as to make the schemes much more available to these country shires?
- (3) Does he agree that the criteria for grants under the Commonwealth employment programme, other than unemployment, are also too restrictive and probably therefore responsible for the paucity of applications coming forward?
- (4) Will he seek to have the conditions eased?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (4) Firstly, I have not received a single approach from a local authority—country or otherwise—concerning the nature of the guidelines and how they affect them. I indicated that in answer to a question on the Notice Paper.

Mr Clarko: I can assure you they are concerned.

Mr PARKER: They may be, but I have not been approached.

Mr Clarko: It is too tight; that is why they have not applied.

Mr PARKER: There have been other approaches about the guidelines and there are a number of concerns about them; indeed, at the Labor Ministers' conference in Adelaide in May, at which the guidelines were first revealed, and on subsequent occasions in my negotiations with the Commonwealth, I have tried to have some of the guidelines changed, but with only partial success. There is to be a further review of the guidelines after some operation of the community employment programme in early March next year when the next meeting of Labor Ministers takes place in, I think, Sydney. The point the member made about the high unemployment is taken. It is our aim to try to assist appropriately the real position in respect of any particular area which applies for assistance. The problem does not appear to

me to have been that areas with high unemployment have not been able to be funded. The real problem has been that there has been a large number of local authorities—particularly because of the complexity of the guidelines and because the local authorities have not been aware of the diversity of the job creation programmes—which have not applied in a way which has enabled us to fund them. It is our intention to rectify this situation in a number of ways. The article to which the member referred is just one small part of one of those ways.

We have received funds, which are under my control, from the Commonwealth Government for the purposes of assisting in administering these programmes, and it is intended to recruit employment development officers, for want of a better name, to assist local authorities and community groups throughout the State to put in applications and to consider the sorts of issues that may well be relevant in terms of applying for funding. In quite a number of areas of the State, local authorities and community groups have not had the facilities and expertise to put in applications that could be funded under the guidelines. It is our intention to assist them and to have these people assisted in different parts of the State in order to ensure that the funds are widely distributed. As for the existing guidelines, I have not had any direct approach. The only aspect of the guidelines that really concerns me is their restricted nature. I am quite happy to consider the matter further with my Federal counterpart.

## EDUCATION

### *Beazley Committee of Inquiry*

457. Mr READ, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Minister read the comments on primary education made by Mr Kim Beazley Senior which appeared in the most recent edition of *WA Education News*?
- (2) Does the Minister view these remarks as casting aspersions on primary education and educators in this State?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) I thank the member for that question, which deals with an article

which appeared on the front page of *WA Education News* quoting a speech given by Mr Kim Beazley Senior, who is the chairman of the very prestigious, Australia-recognised Beazley inquiry.

Mr Blaikie: You need Cabinet approval for this answer.

Mr PEARCE: I do not require Cabinet approval to answer questions in this House, and nor do other Ministers.

As I interpret Mr Beazley's comments in relation to his brief, he is pointing to his own opinion that there needs to be a great commitment in the structure of schooling, at both the primary and secondary level, to place a greater emphasis on literacy and numeracy. I cannot find it in my heart to disagree.

Mr Clarko: The unions probably would; they traditionally object to people saying that.

Mr PEARCE: They may have objected to the member for Karrinyup saying that.

Mr Clarko: I have never said it.

Mr PEARCE: All the evidence is that in recent times there has been a marginal improvement in numeracy and literacy, but that does not take away from the fact—

Mr Clarko: That is not what the Priest report said; it could not find either way.

Mr PEARCE: The Priest report reviewed some evidence, but there is other evidence which has been accumulated in great detail by the Beazley inquiry and which points in the direction I have indicated. Nevertheless I believe Mr Beazley is right in pointing to the fact that our society will continue to require very high levels of literacy and numeracy and indeed higher levels as the technological requirements of our society increase.

Mr Clarko: Very well said; I applaud that comment.

Mr PEARCE: Nevertheless I do not believe Mr Beazley's comments can reasonably be interpreted as an attack on the commitment of teachers in Western Australia. I have toured many country and city schools now and I have been impressed with members of our teaching profession and their commitment. I think Mr Beazley is not pointing a bone at teachers by way of being critical of their personal commitment, because he

has said in discussion with me many times that he is impressed with the professional commitment of teachers in Government schools. He is pointing out what he sees as a structural flaw, and undoubtedly his committee will make recommendations on this matter.

## MINING: URANIUM

### *Yeelirrie: Federal Policy*

458. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Was the Premier correctly reported in *The West Australian* this morning when he was quoted as saying, "I hope that all members of the party will pull together now to implement the policy as it has been interpreted by the national Government"?
- (2) If so, will he explain to the House whether he wants party members to pull together to implement the policy, which excludes development of Yeelirrie, or is he interpreting the Federal Government's decision as one which may soon be extended to include development of Yeelirrie?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Leader of the Opposition seems intent on attempting to ignore what we have stated in this Parliament on several previous occasions, which is that the issue to which his question refers is one that has been controversial and difficult for the Labor Party to deal with. The quote the Leader of the Opposition has repeated to the Parliament is an accurate one of what I had to say in expressing an opinion about that difficulty and about the controversy surrounding the issue. It was said simply to mean that the Government and I hope the Labor Party will not, as it has in the past, publicly dash itself upon the rocks of this controversy. That is what I was trying to say to the reporter who asked me the question, and that is what the quote means.

Mr Laurance: You all want to pull together, but which way?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not think members opposite really appreciate being told quite directly and frankly what the situation is. The quote relates entirely to that difficulty and to the danger to the Labor Party, in Government and in Op-

position throughout the country, of a major disagreement or a major disaffection of a significant part of the party over this issue.

That is what the quote was all about. I know people disagree strongly on this matter, but this is simply because the Labor Party is a party of principle and not one of convenience.

Mr Clarko: No, your Federal big brother has told you what to do; that is what it amounts to. You have made no decisions. You just accept the ones being imposed on you.

Mr Peter Jones: Western Australia comes last.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The statement that we are not a party of convenience may be disarmingly direct to members of the Opposition, but it is the truth, and that is what the quote referred to.

## HEALTH

### *Medical Centres: Dongara and Kalbarri*

459. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Health:

I refer to question 1638 of Wednesday 26 October in which I asked the Minister—

Would he please supply details of Budget allocations to each of the proposed medical centres at Kalbarri and Dongara?

The Minister answered—

A global allocation of \$500 000 has been provided for the proposed centres at Rottnest, Dongara, and Kalbarri. Replanning is proceeding to ensure that the proposed facilities for each of these locations can be contained within the total allocation.

The SPEAKER: Could the member ask his question.

Mr TUBBY: Obviously the Minister has not answered my question. I now ask the Minister—

Would he please explain why he would not answer my question when on the same day he gave a news release giving the very information I sought to the *Geraldton Guardian*? I had thought better of the Minister for Health than for him to come at these tactics. Naturally I wish to

explain to the interested shires what is going on in respect of the Government's answers to questions.

Mr Blaikie: This is interesting, sneaky.

Mr HODGE replied:

As far as I am concerned, I answered the question fully and in a satisfactory manner.

Several members interjected.

Mr O'Connor: He does not know.

Mr Bertram: Better than what the Opposition used to give.

### ANIMALS

#### *Kangaroos: Shooting*

460. Mr SPRIGGS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are restrictions being enforced on kangaroo shooters in this States?
- (2) How many kangaroo tags were issued in 1982-1983?
- (3) What reductions will there be in tags issued in 1984?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) The member did discuss this matter briefly with me at the end of last week. I cannot give him the precise numbers of the tags issued, but I will certainly undertake to do this by the end of this week.
- (2) and (3) The question regarding the culling of kangaroos is under very close scrutiny and examination. As the member knows, an allocation of animals for culling has been set in each State and at this stage Western Australia is very close to its take for the year. For this reason, scaling down of operations is necessary to ensure that an undesirable situation is not reached. The figures the member requires will certainly be made available to him.

Mr Barnett: Well answered.

### DRAINAGE

#### *Rates: Subsidy*

461. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Adverting to his reply to question 1614 (2), I ask—

What are the estimated total losses, or Government subsidies, for all land drainage districts for 1983-84 including the operating loss and capital charges not absorbed?

Mr Carr (for Mr TONKIN) replied:  
The information the member seeks is as follows—

Operating loss .....	\$692 556
Capital charges not absorbed .....	\$641 501

### LAND

#### *South Perth*

462. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Planning and Administrative Services:

Did the proposal to build a medical centre on State Housing Commission land at Ranelagh Crescent, South Perth, have any bearing on—

(a) the decision by the Government to sell the land to the company involved;

(b) the sale price of the land?

Mr PARKER replied:

(a) and (b) I have not had any discussions with the Minister for Housing about this matter. However, I am advised by the Minister for Health, and certainly it is my understanding, that neither he nor I know anything about the proposed medical clinic which was referred to in the newspaper article about which the member speaks.

In relation to the valuation of the land, I am aware that this was some of the land which was identified quite apart from any proposed future use of the land—in terms of medical clinics at least—by the Government for sale as part of its election commitments to sell certain State Housing Commission land in order to fund the construction of additional State Housing Commission accommodation. The report which recommended the sale of various parcels of land, including that portion, was supplied to me and, in my capacity as the Minister who has the authority to either approve or otherwise the disposal of Government land, I gave approval for its disposal. I imagine the valuation of the land is related to its current zoning under the City of South

Perth town planning scheme. If it is related to anything else, I suggest the investors concerned should proceed very cautiously.

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Jobs on Local Roads*

463. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Can he give me a report on the success or otherwise of the programme to create employment known as "JOLOR", or jobs on local roads, which was introduced by the Federal Government last May and administered through local authorities and the Department of Main Roads?

(2) How many people are employed in that project?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) and (2) As the member knows, this is a Federal matter. It is, however, one on which I am prepared to obtain the information and advise the member in due course.

## MINING: URANIUM

### *Yeelirrie: Government Attitude*

464. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

I am just trying to obtain a simple reply as to where the Government is going in this area. Therefore, I ask a very simple question—

Will the Premier assure the House that the Government will do everything possible to facilitate the development of the Yeelirrie uranium deposits?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I have said on numerous occasions in this House that we are perfectly happy to support the Yeelirrie project provided the Federal Government is prepared to grant an export licence. We do not have the facility to grant the licence.

Mr Clarko: No, but give them a lead.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have said several times today and previously that we have made a number of representations to the Federal Government on this matter.

Mr Rushton: Do you want it?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know what the member or the Leader of the Opposition wants, but we have made a

number of representations to the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. I repeated that again today.

Mr O'Connor: We are prepared to join you in a very firm effort to go over and get something—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition had five years to get the project off the ground.

Mr O'Connor: We did that. We had \$35 million spent on it.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: All that happened while the Opposition was in control of the fortunes of the project was that one of the joint venturers up and left the State.

Mr Clarko: Don't shout.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is a lot of humbug and nonsense for the Opposition to keep going on like this in regard to this matter.

Mr O'Connor: You are walking on water.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I really do not mind, but we have made a number of representations to the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister and, believe it or not, whether the Opposition can accept it or not, we do not have the ability to grant an export licence.

Mr Clarko: No, but give them a lead.

Mr Williams: Go out and shout it from the roof tops.

## WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

### *Establishment: Financial Advice*

465. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

(1) Is the Government seeking outside financial advice on its proposal to establish the Western Australian development corporation with subsidiary companies in which the public can take shares?

(2) If "Yes", what firm or firms are being used?

(3) Is this proposed complex company structure being used so the State avoids paying Federal income tax?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) to (3) The proposed complex structure is not being used in any way at the moment and no detailed consideration is being given to the avoidance of Federal



income tax, although I know this is the second time the member has raised the matter with the implication that we should attempt to maximise the benefit of any arrangement into which we enter by seeing whether legitimately—I suppose he means—we can avoid any income tax.

I suppose at least four or five different organisations have submitted to the Government proposals that touch upon the development corporation. The proposals in some cases have been very detailed, and in other cases brief, and have simply gone to the main elements of the proposal.

I really do not know the names of all the people who have submitted proposals. I do not know that one can say that anyone has been “used” in this sense. Certainly I am not aware of anyone who has been paid to give advice on this matter. So, in the same way, I guess, as the previous Government received helpful suggestions from different business people when plans were announced to institute some organisation, that has certainly been the case with us; but I do not know of anyone who has been paid to carry out the work the member refers to.

### MINERAL SANDS

#### *Industry: Cover-up*

466. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

In answer to question 1847 today, the Minister failed to answer parts (2) and (3). Those parts were—

(2) Has the Government found any cover-up by the former Government over the dangers involved in the production of monazite?

(3) Does the Government support the unions mentioned in *The Daily News* article of 26 October 1983, headed “Unions Back Sands Move” in calling on the shutdown of the mineral sands industry in Western Australia?

Mr HODGE replied:

The member is incorrect. In fact, I answered parts (1) to (3) with one answer, that covered all those parts.

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

#### *Number*

467. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

I refer him to my previous question and his undertaking to supply me with the information sought. My question related to his policy commitments to reduce staff by 50 per cent. I will not go through it all.

The SPEAKER: Just ask the question.

Mr Brian Burke: I hope you won't go through it all.

Mr RUSHTON: I am only identifying the question. Will the Premier now let me have the projections of the staff that would be reduced and the gain in expenditure from each of those departments relative to the reductions to be achieved in this financial year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

My inability to answer the question previously, apart from, I suppose, relating to any lack of capacity that I have, was simply centred on the impossibilities of making the estimate the member was talking about; that is, the prediction of how many people might retire or resign. I can now, however, give the member the statistical returns for the first few months of the policy. I am happy for him to have that statistical return, and to use that as a basis for his calculations. If, for example, two months' figures are provided, if he multiplies them by six, he will get some sort of rough estimate of the end result. I am happy to give the member those figures. Depending on how many months' figures I have available, the member should multiply it by the appropriate number to get the result for 12 months.

Mr Barnett: Well answered.

### AGRICULTURE

#### *Industry: Indebtedness*

468. Mr McNEE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is the Minister aware of an increase in the level of indebtedness of the rural industries caused primarily by poor seasons, high interest rates and the lack of availability of long-term finance?

- (2) If he is aware of this, has he discussed the matter with the Treasurer? If so, is any action proposed?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) I am aware in a general sense of an increased level of indebtedness and, indeed, a greater level of indebtedness by rural producers in this State, *vis-à-vis* producers in other States. For that reason, I am very grateful that the Federal Government this year has almost doubled its contribution to rural ad-

justment funds. Although I am always hopeful those funds will not be required, I very much fear that this year they will be required.

- (2) As far as additional financing is concerned, investigations are currently under way seeking other avenues for rural financing, though these are in the preliminary stages at this time.