



# **Parliamentary Debates**

**(HANSARD)**

THIRTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT  
THIRD SESSION  
2000

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 27 June 2000

# Legislative Council

Tuesday, 27 June 2000

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon George Cash) took the Chair at 3.30 pm, and read prayers.

## **PROSTITUTION BILL 1999**

*Assent*

Message from the Administrator received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

## **AERIAL SPRAYING OF INTENSIVE MONOCULTURE TREE FARMING**

*Petition*

Hon Bob Thomas presented a petition, by delivery to the Clerk, from 524 persons praying that the Government ban the aerial spraying of intensive monoculture tree farming in the great southern region.

[See paper No 1103.]

## **ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2) 2000**

*President's Ruling*

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon George Cash): On 23 May this year I ruled that the Road Traffic Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2000 was not a Bill subject to Standing Order 230(c). My ruling was based on the provisions of the Bill and supporting documentation. In particular, I held that the ability of the state authorities to apply national standards, with or without variation, indicated that no commonwealth-state agreement appeared to be involved. I was advised yesterday that the Bill does, in fact, reflect such an agreement through proposed sections 103A and 103B. Accordingly, Standing Order 230(c) did and still does apply to the Bill.

## **PARTNERSHIP 21, LOCAL TOURIST BUREAUS**

*Urgency Motion*

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon George Cash): I have received the following letter addressed to me and dated 27 June -

Dear Mr President

At today's sitting, it is my intention to move under SO 72 that the House, at its rising, adjourn until 9.00 am on 25 December 2000 for the purpose of discussing the Government's failure to support local tourist bureaus under the Partnership 21 program and the consequent impact for local tourism.

Yours sincerely

Tom Stephens MLC  
Member for Mining and Pastoral Region

In order to discuss this matter, it will be necessary for at least four members to indicate their support by rising in their places.

[At least four members rose in their places.]

**HON TOM STEPHENS** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [3.38 pm]: I move -

That the House at its rising adjourn until 9.00 am on 25 December.

As a matter of urgency this motion expresses concern about the Government's new Partnership 21 program and draws the attention of the House to the fact that this Government, accompanied by fanfare, made much of the value of this Partnership 21. Regrettably, at the launch of the program at Lake Monger, the Government refused to detail the specific costs - presumably because it did not know the costs. Not only does the Government appear not to know the cost of the extravagant launch of Partnership 21 -

Hon N.F. Moore: We didn't know on the day - one doesn't know until one pays the bill. You could have put that on the list.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The Minister for Tourism might tell us now whether he knows the cost, because it is one of the issues in which the Opposition continues to maintain an interest.

Most importantly, this program runs the risk of not creating for the regions and those local tourist bureaus the benefits that should be the hallmark of government initiatives in this area. Instead, the Government is effectively foisting on small Western Australian tourist bureaus a Partnership 21 initiative which is not being greeted with the universal acclaim that the Government would have us believe is the hallmark of this program.

Today I have had direct contact with a number tourist bureaus in many parts of this State. I will focus on the comments I have heard from various parts of the electorate that I share with the Minister for Tourism, who should display more

sensitivity to the tourist bureaux' needs than he does. The main concern is that the Government is asking local government and tourist bureaux to bear the burden of administration and dealing with clients, without any incentive. They are asking what is the gain for them. They will need to provide more highly trained staff to cope with the new system. The new software program will divert calls from consumers looking for a tourist product to a recorded telephone message, stripped of personal contact. If the caller wishes to make inquiries about Broome, he will be required to press -

Hon N.F. Moore: It is voice activated.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: My main point is still true: It is depersonalised.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is the most personalised system ever invented.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the House will get his opportunity to speak.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It is a depersonalised, voice-activated system. That is an advance on what I and the tourist bureaux understood to be the case. They believe their clients will be required to deal with a push-button system that will divert their calls to various regional or local offices. They are understandably angry about this process. Those tourist bureaux are effectively the engine room of tourism in Western Australia. They should be given the respect, regard and support they deserve from this Government instead of being victimised and left to face financial ruin. Many bureaux survive on commissions from accommodation. The booking service will now be centralised in Perth, and general information inquiries will be diverted to the tourist bureaux. An inquirer with a knowledge of the product he wants does not have the opportunity to be diverted to the region. As a result, the commission is siphoned away from the tourist bureaux.

Partnership 21 is removing profit-making activities from these regional bureaux and giving the spoils either to private enterprise or to a central organisation. The State Government's you-beaut call centre will no longer deal with the time-consuming inquiries about places like Windjana Gorge or Cape Leveque. Those calls will now be diverted to the local tourist bureaux even when there is no financial return. The Government will hive off the work to the small bureaux and the money-making tourism bookings will be shunted to the big hotels that can afford the \$1 035 entry fee for their participation in Partnership 21.

Hon N.F. Moore: Who gave you that figure?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: That is the figure the tourist bureaux have been told to expect.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is the top-of-the-range option. There is also a free option. Did you mention that? That is about the right price for you.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This runs the risk of being a one-way partnership, which means the top end of town will get richer and the smaller and more isolated businesses will be shafted by this Minister for Tourism. Partnership 21 is an example of a Government gone mad.

It is no wonder that tourist bureau operators are calling to express their concerns. They have been told that they must come or send staff to Perth for the 15-16 July weekend, which is the peak tourist season and the school holiday period. These people must come to a forum to discuss this new total-concept Partnership 21. Rather than having this foisted on them at the peak of the season, they should have been and could have been involved in a consultation process. They could have been involved in influencing the direction taken rather than having their views fall on deaf ears, their advice ignored and the minister's displaying all the hallmarks of a member of an arrogant Government. The public of Western Australia sees this Government as arrogant in its response to the needs of the community. None is more arrogant than the Minister for Tourism and Leader of the Government in this House.

The tourist bureaux have asked who will be paying for the 1800 telephone number they will be required to use as part of the new service. The Government will expect a high level of customer service from the tourist bureaux, but it has not allocated any funding for training of staff -

Hon N.F. Moore: You are reading Mr McGowan's speech - although this is worse than his.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: No, I am drawing on the comments made to me by people in the tourist bureaux who are concerned about their fate at the hands of this Government. Some of these people know the vindictive nature of this Government and do not want to be identified. They know that, under this Minister for Tourism and this arrogant Government, they run the risk of being victimised if they complain that the new system will cause them problems. They fear that inquiry calls to the virtual centre will be put through to the local tourist bureaux, but the easy calls - from those simply wanting accommodation or tour bookings - will be directed to the accredited travel agents. That may be all very well for the travel agents and there may be some with particular regard for their interests, but the Minister for Tourism should also be concerned about the tourist bureaux. That concern has not been evident, and it should be. Members on this side have previously pointed out to the minister why he should show more regard for the tourism industry than he does.

The tourist bureaux, which would ordinarily receive a commission for bookings, will miss out and there will be no opportunity to attract additional revenue. An inquirer might want accommodation at the Cable Beach Intercontinental Resort. If he is directed straight through to the resort by the new system rather than to the tourist bureaux, the tourist bureaux will miss the opportunity to make the booking.

Hon N.F. Moore: Are you saying they should not ring the resort direct?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This new system can channel accommodation business away from the tourist bureaus and the travel agents directly to the resort concerned. However, general inquiries, which generate no income, will be directed to tourist bureaus. They will be required to do all the work with minimal opportunity to make money. These small operators cannot afford to join the regional bodies. The membership fee ranges from \$535 to \$1 035.

Hon N.F. Moore: No, it ranges from a free option -

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The minister should explain that. Many people will want to take up the free option. If the minister is telling me that the operators of small homesteads, small station-stays and bed and breakfast accommodation, who could ill afford a membership fee of \$535, will have that available to them, it will be one welcome relief from the otherwise draconian initiatives foisted upon this industry. It will clearly suffer from many actions being taken by coalition Governments at a state and federal level. As champions of the goods and services tax they promised cheaper fuel, but they are now effectively delivering fuel and petrol costs that are dramatically increasing in this State as a result of the problem tax foisted upon the people of Western Australia. I am glad that the representative of the Australian Democrats in this Chamber is smiling because it reminds me that he, through his federal colleagues, is part of the club that has caused this problem for Western Australia.

The Government has caused many other problems, not only because it has failed to decrease the price of fuel, in accordance with the claims made by the coalition Governments at a state and federal level in advance of the introduction of the goods and services tax, but also because 10 per cent additional cost will be imposed on the ordinary tourist, whether for hotel accommodation, air fares, or a variety of bookings being made in the tourist industry. Some big operators already pay more to the Kimberley Tourism Association than the amount suggested for Partnership 21, and those already aligned to the KTA will not be intimidated by the cost. However, there are many other small operators. One small husband and wife team will balk dramatically at a cost of \$535 to get onto the Internet to receive the benefits that might flow from a program that could have been a benefit to the people of Western Australia, were it not for this arrogant Government and arrogant minister. Some features and technical initiatives in this program are worthwhile, but the Minister for Tourism displays an arrogance that limits the value of the program. In the short time I had available in which to talk to people in tourist bureaus and the industry generally, from Kalgoorlie, Carnarvon, Exmouth and Broome, and beyond into the Kimberley region, it is no wonder they expressed their fury that this Partnership 21 program has not taken on board their concerns but drags them into an initiative that potentially will cause more harm than good. It is regrettable that the Minister for Tourism will not take on board those concerns.

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Minister for Tourism) [3.53 pm]: I now respond to a speech by a member who does not have a great deal of knowledge of the subject about which he spoke. If that speech had been written by the shadow Minister for Tourism, I would be even more concerned because he knows even less than I thought he did. Partnership 21 was put together by an industry steering group of 14 members, only two of whom were from the Tourism Commission. Partnership 21 was created as a result of many meetings around Western Australia. Literally hundreds of meetings and briefings of people in the tourism industry took place before Partnership 21 was arrived at, and it is an industry document which the Government has accepted and is funding. Whenever the Opposition criticises Partnership 21, it is criticising the tourism industry. That industry is horrified at the attitude of the Labor Party to this and other tourism issues. The industry cannot believe the alternative Government would be so negative to tourism; it wants no Partnership 21, no convention centre, no exhibition centre, no Elle campaign, no nothing. It will stand up for some tourist bureaus that it thinks will be disadvantaged.

I will tell members how Partnership 21 works. The previous Government and this Government in its earlier days funded regional tourism associations and bureaus, and often the money was used to keep tourist bureaus open and to pay for time and a half staff wages at weekends. In 1995-96 the regional tourism associations received \$340 000 and the regional tourist bureaus received \$670 000, a total of more than \$1m to regional Western Australia. Under the new arrangements, prior to Partnership 21, this Government decided that all the money for country tourism should go to the regional tourism associations, and it gives them \$1.4m, which is an increase of 30 per cent in funding over the previous four years. Those RTAs decide how to spend the money within their regions, and whether to give it to tourist bureaus. It is giving local people in the regions some decision making about tourism in their area.

The creation of Partnership 21 gave opportunities for tourism operators to join the WA tourism network. People can join that either by not paying any money, in which case their name just goes on the database, or by paying \$535 a year, which gives membership of the local tourist bureau and the regional tourism association, and access to the electronic marketing initiative. That gives access to the data system, and details of their business are provided on the database. People can also choose the \$1 036 package, which again gives membership of the local tourist bureau and the regional tourism association, and an expanded presence on the electronic marketing system. Of the \$535 membership fee, \$293 goes to the tourist bureau as a membership fee. Of the \$1 036 membership fee, \$543 goes to the tourist bureau as a membership fee.

With regard to tourist bureaus under the new Partnership 21 strategy, the Government believes small bureaus will get roughly \$9 800 per annum in addition to what they receive from the RTAs. Medium sized tourist bureaus will make \$12 500 on top of their RTA funding, and large tourist bureaus will receive about \$23 000 on top of the funding they currently get from the RTA. In addition, of the money paid by tourist operators in the \$535 package, \$106 will go to their regional tourism association. On the \$1 036 package, \$235 will go to the local RTA, so the RTAs will also get a significant increase in funding. That will be in addition to the \$1.4m the Government provides. That will better position the RTAs to provide further support to tourist bureaus if they so desire. It is far better for regions to make their own decisions about their tourism outlets, rather than a central Government deciding which bureaus will get the money, as was the case under

the previous Government. The Labor Government even gave money to small bureaus so they could stay open at weekends. It was a crazy, ad hoc system under which there was no accountability or strategic direction for the way in which tourism in the regions would operate.

Network WA is the fundamental cornerstone of Partnership 21, and it provides tourist bureaus with the capacity to be online. The Government will pay for every tourist bureau to be online, and they will have access to this database which will contain every product available in Western Australia. Any tourist bureau in WA can put the information on screen for anyone who seeks tourism information from it.

Hon Tom Stephens: How much did the software cost?

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government is putting an additional \$1.2m into this initiative. The Leader of the Opposition will remain just that for a long time on the basis of the way he performs.

This initiative provides an opportunity for tourist bureaus to go online and create the database. At the same time it provides the virtual call centre, which was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. Any call to a particular number will be diverted to the local tourist bureau by a voice-activated system. If somebody from Sydney, for example, wants to know about Broome, the call will be diverted to the Broome tourist bureau. What better place is there to learn about Broome? The bureau will ask what accommodation, travel packages and so on the caller is interested in, and that can be sold over the telephone. The bureau will then take the commission that goes with that sale. Tourist bureaus have a significant opportunity to make money from selling product. When people call about Western Australia, instead of calls going to one central place, which is the Western Australian Tourist Centre in Perth, they will go to the tourist bureau in the town about which they are making the inquiry. That will give the local tourist bureau every opportunity to sell its product over the phone and make money by way of commission and at the same time market its town. If someone calls the travel centre in Perth about Widgiemooltha, the centre may never have heard of it. However, if the call goes to Widgiemooltha tourist bureau, someone there will say, "I know all about it. What do you want to know? Come and see us. We are looking forward to seeing you." That is what this project is all about. It is about giving people a better opportunity to make bookings and to find out about their preferred destination. The Government is contributing \$1.2m to the project. There is a fall back, however, in the event that information cannot be provided to a caller; that is, the call will go to the Western Australian Tourist Centre which will direct the caller to where they want to go.

Hon Tom Stephens talked about the 14 July meeting. Huge numbers of meetings were held before Partnership 21 was determined and agreed to; tourist bureaus were very much involved in those meetings. We are now proceeding to implementation of the package. Tourist bureaus have been asked to visit Perth on 14 July to learn more about the implementation of the strategy and the Western Australian Tourism Commission is paying for them to do that. In fact, the date was chosen to accommodate a particular tourist bureau in the Kimberley. We will fund 10 educators - one per region - who will spend three months training staff in tourist bureaus around Western Australia to utilise the system; that is a significant contribution by the Government.

We have in this place again another example of the Australian Labor Party knocking everything that happens in this State. Its attitude is knock, knock, knock, negative, negative, negative.

Hon Tom Stephens: That is arrogant.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It has not one positive thing to say about anything, except it has done some research that has come up with the word "arrogant". The Leader of the Opposition says, "Arrogant, arrogant, arrogant" and I say to him, "Negative, negative, negative" as that is what the Opposition is. Its attitude is knock, knock, knock all the time. The worst knocker is not the Leader of the Opposition in this House, although he cannot help himself; it is the shadow Minister for Tourism, who is the greatest knocker of tourism I have ever heard. He makes crazy statements all the time, is found out all the time and the industry thinks he is an absolute joke. The industry cannot believe what he is about. He trots out all the silly ideas that he comes up with and knocks everything the Tourism Commission does. When members criticise Partnership 21 they knock the industry. It was the industry that put this project together, not the Government. The Government agreed to implement the industry's proposals which were put forward by the steering committee.

Hon Tom Stephens: You have foisted the goods and services tax upon them and you have foisted the belltower on them.

Hon N.F. MOORE: We have not foisted anything on anybody. The Leader of the Opposition should ask some people in the industry. The industry was asked what it thought of the steering committee's proposals. Many meetings were held and the industry agreed with the committee's proposals. The industry launched the project with the Government's support. The Leader of the Opposition should tell the industry just how wrong it is and it will tell him where to get off at the next election.

**HON BOB THOMAS** (South West) [4.03 pm]: I am glad I sat in this place and listened to the Minister for Tourism before I spoke as it gives me an opportunity to put the views of my constituents.

Hon N.F. Moore: Have you asked the Albany Tourist Travel and Promotion Bureau what it thinks?

Hon BOB THOMAS: Yes, I have spoken to people and I tell the Minister for Tourism that it is different from the way in which he presents the matter.

Hon N.F. Moore: Tell us what the Albany Tourist Bureau thinks.

Hon BOB THOMAS: My listening to the minister was a pleasant experience as it reminded me of a favourite story that my father used to tell me when I was a young kid. It is essentially the story of the king who had no clothes. His subjects were not prepared to tell him that the new clothes he bought did not exist and that he was naked. That is what is happening to the Minister for Tourism and what is happening to this Government.

Hon N.F. Moore: Have you talked to the Albany Tourist Bureau?

Hon BOB THOMAS: I am talking to people in my -

Hon N.F. Moore: I'll bet you haven't talked to them at all.

Hon BOB THOMAS: The Minister for Tourism should not bet.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to hear one person at the moment. Hon Bob Thomas has the call.

Hon BOB THOMAS: The Government is not listening to people around it. That was ably demonstrated by the Minister for the Arts when he said there was no opposition to his Culture, Libraries and the Arts Bill, when the whole of the industry was jacking up and saying, "We do not like this; drop the Bill." However, Hon Peter Foss stood in this House and said there was no opposition to the Bill. The problem is that this Government is not listening to the tourist operators in the regions. The minister said this project was developed by the industry; it was developed by a consultant called Market Equity.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is a very unfair and incorrect comment, and you know it.

Hon W.N. Stretch: You are misleading the House.

Hon BOB THOMAS: I will read a letter I have with me.

Hon N.F. Moore interjected.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the House will come to order.

Hon BOB THOMAS: Concerns that have been expressed to me by tourist operators and people in the industry are four-fold: Firstly, they are saying there was no consultation with industry and local government about this plan before it was launched in March 2000.

Hon N.F. Moore: Would you do me a favour and tell the Tourism Commission who they are so that it can work out why they did not get to the 36 meetings which it held?

Hon BOB THOMAS: I will read something to the minister in a minute that will prove what I am saying is correct. The industry is also saying that costs will be defrayed back to it as it will cost money to train its operators and it will cost smaller bureaux money to acquire computer equipment to access the WA network. Tourist bureaux are also saying that they are worried that operators will opt out of the system and that they will lose revenues from fees. In some cases people who deliver non-accommodation services will miss out on business because when people visit tourist bureaux to book accommodation they often book other non-accommodation services while they are there. Other people in the industry are saying that some of the income that the tourist bureaux previously received will now go to the regional tourism associations and that the priorities set by those associations may be inconsistent with the priorities of those areas.

Hon N.F. Moore: Aren't they supposed to be the people who decide what goes on in their region? You would rather the Government decide what money goes to the regional tourism associations?

Hon BOB THOMAS: Did the minister not listen to me? That is why he has been caught out on this matter.

Hon Tom Stephens: People don't live in regions, they live in towns.

Hon BOB THOMAS: That is right. The minister told us boldly that the industry was consulted before this plan was announced.

Hon N.F. Moore: Extensively.

Hon BOB THOMAS: That is incorrect. I will read from a letter sent to the local government shire presidents, mayors, etc. The first paragraph refers to Western Australia's tourism industry. The second paragraph states -

... Market Equity has been contracted by the Western Australian Tourism Commission to develop 'Partnership 21'.

The letter then states that in May 1999 Market Equity met with the Western Australian Municipal Association to discuss the future of tourism in WA. The letter continues -

As Local Government is potentially a key stakeholder in tourism in this State, we are very keen to have your input on what you regard as the key issues and strategies required to further develop tourism in Western Australia.

We are particularly keen to determine from you what you believe Local Government's role should be in the servicing of tourists to your jurisdiction.

The first paragraph on the second page of the letter states that as part of the Partnership 21 process, Market Equity has run workshops and wants to collate information under the headings of national marketing, international marketing, visitor servicing, event tourism, meetings, incentive, etc.

It then states -

It is our hope that you will be able to provide a brief, written submission outlining any issues or strategies that you feel should be taken up by the Tourism Industry in the planning of its future development.

It then outlines how to present submissions. However, it provides no idea to local government regarding what Network WA or Partnership 21 are about, and what is planned. Local government in my area has told me that it was not consulted about the detail of the plan before it was presented in March of this year. Sufficient information still has not been received.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon BOB THOMAS: I am running short of time.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I know. If necessary, I will give the member more time. If the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House need some questions answered among themselves, they should move outside the Chamber and not interrupt the member.

Hon BOB THOMAS: The feedback I received from places such as Albany, Nannup, Collie, Pemberton, Walpole, Northcliffe and Manjimup is varied. Many people say that it is not a bad scheme; however, it contains many hooks. Some of the information provided by the Tourism Commission is not correct.

Hon N.F. Moore: Give an example of wrong information. We'll fix it.

Hon BOB THOMAS: I will give an example. The minister said that the tourist bureaux will be better off. The tourist bureau at Pemberton received \$20 000 per annum from the State Government, but that funding has been gradually reduced to zero this year. That bureau will possibly receive \$9 000 under this scheme.

Hon N.F. Moore: In addition to any funding the regional tourism associations provide to them. We have made the decision that the Government will not fund tourist bureaux directly.

Hon BOB THOMAS: The bureau has insufficient funds to deliver the service that people in that town decide they need to support visitors to that town. The same applies at Northcliffe, Walpole, Manjimup and Nannup. Some of the tourist bureaux believe they will lose further under the scheme, as many tourist operators will simply opt out; that is, they will not join this scheme and cease to pay their membership to the tourist bureaux, which will receive less money. People are gravely concerned about the fudged figures the Government is providing on this matter. The bureaux see themselves as the catalyst for future economic development and job growth in our regions. They believe they are not getting the support they need from this Government to deliver the services and attract more visitors to those areas. They point out that every visitor attracted to the region spends \$80 a night in those towns, which has a direct economic spin-off for the entire region. This economic activity has been put into jeopardy by the scheme.

**HON GREG SMITH** (Mining and Pastoral) [4.14 pm]: The Opposition is one of the most damaging things faced by tourism in Western Australia. If people listened to members opposite, they would never come to Western Australia as they would think it was the worst State in Australia.

The best way to stimulate tourism is to attract more tourists. Knocking Partnership 21 is ridiculous, as is suggesting that \$500 is a prohibitive fee. Placing an advertisement in the Royal Automobile Club of WA guide to tourism destinations costs \$350 to \$380. Much of tourist operators' expenditure is in advertising. Therefore, \$500 is not a prohibitive figure to be listed on the Internet, which can be accessed by anyone in the world. People will be able to go to Western Australia through the single gateway on the Internet and look at any town to find a list of destinations in the area, whether available accommodation is three or five stars and so on. It is ridiculous to suggest that \$500 is a large amount.

The best thing we can do for tourism is attract more tourists. All the Opposition has done about the Elle campaign is complain. We promote tourism and Western Australia to the world, yet the Opposition complains about the Government's promoting tourism. Members opposite cannot have it both ways! The Government wants to provide \$100m in seed capital to build a convention centre, yet the Opposition does not realise that conventions are one of the fastest developing areas of tourism. What do members opposite do about the convention centre? They complain. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot complain about our implementing programs to bring thousands of people to Western Australia, and then complain about not spending enough on tourism.

Hon Tom Stephens: Tell us about the belltower.

Hon GREG SMITH: The belltower will be a good investment for tourism. What has the ALP done? It has knocked, knocked and knocked. The Leader of the House had the best idea for keeping illegal immigrants out of Western Australia; namely, to send them a copy of *The West Australian* because no-one will want to come here after reading what the ALP says about WA. That is the truest comment I have ever heard.

Members opposite complain about expenditure on tourism. The 1991-92 budget allocation for Tourism was \$19m, with

\$38m allocated in 1999-2000. We have more than doubled expenditure on the Tourism portfolio, yet the Opposition complains.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the House will come to order. Hon Greg Smith has the call.

Hon GREG SMITH: The best thing a Minister for Tourism can do is attract more tourists. They spend the money, book into the motels and take the tours. Let us look at the figures. We had 32 600 visitor night stays in Western Australia in 1992, and 57 000 visitor night stays last year. That is 25 000 more visitor night stays per year achieved in less than 10 years. Members opposite say we have the wrong priorities in tourism, but we have nearly doubled the visitor figure. Tourism expenditure in WA was \$1.8b in 1992, with \$4b last year. To suggest that this Government is not committed to tourism is a joke. The Government is very supportive of tourism and develops initiatives to increase Western Australia's market share. Every billion dollars generated through tourism creates 10 000 jobs; and every billion dollars generated by the oil and gas industry, which is a very good industry, creates 120 jobs. Therefore, a Government would be dumb if it did nothing to increase tourist numbers.

Hon Ken Travers: What about logging in old-growth forests?

Hon Tom Stephens: Tell us about fuel prices.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon N.F. Moore: They are trying to change the subject, as they have lost their way.

Hon GREG SMITH: Indeed. I do not know why the Opposition brings such matters forward as urgency motions, which are supposed to deal with the most urgent issues in the State at the time. They present issues which give us a free kick as the Government is doing well in these matters. I do not understand how members opposite can be so politically dumb. I do not know who sets up the Leader of the Opposition with these motions. However, every time he moves a motion, it gives government members an opportunity to highlight how well the Government is doing. Most people I talk to in the Kimberley - it would be unparliamentary to repeat what they say - do not like the Leader of the Opposition very much. For only \$500, Partnership 21 will allow every small tourist operator to have as much exposure as someone who is spending millions of dollars. People will have access to their Internet site. Tourism is a business. The way the Opposition is talking about it, it seems to think it is a hobby. The Opposition thinks we should fund tourist bureaus and that, if they lose money, we should keep funding them. There are tourism operators in places like Kununurra who have opened up in competition with the local tourist bureau and are making a living selling tourism.

Hon Tom Stephens: Eddy was right about you - Dominic Polumbo would make a better member.

Hon GREG SMITH: The Alf Bussell of the north west!

To suggest that the Government has its priorities wrong in tourism or that it has not adequately researched this matter or funded tourist bureaus is ridiculous. As the minister said, all we have done is to stop it being a centralised system. We have given authority back to the regions so the people there can decide where the priorities are and where the funding is best spent; we will let them spend money where they think it is best spent. Our record is reflected in the increased number of tourists coming to Western Australia and the increased amounts of money they are spending. We are doing it right.

I support Partnership 21, and members will find that most of the tourism industry does also. If the broad spectrum of the tourism industry is opposed to it, by all means let the Opposition go to the next election with a policy to abolish it.

**HON TOM STEPHENS** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [4.21 pm]: While some features of the Partnership 21 program are attractive, we see a Government that is so arrogant that it will not learn from the complaints that the regional tourist bureaus legitimately want brought before the Government to have it change the program to meet the needs of those bureaus, their towns and their regions. Instead of that, the Minister for Tourism displays all the hallmarks of an arrogant minister in an arrogant Government that will not listen to the people of this State. He fails to recognise that the people who live in the small regional communities are concerned for those communities; they are preoccupied with the future of their towns because they are the future of those people. They cannot afford to see the benefits that flow from having local tourist bureaus being stripped from their towns - which is effectively what is on offer from the Partnership 21 program insofar as it will divert from the Perth central tourist bureau all of the losses that are currently said to be associated with the cost of operating that bureau. People speculate that the cost is in the order of several millions of dollars. It is now to be diverted to the regional tourist bureaus so that those bureaus have to wear the cost of delivering services that were previously the responsibility of the central tourism agency.

Hon N.F. Moore: Tell me what we should change.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The minister needs to recognise that this system will impose extra costs on the regional tourist bureaus. Instead of delivering to those bureaus the financial support that will assist them with the program, the Government has perpetrated a hoax on them by way of its alleged consultations with them. They were asked what they thought and many of them told the Government what they thought. Instead of taking any notice of them, the Government has gone ahead and done exactly what it intended to do from day one without taking on board any of the views of the local people. Although in excess of \$1m has been spent on software programming, it would seem that the Government has not been able to find from the extra allocation of financial resources - and it is a big contribution by anyone's standards - the meagre amounts that Hon Bob Thomas talked about that are required by the south west tourist bureaus to keep them afloat, amounts



that are also required in the north west and in the goldfields to make sure that the tourist bureaus there can continue to function. Instead, this Government intends to throw all of the costs, but none of the support that should be coming from the Government, onto the local communities, towns, shires and tourist bureaus. This Government does not believe in government. It tries to dismantle those things that Governments should be doing; that is, supporting communities to make sure they have prosperous tourism industries. Instead of that, this Government seems to be of the view that things are only good if they can make private entrepreneurs more successful; but anyone within a local community who is struggling to succeed and to support their local tourist bureau is left to flounder and will not get the support of this Government. The Government is preoccupied with imposing upon the tourism industry the goods and services tax and the extra fuel costs in excess of the increases that will result from the introduction of the GST. They have given the people of Western Australia the belltower, yet they now strike back at the same tourism industry by taking away the funds from the local tourist bureaus that are essentially the engine rooms that drive tourism in regional areas. The Government needs to know that its biggest difficulty is its arrogance. People know that it is arrogant and will not listen. Regrettably, the tourism industry is faced with the most arrogant minister of all, the Minister for Tourism.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to standing orders.

### **SAFE INJECTING ROOMS AND HEROIN PRESCRIPTION TRIAL**

#### *Motion*

Resumed from 22 June on the following motion moved by Hon Norm Kelly -

That the Legislative Council -

- (1) Notes the drug policies of Switzerland and the Netherlands, and their impacts.
- (2) Notes the progress being made in Australia for the establishment of safe injecting rooms.
- (3) Supports the provision of safe injecting rooms that are a part of primary health-care centres catering to the needs of drug users.
- (4) Supports the introduction of a heroin prescription trial in Western Australia.

**HON NORM KELLY** (East Metropolitan) [4.27 pm]: It is interesting to hear the Leader of the House, as he is fully aware of my desire to amend this motion due to the continuing consultation that has occurred since 10 August last year, when I first gave notice of this motion. Unlike certain members on the other side of the House, I have continued my consultations since then.

One of the important things to do when considering the possible provision of a safe injecting room in this State is to compare it with other States; in particular with New South Wales, Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory. It is true to say that we do not have the same street scene when it comes to young people injecting heroin. There is not the same level of public abuse of heroin in lanes, streets and other public places as in the other States. Our smaller population is also a consideration. That is why I am foreshadowing that an amendment will be proposed to achieve the same purpose as I sought a few weeks ago; that is, to make sure that we do have an inquiry to determine the feasibility of and the need for a safe injecting room.

Another aspect of the motion relates to a heroin prescription trial. I am glad to see that there is more widespread support for the idea of having a formal trial in this State. I refer members to an agreement that was formed last year on the steps of Parliament House. It was signed by three members of this House, representing three different political parties. The statement reads -

We, the undersigned representatives of our respective political parties, support a controlled trial of medically prescribed heroin in Western Australia to dependent, long-term heroin addicts who:

- a) are registered and have failed other forms of treatment;
- b) have given an undertaking to seek treatment for their problem;
- c) have been resident in Western Australia for at least three years; and
- d) are at least eighteen (18) years of age.

That statement was signed by me representing the Australian Democrats, Hon Christine Sharp representing the Greens (WA) and Hon Dexter Davies representing the National Party. I notice that the direction statement of the Australian Labor Party also has a fairly similar position on a heroin prescription trial. Therefore, four of the five parties represented here support such a trial.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

### **SELECT COMMITTEE INTO THE FINANCE BROKING INDUSTRY IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

#### *Special Report*

**HON KEN TRAVERS** (North Metropolitan) [4.31 pm]: I am directed to present a special report of the Select Committee into the Finance Broking Industry in Western Australia. I move -

That the report do lie upon the Table and be adopted and agreed to.

By way of explanation to the House -

Hon N.F. Moore: I should hope so. You should tell us.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The report will no doubt be distributed to members. In the meantime, Hon Ken Travers has the opportunity to speak to the motion that he has moved.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The report deals with the way in which the committee wishes to proceed with its hearings. Members will see in the report that we have indicated that we would like to take evidence in public session wherever possible. That issue was appropriately considered by the committee in its first meeting. The committee recognises that at times it will need to go into private session. A number of concerns of committee members about the recommendation being moved today as part of this special report have been taken into account.

Hon Greg Smith: Is it a unanimous report?

The PRESIDENT: Order! If Hon Greg Smith listens, he will get an opportunity to speak in a moment.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The special report picks up provisions similar to those which were previously part of a special report presented by the Select Committee on Native Title Rights in Western Australia. I assure the House that it is a unanimous report of the members of the committee. I commend the report to the House.

[See paper No 1104.]

*Adjournment of Debate*

**HON MURIEL PATTERSON** (South West) [4.33 pm]: I move -

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

*Points of Order*

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I know this is not a debateable motion. However, the Opposition may be in a position to agree to it if the Government can give some indication or assurance that this matter will be brought to resolution today or before the end of this week. Is a mechanism available to me before this -

The PRESIDENT: There is a mechanism, and that is for you to speak to the Leader of the House in due course about the general management of the House. I cannot do any more at the moment than put the motion. The first thing I want is for the document to be distributed.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Is it within the standing orders for the Leader of the House to interject on me to say whether he would -

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Leader of the Opposition knows interjections are out of order.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Will the Leader of the House tell me whether he will bring on this matter for resolution before the end of the week?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I do not yet know what the report says.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Can the Leader of the Opposition give an assurance to the House?

Hon N.F. MOORE: No, I cannot give an assurance.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have asked that the report be distributed so that people know what it is about. The question is that the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

*Ayes (17)*

Hon M.J. Criddle  
Hon Dexter Davies  
Hon B.K. Donaldson  
Hon Max Evans  
Hon Ray Halligan

Hon Helen Hodgson  
Hon Barry House  
Hon Norm Kelly  
Hon Murray Montgomery  
Hon N.F. Moore

Hon M.D. Nixon  
Hon Simon O'Brien  
Hon B.M. Scott  
Hon Greg Smith

Hon W.N. Stretch  
Hon Derrick Tomlinson  
Hon Muriel Patterson  
(Teller)

*Noes (14)*

Hon Kim Chance  
Hon J.A. Cowdell  
Hon Cheryl Davenport  
Hon G.T. Giffard

Hon N.D. Griffiths  
Hon Tom Helm  
Hon Mark Nevill  
Hon Ljiljana Ravlich

Hon J.A. Scott  
Hon Christine Sharp  
Hon Tom Stephens

Hon Ken Travers  
Hon Giz Watson  
Hon Bob Thomas (Teller)

---

*Pairs*

Hon Peter Foss

Hon E.R.J. Dermer

Question thus passed.

Debate thus adjourned.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE***Order of Business*

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [4.36 pm]: I move -

That Orders of the Day Nos 3, 11 and 12 be taken before Order of the Day No 1.

Question put and passed.

Hon Tom Stephens: I wanted to alert the President that I wish to speak on Order of the Day No 3.

The PRESIDENT: That is all right. I will now call the order of the day. Is there some reason for wanting to let me know? I do not understand.

Hon Tom Stephens: I did not have the opportunity to alert the President beforehand, but I want to explain the Labor Party's position on the Dairy Industry and Herd Improvement Legislation Repeal Bill.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is my job to facilitate the business of the House, and if it is necessary for me to know something, I am pleased to know it. The fact is that Hon Barry House indicated on the last occasion that he would speak, but the debate was adjourned by Hon Muriel Patterson. As I recall, the last speaker was from my left, and it is normal for me to call one speaker from either side of the House. That would be my intention.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It would assist the House if it were able to hear what is the Opposition's position which has flowed as a result of communication between the Government and the Opposition.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: We know that. Hon Kim Chance has told us.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no need for us to debate this at great length. If the Leader of the Opposition has to say something of such importance that it requires the House to hear him first, I ask Hon Barry House - I have not even called the order of the day - if he will yield to the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon Barry House: Yes.

**DAIRY INDUSTRY AND HERD IMPROVEMENT LEGISLATION REPEAL BILL 2000***Second Reading*

Resumed from 22 June.

**HON TOM STEPHENS** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [4.40 pm]: On Monday, 26 June, the Leader of the Opposition, Hon Geoff Gallop, wrote to Hon Monty House, the Minister for Primary Industry, with regard to the dairy industry deregulation. The letter states -

I take this opportunity to write to you about the Opposition's position on the Dairy Industry and Herd Improvement Legislation Repeal Bill 2000.

We note the Report of the Legislative Council's Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs, which has concluded that the Dairy Structural Adjustment Payment brings no net advantage to Western Australia (p45) and that the Commonwealth will gain a tax windfall from the restructuring package (p16-17).

I also note that should we go down the deregulation path, there are many issues that would need to be addressed, including the price of milk paid by consumers as well as dairy farmers and the future of the dairy industry itself in the new environment.

With these points in mind, we would be willing to pass the Bill subject to the following conditions.

1. That the State Government approach and work with the other States to ensure that the tax windfall to the Commonwealth is returned to the States to assist with restructuring and rural development. Such discussion should also address the issue of the gap between the \$180 million raised from Western Australia via consumer levies and the \$109 million paid to Western Australian producers.
2. That the State Government approach and work with the other States and Commonwealth to ensure that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission and relevant State agencies establish a proper process to ensure that there is no misuse of market power at the expense of producers and consumers.
3. That the State Government, in consultation with the Opposition, establish a Task Force to examine and report on Western Australia's dairy industry in the deregulated environment and make recommendations on measures needed to ensure its long-term future.

Today, following discussions between the Opposition and the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, Geoff Gallop, released the following media statement on behalf of the Opposition -

Western Australian dairy farmers and milk consumers stand to benefit from a package of measures agreed to by the State Government in return for Labor's support for legislation to deregulate the local dairy industry.

The package is aimed at producing a better financial deal for dairy farmers who are set to lose their quota entitlements under deregulation and greater protection against price rises for consumers.

It also promises an examination of the industry's future needs in a deregulated environment.

The press release then quotes the three conditions that were referred to in the letter to the Minister for Primary Industry. It continues -

The Opposition does not favour deregulation of our dairy industry but we understand that competition amongst the States is inevitable with the massive Victorian dairy industry deregulating from July 1 with or without the Federal Government's restructure package.

Accordingly, the only way to ensure WA dairy farmers were compensated for the loss of their quota entitlements is to pass the State Government's legislation before the 1<sup>st</sup> of July.

Put simply, rejection of the Government's Bill would not have stopped deregulation but would have denied local dairy farmers a share of the Commonwealth's \$1.8 billion restructure package.

The package of measures agreed to by the Government in return for Labor's support for its Bill provides the best possible outcome for the local industry and consumers.

I hope that puts on the record where the Labor Opposition stands on this Bill, and that it provides for the orderly handling of this Bill from this point.

Hon Christine Sharp interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Christine Sharp has spoken on the second reading.

**HON BARRY HOUSE** (South West) [4.43 pm]: No member of this place particularly wanted this debate on the Dairy Industry and Herd Improvement Legislation Repeal Bill, but we all know that we need to have it and we need to have it now; and I am pleased that Hon Tom Stephens has clarified the Labor Party's position on this matter. The reason that we do not particularly relish this debate as legislators, and certainly as representatives of the South West Region, is that it was not invited by the industry and the State Government, but it is here, and we have no option other than to deal with it. It has been forced on Western Australia against the wishes of the industry and the Government. We all know and we have heard at some length over the past couple of days the background to this debate. The origins of this debate go back for some 15 years in Victoria, and it has been building for that long. We cannot walk away from the fact that Victoria produces 64 per cent of the nation's milk and Western Australia produces 4 per cent. The final catalyst for change - a change that we had to address - came in the form of the sunseting of the dairy marketing scheme on 30 June - this Friday - and the industry's presentation of its package to the Federal Government, which facilitated the restructure package. The correct word is "facilitated" because, as Hon Kim Chance and others have said, the Federal Government is not providing any assistance in the way of compensation. It is not costing the Federal Government one cent. In fact, the Federal Government will, over an eight-year period, get a taxation windfall of \$360m, and possibly more. I share the distaste of many other people in the industry and in this Chamber about that matter, but the alternative has not surfaced and will not surface -

Hon Christine Sharp: You have not explored the alternative. That is why.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Hon Christine Sharp quoted an alternative the other day that involved looking at the effluent from dairy farms, and that was about it.

This is an extremely difficult time for the industry, and has been for the past three or four years. This is not a situation which has just arisen and has just been foisted on us. The fact is that we are in this position now and we need to deal with it now. It cannot be delayed any further. It is now our turn as legislators to feel the heat that the producers in the industry have felt on their necks for some time, as they know it will impinge on them severely from 1 July.

This debate has been and continues to be a moveable feast. The statement from the Leader of the Opposition indicates that the positions have been changing even to this point in time, and that has made this a very challenging situation for all of us. None of us enters this debate lightly, so please do not trivialise it. It is an extremely serious matter for the producers in the dairy industry, for those of us who live in the south west and for all of us who live in this State.

I do not support the legislation to deregulate the dairy industry for the usual reasons that I might support deregulation. When I am faced with a question about an industry restructure, whether it involves corporatisation, outsourcing, privatisation or deregulation, I ask myself a series of questions, and I have tried to do that in this case. The first question that needs to be asked is, will it deliver a better service and a better quality milk product? The answer to that question is no, because the Western Australian dairy industry is already among the most efficient in Australia. The second question is, will it be cost effective? In the case of producers, the answer is no, because their incomes will be halved; in the case of the consumers, there will not be an immediate price reduction, so again the answer is no; and in the case of the processors and large retailers, the answer is maybe. That has been explained at some length by previous speakers in this debate, and I share their concern that the margins of profit in this industry are moving from the producers towards the manufacturers and retailers. That is not a trend I like either, but I remain unconvinced that we can do much about that at this stage. The

third question I must ask myself is, will it will positively change the ethos in the industry? In some of the committee work we did, we found that that was a fundamental reason for change in certain public administration, particularly in the United Kingdom. I cannot say that with certainty, but I know that some, perhaps many, dairy farmers across Australia will exit the industry. In Western Australia, that prediction ranges from 70 to about 200 dairy farmers. That is not a situation I relish.

We can also predict with some certainty that the structure of dairy farms will change in Western Australia. Over time, dairy farms will change from a smaller family unit to perhaps a larger, highly mechanised, technological corporate unit. I cannot say with certainty that that will be a positive change. I know there will be a lot of heartache and financial pain along the way. You, Mr President, are entitled to ask me, and I have asked myself, why I support it under those conditions when none of these factors adds up. I am sure a lot of other people have agonised over this as well. The fact is that there is another overriding principle in the whole issue; that is, the industry across Australia has been examining this up hill, down dale, inside out, backwards, forwards and every which way for the past five or six years, and it has not come up with another viable alternative. A few have been floated. As late as the past couple of days, an alternative was floated to me. I am sure that alternative has previously been considered by the industry across this nation. It has been considered by the industry representative body, the Western Australian Farmers Federation. This alternative has been floated by the Australian Milk Producers Association. It is not a very well worked out alternative. It contains some aspects which are not plausible, because it relies on the various state dairy industry authorities administering a scheme of quota entitlements across the nation. Those state dairy industry authorities do not exist anymore, so there is no structure to put together the alternative. The overriding factor is that there is a need to bring some sanity to the issue and to bring the saga to an end. More importantly, there is a need to give the industry some certainty of where it will go in the future so it can build for that future. It is not the financial security that many have sought, but at least it will provide some certainty. It would be extremely difficult for many of them to live with further uncertainty and, in some cases, it would bring on enormous social and financial problems.

If we reject the legislation, all we will achieve is to deny the Western Australian dairy producers access to, first, the federal restructure money, and, secondly, the state assistance package. I have come to the conclusion that, as difficult as it may be, we have no other option than to accept the package. Obviously the Labor Party has come to the same conclusion after much agonising. Last week we heard Hon Kim Chance agonise up hill and down dale about the situation. I empathise with a lot of the sentiments, and I share a lot of the concerns and the observations. It is easy to make those observations; we can see it happening. However, in this situation, we are powerless to change the course of history. What would happen if the producers were denied their share of the restructure package and the state assistance package? It is the only state assistance package provided throughout Australia at this point; that is, the Western Australian State Government is providing \$27m. It is not compensation -

Hon Bob Thomas: It is not from the Government; it is the Dairy Industry Authority's assets.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The member should clean out his ears.

Hon Bob Thomas: I do not need to.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I will say that again for the benefit of Hon Bob Thomas: In addition to the federal restructure package, the dairy producers in Western Australia will receive a state assistance package of \$27m plus the assets of the Commonwealth Dairy Industry Authority.

Hon Bob Thomas: Will the \$27m go to the individual farmers?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: It will go to the industry in various forms.

Hon Bob Thomas: Why did you say that it was going to the farmers if it is going to the industry?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: It is going to the industry in various forms.

Hon Bob Thomas: If a dairy farmer in my electorate asks where his cheque is, will you tell him that it went to the industry?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Some of the money will go to the producers and some will go to the processors.

Hon Bob Thomas: How much will go to producers?

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Give us a breakdown.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The member can have his say in a little while.

The PRESIDENT: Order! A number of members have not spoken yet. I have no doubt they will take that opportunity in due course. They can then ask the various questions that puzzle them.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: If we deny our state industry that assistance package and the restructure money, we will guarantee the collapse of the industry. They are the hard facts we are faced with. We are between a rock and a hard place. After 1 July we will be sentencing them to producing milk on about half their incomes, with absolutely no restructure money with which to organise their businesses at the time and into the future. They will have no additional restructure money - even though it is industry money - to pay their debts and handle their costs of production. They will be in worse trouble than they would be if this legislation were passed.

If we reject this legislation, it will not prevent commercial pricing. Commercial pricing is here in the milk industry. One of our processors, Capel Dairy Company (WA), has already inflicted what it considers to be commercial prices on its producers. That was a rock bottom price. It deliberately flouted the dairy industry legislation. I have not seen any legal advice, but I understand there is virtually nothing the DIA can do about that. Once again, the State Government provided the assistance, through the DIA, by guaranteeing to make up that shortfall for the months of May and June for the 82 Capel dairy producers. That is an example of the processors driving a wedge through the legislation as it currently exists and demonstrating that the legislation would not hold into the future, even if we wanted it to. After Friday, the commercial pricing in the dairy industry will be here to stay.

If we reject the legislation, national competition policy payments to Western Australia may be put in jeopardy. The major factor is that there will be further agony and uncertainty for dairy farmers. As I have already suggested, there is enormous uncertainty and even fear of the unknown. They are facing the change reluctantly. If they can face the change in the knowledge that they have a certain path to follow after 1 July, that will be the most acceptable outcome for many dairy farmers in Western Australia.

**[Questions without notice taken.]**

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I have been explaining how I have arrived at the view that we must accept and pass this legislation, however difficult it is; and I assure members that it is very difficult for all of us, particularly members who represent the South West Region, where the bulk of the 440 dairy farmers in this State are located. I know many of those people, and many of them are my personal friends. I realise the gravity of the situation that is facing many of those people, and I also realise the importance of the dairy industry to the historic, economic and social values of the south west and rural communities; so it will be a major change. I have reached this conclusion by doing a reality check on the industry. The reality is that no other alternative stacks up.

Earlier this year I was asked to do some research on this legislation and to assess the situation that is facing the dairy industry in Western Australia on two principles. The first principle is that in the transition to the new world after 30 June, everyone should be treated fairly and equitably. The second principle is that I wanted to ensure that there was a viable dairy industry at the other end of the changes. Several issues need to be addressed to achieve those principles. A number of those issues centre around the George Weston Foods producers and the Capel dairy. I understand that 82 producers supply the Capel dairy. The restructure package contained an anomaly that needed to be corrected. That anomaly was caused by a historic accident whereby, in Western Australia, flavoured milk was lumped together with manufacturing milk, but in the eastern States it was classified as market milk. That meant that the money that would come to the producers from the restructure package would be 46¢ for market milk as opposed to only 8.96¢ for manufacturing milk. I say again that I am disappointed in the federal package, but I am pleased that about \$2.2m of the \$27m state assistance package will be made available to correct that anomaly in the payouts. That is not insignificant for many people. It will mean an average of about \$20 000 for the 82 producers, with up to \$80 000 for a number of them. That will make an enormous difference in providing some equity for those people.

The other principle that involves the Capel dairy producers is that they cannot currently access market milk. I believe that after 30 June, all producers in Western Australia must start on a level playing field. That means that these 82 producers must have access to market milk, along with the Peters and Brownes Group and National Foods producers. I understand that negotiations have been facilitated by Danny Harris and the Western Australian Farmers Federation dairy section with the aim of achieving that access, but I am not aware of any breakthroughs. That is an essential part of the whole equation, because if that access is not achieved, it will affect all producers across the industry, not just the 80-odd George Weston producers. They will very soon be in the marketplace and will be offering to supply milk to Peters-Brownes and National Foods at a price which will undercut their traditional producers; and that situation of industry players feeding off each other will not be in anyone's interests in the long term.

The other issue that needs to be addressed is that the industry must have a sump to take the excess non-perishable products; for example, cheese and milk powder. That sump is currently provided by Peters-Brownes, which makes cheese etc; National Foods, which makes milk powder and other products through its Boyanup plant; and George Weston Foods, which makes a range of cheeses and other dairy products through its Capel plant. A sump will ensure that the industry has room to grow, and that during peak seasonal periods the excess milk can be channelled into this sump and have a productive use. In order to do that, the industry will ultimately need to find some markets - preferably export markets - and some work has been done by all of the companies, significantly Peters-Brownes, but also by companies as small as Harvey Fresh, which is using its contacts through the juice industry to export some UHT milk into China. Opportunities do exist, and, from this point on, that is where the industry needs to focus its energy. The industry needs to put history behind it and look forward. I know that will be difficult, but an industry conference will be held in Busselton next week, and that may well be the beginning of a new outlook for the dairy industry.

In terms of providing a remedy for the sump, Challenge Co-operative has put together a proposal and has lobbied very hard over recent years, with mixed success, to sell the proposal to the Western Australian industry. It managed to sign up about 100 dairy producers to contribute to its proposal but, unfortunately, it fell short. It made an offer for the Capel plant which was not accepted by George Weston Foods. It thought it had purchased the Boyanup plant from National Foods Limited, but that deal also fell through. At the end of the day, Challenge Co-operative was left with a proposal but no plant to deliver its commitments to its suppliers. I am not sure where Challenge Co-operative goes from here and I am not sure whether it knows either. There is still a lot of talk in the industry about the need for a cooperative. The idealists talk about an industry-wide cooperative. With an industry so divided, I am pessimistic about whether that would ever be achieved.

Perhaps that is unfortunate. However, at the end of the day we have to be realistic and acknowledge that the industry is divided over deregulation, it is divided over the need for a cooperative, and it is divided over who to support. That has not helped the industry and it has not helped us to come to a reasonable conclusion with the legislation.

I should finish by mentioning the names of a few people. Whatever the outcome of the debate, I want to acknowledge on the record many of the people in the industry who have worked very hard over the years to achieve a reasonable outcome. Unfortunately, the outcome is not acknowledged or supported by everybody.

The dairy section of the Western Australian Farmers Federation was the unchallenged industry representative until the past few months, when the Australian Milk Producers Association emerged. It was the unchallenged voice of the industry in Western Australia. Over the years many people have put a lot of work into the industry to try to achieve resolutions. People such as David Partridge, Barry Oates, Larry Brennen, Neville Haddon and Ray Blackburne, have, at various times, played significant roles in the Western Australian Farmers Federation. It is unfortunate that personalities have played a role in this debate. Larry Brennen worked extremely hard, as a director of Challenge Co-operative, to get the proposal accepted. Unfortunately, it was not accepted by a large proportion of the industry. I think that is a great disappointment to him and many other producers. There may be a future for them, but I do not know. The leadership of Danny Harris of the WA Farmers Federation has been outstanding during a very difficult period. His deputy, Eric Biddulph, has been the voice of reason in many of the debates and has made an enormous contribution. Leanne Ablett, Geoff Jenkins, Graham Manning and Greg Chapman have all made a significant contribution to the debate. They have not always agreed among themselves. In fact, there has often been open disagreement between them and other producers. It is a great shame that, at times, personalities have interfered with the process.

Very late in the piece we saw the emergence of the Australian Milk Producers Association, an Australia-wide organisation. That is a great pity for the debate. It has been too late to have an impact. Some of the people, including Tony Pratico, Tony Ferraro, Arthur Green, Bernie Ridley and Kingsley Palmer put together a proposal. Through interjections I have been asking other speakers in the debate over the past few days what is the alternative? I also asked the Australian Milk Producers Association for its alternative proposal for what faces us with this legislation. Over the weekend I was faxed a copy of a document called the Baker Plan. It is a draft proposal for a quota scheme in which every State would be involved and it would allow quotas to be bought and sold across state boundaries.

Hon Christine Sharp: Why does the member not adjourn this debate until he has time to study it?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I understand that this plan was considered years ago and it was rejected by the dairy industry organisations across Australia, including the Western Australian dairy industry. It has been analysed. It requires federal legislation and the Federal Government has rejected the proposal. The proposal requires state dairy authorities to administer it. As a requirement of the federal restructure package, and after the deregulation of the dairy industry in the various States, the state dairy authorities will not exist. If the plan had enough merit, it would have been up and running some time ago.

I believe that this is a debate that none of us really wanted. However, we have to have it now and we have to look at the industry in a realistic way. The overriding factor for me is to remove the uncertainty in the industry and to give it some stability for the future. This is what is needed, therefore I will support the legislation.

**HON MURRAY MONTGOMERY** (South West) [5.48 pm]: I wish to put on record a few of the issues as I see them. I also commend Hon Barry House's comments to the House. I believe he has done a lot of research and I heartily endorse his comments.

The dairy industry has been through a number of restructures over the past 30 to 35 years. Having been part of one of those restructures during the 1960s, I can understand the dilemma and concerns of the dairy farmers of today. It was difficult to disband a dairy herd and to move into other areas of farming. However, my parents and I had to make that decision when we were dairy producers. The situation has gone a full circle. We need to look at the dairy industry as a global industry and not as something that is just in our backyard. It is very much an Australian, as well as a worldwide, industry. We get caught up in it whether or not we like it. Saying that our quota milk - the white milk that we drink on a daily basis - is there on quota or saying that Western Australia can produce this milk for home consumption is now seen to be out of the realms of this State. As of this morning, the legislation that was passed through the Victorian Parliament was assented to and will become law on 1 July. The die has been cast. As Hon Barry House said, the debate we did not want to have, which is the debate we are continuing to have, has been flagged for a considerable time as a result of the Wriedt plan, which was the 7¢ levy that was put on all dairy farmers and returned to the Victorian farmers.

In 1993 or 1994 - I stand to be corrected on the year - I was given the opportunity to open the dairy farmers conference in Bunbury. A keynote speaker had been brought out from the United Kingdom to speak on deregulation and the direction in which the industry needed to be taken at that time. The President of the Australian Dairy Farmers Federation, Pat Rowley, was also at that conference. He spoke on the need for change and the fact that if dairy farmers did not make changes, industry and government would be forced into ensuring that the deregulation for change would take place. In my opening remarks at that conference I said that we can liken change to a bus coming over a hill: If one does not see it, one will be run over by it. I take the hill as the border between us and our eastern States counterparts. Victoria is an awfully big bus and we need to be well aware of it. Even then it was very difficult for dairy farmers and most people in the community to understand what might happen. We do not need to be in a state of doom and gloom. I believe that dairy farmers can and will adjust. Because of a restructure, some may not; some may take up other farming activities or other pursuits. I believe that dairy farming will still be here after restructuring and that we will have a strong milk-producing industry. However, change is inevitable; it will come. As Hon Barry House said, if we dwell on the past, we and the dairy

farmers will fall into a trap, because not only are the dairy farmers hurting, but also the wider community in dairy farming areas is hurting. The general farming community as such is also hurting. If we do not pass this legislation so that the community and the dairy farmers understand where they are and what avenues they have available, that community will bleed even more than it is currently.

If the legislation is rejected, the State and the dairy farmers will be the losers. As Hon Barry House indicated, the \$27m state assistance package, along with the federal package, will assist those farmers who wish to stay in the industry. It will also give assistance to those who wish to get out of the industry. We have heard of some suggestions of cooperatives which could or should be taken up. One of the largest dairy farming cooperatives in Australia is Murray Goulburn Co-operative Co Ltd, which I understand is supplied by about 2 700 dairy farmers. It has a throughput of about three billion litres, which is used in ultra heat treated milk or other milk products or commodities. It is my understanding that it does not produce one bottle of milk, which is contrary to what we were told the other day. It is also my understanding that, towards the end of this week, contracts to the dairy farmers in this State will be announced by the processors.

As I said, I do not want to take up a great deal of time. I just indicate that a great deal of hurt is being suffered in the dairy farming community. There is a possibility that if this legislation is not passed, the community will bleed and hurt even more. Although this is not legislation which I would normally care to have brought into this Parliament, it is here and we must make a decision right now that it be passed for the benefit of the dairy industry.

**HON M.J. CRIDDLE** (Agricultural - Minister for Transport) [5.58 pm]: I do not think it is necessary to point out the difficulty people have had coming to grips with this legislation and the final decision they have made. Obviously, a great deal of thought and work has gone into the final resolution that is before us. The Government's position has consistently been that no change will be made to the Dairy Industry Act 1973 unless we are requested to do so by the industry. That is something which the minister has constantly echoed.

In February 1999, the recommendations of the national competition policy legislative review of the Western Australian Dairy Industry Act 1973 were accepted. The review demonstrated that the net public benefit arose from, first, the regulated farm gate price for milk and the vesting of milk insofar as it provided funds to the Dairy Industry Authority to provide services to the industry, and, secondly, the licensing of processors and dairy farmers with respect to food safety standards. The national industry has had the view that increasing commercial pressures in an increasingly flexible marketplace would undermine any regulatory regime. It is well known that the Victorian milk producers and the United Dairy Farmers of Victoria have been pressing for deregulation in Victoria. Due to the size of the production of the processing sectors in that State - that is, they produce 64 per cent of the milk produced in this country - a decision by Victoria to deregulate would be likely to place considerable pressure on markets in other States.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: Before the dinner suspension I was talking about the Victorian milk processors and the United Dairy Farmers of Victoria pressing for deregulation. In addition to that, the national competition review of dairy legislation in Victoria found no public benefit from retaining the dairy legislation. Consequently, the former Premier of Victoria announced last year that the dairy industry in that State would be deregulated from 1 July 2000. That announcement was later supported by a plebiscite of the Victorian producers. Of the 84 producers who voted, 89 per cent wished to pursue deregulation and to access a national support package if one were to be made available - subsequently that has been made available. Another factor was the approaching end of the national domestic market support scheme on 30 June this year. The finalisation of the Federal Government's domestic market support scheme put the national dairy industry in a position of having to request a structural adjustment package from the Federal Government to assist the transition to a deregulated market.

Strong representation from Western Australian interests towards the Federal Government's structural adjustment package was made by the Western Australian Farmers Federation dairy section president in his role as Western Australia's representative on the Australian Dairy Industry Council. Representation was made to the Federal Government some time ago by the Australian dairy industry leaders for a package of assistance to help the national industry adjust with the least possible disruption to what was, in the industry's view, the inevitable deregulation of existing domestic market milk arrangements in Australia.

On 28 September 1999 the federal Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry indicated his support for a \$1.8b restructuring adjustment package for the dairy industry, to be funded by a levy of 11¢ a litre on the sale of drinking milk for eight years. The package will be available only if all States and Territories repeal the legislation providing for the management of the supply of milk. The main feature of the federal package is that farmers will be paid a total of 46.23¢ a litre for drinking milk and 8.96¢ a litre for manufacturing milk produced in 1998-99. Western Australian dairy farmers will receive approximately \$109m, a figure that has been debated widely.

Recognising the various arguments, the Western Australian dairy industry conducted a plebiscite of Western Australian producers. Of the 92 producers who voted, 58 per cent voted to proceed with deregulation of the dairy industry in this State. Following a formal request to this State Government by the Western Australian Farmers Federation dairy section to deregulate the Western Australian dairy industry in order to access the federal restructuring package, legislation to deregulate the dairy industry was introduced into this Parliament. If the federal restructure package is unsuccessful, it is likely that the national dairy industry will deregulate anyway and Western Australian dairy farmers will miss out on an opportunity to receive the financial restructure assistance money. In this regard the Victorian State Government has announced that the Victorian dairy industry will operate in a deregulated environment from 1 July 2000.



I make those remarks prior to replying to some of the comments made by Hon Kim Chance in his speech. Most of his remarks relate to what other members have said in the House, and I will follow up their remarks a little later. However, I turn to some of the remarks made by Hon Kim Chance. He questioned the urgency of the Bill, which as members know must be passed before 30 June, and said that a delay in passing the Bill would not delay the time of the first payment from the federal restructure package. As I said earlier, Victoria will deregulate from 1 July, and it is likely that South Australia, Tasmania and Queensland will follow suit. Farmers must have certainty now to plan. If all States have not repealed their legislation by 3 October, the federal package will lapse. Processors and manufacturers have in place arrangements, assuming that deregulation will occur. Their reaction to no deregulation could be to take steps commercially to ensure they remain competitive with processors elsewhere.

Hon Kim Chance suggested that it is the rich, powerful and corrupt who are driving deregulation in Victoria. In fact the companies identified by the member - Murray Goulburn Co-operative Co Ltd and Bonlac Foods Ltd - are the farmer cooperatives. Murray Goulburn is fully owned by dairy farmers, and they are simply making decisions relevant to their commercial aspirations based on their assessment of their competitive strengths.

Hon Kim Chance: That is not inconsistent with being rich, powerful and corrupt.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: Obviously, those people in the industry have made a decision. Hon Kim Chance also suggested that the more milk a farmer produces, the lower is his average price because the increased supply is sold at spot prices. In fact, the more milk a farmer produces the greater his revenue. The important figure is not the average price received but the difference between the cost of production of another litre compared with the price received. It ignores the fact that the cost of producing another litre of milk is less than that of producing the first litre. Increased production spreads fixed costs over more litres so that the profit per litre increases. I remember that debate occurring in my industry many years ago. However, obviously the same principles apply here.

At the end of the debate on Wednesday Hon Kim Chance made reference to five points to which I will refer. The first point dealt with the lack of a post-deregulation structure, in particular to deal with the price problems of suppliers of George Weston Foods Ltd at Capel. The Western Australian Farmers Federation facilitated a meeting between all major processors and is optimistic that arrangements can be made for GWF suppliers to have access to the prices paid for milk used in premium products by those processors.

Hon Kim Chance's second point related to the impact of the goods and services tax on the federal restructure package payments, which has not been resolved. In fact, officers of Agriculture Western Australia have been advised by officers of the commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry that GST will not be applied to the federal restructure package or the dairy regional assistance payments.

Hon Kim Chance's third point related to the concern that farmers cannot treat their losses on quota value as capital gains losses. How a business is structured determines how capital gains and losses are treated. This is a confidential matter between the Australian Taxation Office and the individual concerned.

Fourthly, the member stated that two plans promoted by the Australian Milk Producers Association had not been considered. Hon Barry House touched on at least one of those plans. The Australian Dairy Industry Council, of which the Australian Dairy Farmers Federation is a member - they have the same chairman incidently - considered over many months eight options for the future. These included the Dairy Industry Authority's notionally swapping milk and a national market milk pool. These were essentially the same as the AMPA's proposals. The Australian Dairy Industry Council rejected these two options, and settled on the Australia-wide deregulation and the proposal for the restructure package - now known as the federal restructure package - as the only practical option in response to the termination of the domestic market support scheme and Victoria's stated intent to deregulate its industry.

The member's fifth point was that there is injustice in deregulation. We estimate that about one-third of farmers will have reduced income, one-third will see little change and one-third will have increased income as a result of deregulation and the payments under the federal restructure package.

On resuming debate last Thursday - I remember the break in debate was because the member wanted to consider the situation and the vote that was to be taken - Hon Kim Chance commented that he was offended that Western Australian interests were being compromised in a deal which would benefit the single Victorian company of Murray Goulburn. The Victorian dairy industry, represented by the United Dairy Farmers of Victoria, asked the Victorian Government to deregulate. The national competition policy review of the Victorian dairy industry concluded that continued regulation was not in the public interest.

Hon Kim Chance was also concerned that the discount rate for the up-front payment facility was not known. The amount of the federal restructure package payments due to all farmers can be calculated by them from the information provided to all farmers. It is up to the individuals to decide whether they want to use the up-front payment facility and, if so, whether it be one organised by their industry body or one they choose to organise privately.

Hon Kim Chance questioned the prospect of growth of export markets. The Australian Dairy Industry Council believes that the longer term international market outlook remains favourable for Australian dairy farmers. This refers to post 1999-2000. World milk demand is generally expected to increase. Rabobank research predicts an increase in demand from 539 million tonnes of milk in 1998-99 to 550 million tonnes in 2005. That is a substantial amount of milk, and I was surprised to see those figures. Only a small amount of this world demand is traded - namely, 34 million tonnes - of which New

Zealand and Australia supply about 33 per cent; and Western Australia's dairy export is about 2 per cent. Much of the demand is in Asia, which is close to the Western Australian market. About 90 per cent of Western Australian exports now go to Asia. Export of fresh milk, a high value product, from Western Australia is an expanding opportunity that is being taken up with novel technology by processors.

Finally, the honourable member said that if Western Australia does not repeal the legislation, farmers will not receive the federal restructure payments of an average of \$248 000 each. This is true. Furthermore, the federal Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry advises that the levies collected from 9 July until the lapse point will be returned to the federal consolidated revenue after recouping the Dairy Industry Authority and the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry for the work done on the scheme to that time.

That covers most of the points Hon Kim Chance made. Hon Ken Travers explained his opposition to the Bill at the time. Hon Christine Sharp, on behalf of the Greens (WA), and Hon Helen Hodgson, on behalf of the Australian Democrats, firmly maintain their views. Hon Mark Nevill put forward some mechanism by which his support could be achieved; however, he would not support the Bill under the present position. He pointed out opportunities to have compulsory milk supplies for schools, as applied in the past, and he put forward other ideas.

I thank Hon Barry House for his contribution. He had great input into the way this legislation has been brought forward. He, along with Hon Murray Montgomery, has been very concerned for some time about this matter and both members outlined their concern very eloquently.

I touch now on the letter from the Leader of the Opposition on the Labor Party's present position which Hon Tom Stephens quoted. Three points were raised in that letter. It requested that the Government pursue the matter of tax accrual to the Federal Government as a result of implementing the dairy structural adjustment payment. That will occur through some monitoring of returns to the producers and consumer prices for dairy products. If inconsistencies arise via the surveillance of this information, they can be passed on to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. The minister has agreed to that point. Also, he agreed to establish a working group which will focus on the outcomes of the importance of a strong future for the State's dairy industry. The group will comprise adequately experienced and skilled business, technical and industry representatives. Its priority will be to maximise producer returns, which will be linked to progress in the export sector.

The Government has agreed with the Opposition to progress the three issues mentioned in assisting the industry in a difficult time. I understand that in coming to an agreement, the Opposition will progress the Bill without amendment. That is my understanding of the agreement. I look forward to access to the federal package benefitting the industry in the future. The state government package is also available. I look forward to the passage of the Bill through Parliament with the support of the Labor Party.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

#### Ayes (22)

Hon Kim Chance	Hon Max Evans	Hon N.F. Moore	Hon W.N. Stretch
Hon J.A. Cowdell	Hon G.T. Giffard	Hon M.D. Nixon	Hon Bob Thomas
Hon M.J. Criddle	Hon N.D. Griffiths	Hon Simon O'Brien	Hon Ken Travers
Hon Cheryl Davenport	Hon Ray Halligan	Hon Ljiljana Ravlich	Hon Muriel Patterson
Hon Dexter Davies	Hon Barry House	Hon B.M. Scott	<i>(Teller)</i>
Hon B.K. Donaldson	Hon Murray Montgomery	Hon Greg Smith	

#### Noes (5)

Hon Helen Hodgson	Hon J.A. Scott	Hon Giz Watson	<i>(Teller)</i>
Hon Norm Kelly	Hon Christine Sharp		

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Hon J.A. Cowdell) in the Chair; Hon M.J. Criddle (Minister for Transport) in charge of the Bill.

#### Clause 1: Short title -

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not intend to spend a great deal of time on the short title. However, it provides me with the first opportunity that I have had to comment on the position which the Australian Labor Party took in the division on the second reading. I intend to comment, albeit briefly, on three issues which may have arisen in the second reading debate. I will comment only on those issues that have played a part in those factors which the Leader of the Opposition has recently announced to the House and which constitute the agreement that we have reached with the Government. The first of these is the agreement which the Opposition and the Government have come to in announcing our willingness to work, firstly, with each other and, secondly, with the other State Governments, in particular the Governments of Queensland and New South Wales, to endeavour to ensure that the identified tax windfall of \$360m to \$500m - I understand that figure is a bit rubbery - or at least part of that, be returned to the States in one manner or another. What we are seeking to be returned

is in effect no more than that amount of levy revenue which is raised in Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland net of the dairy structural adjustment payments which are made in those States. In this State that amount of money is variously estimated, but generally is estimated at around \$72m. In New South Wales the figure is about \$213m, and my guess is that in Queensland it will be around \$90m to \$95m. It is a considerable sum of money; almost incidentally it is close to the figure we have identified by various means as the income tax windfall.

Lest anybody believe the agreement that the Opposition and the Government have come to is in any way weak-kneed, let me assure them that our commitment to achieving this end on behalf of Western Australian dairy farmers is as strong a commitment as anyone will ever get. I am grateful for the Government's ready agreement to the position that we have put to it. We look forward to working with the Government on this issue to try to achieve this end. We are totally committed to achieving this end. Government and Opposition have not worked together on this issue from day one. We look forward to doing just that. It does not mean that we have to go hand in hand to make approaches to the federal minister, but it does mean that where we have good offices - which may not be where the Government has good offices - we will be prepared to use those good offices to achieve this outcome.

I do not derogate from anything that I said in the second reading debate. I believe passionately in every word that I said. I still believe, notwithstanding the decision that we have just made by walking to the other side of the Chamber, that we may have done the wrong thing. In the second reading debate we talked about the beautiful clarity of hindsight and that perhaps in two years' time we will be able to say that we did the wrong thing but just as equally we might be able to say, "Thank God we did that." I do not know. I do not think anybody claims to have that knowledge. In the end we did what people do in circumstances like this: We took what seemed to be the safer of the two courses. However, if there is a chance for a win out of this deplorable situation in which we have all been caught - it is too late now to be political about this - we must take it. I believe it is winnable. I believe we can go back to the Commonwealth if we are united. There is no reason that union should be limited to Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales. That union can reasonably include Victoria and Tasmania because their position is assisted by the spirit of the first condition. If we are able to do that, and if other States can do what we have attempted to do here - that is, to form a union between government and opposition on this matter - that is a force which the Federal Government running into a future election might find irresistible, because the Federal Government, as with the federal Opposition, has a number of marginal seats at risk in this. It is in their interests to find an accommodation for the States, provided we can put a sufficiently strong argument to the other States that this is worth pursuing. It is worth pursuing, because it is justice for people such as those who gave evidence to the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs, people who rely totally on the income they get from leasing the asset which we are just about to take away from them. If we can win this, we can provide those people with some justice. It has been a very tough call. As I said, I do not know whether we have done the right thing. If we have done the wrong thing, we stand a chance of correcting that wrong by applying ourselves with equal vigour to that first condition.

In respect of the second condition - that is, that the Government approach and work with other States to ensure that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission and relevant state agencies establish a meaningful process which can ensure the elimination of the misuse of power at the expense of producers and consumers - one could say that, in the long-term interests of the industry, it may be as important, if not more important, than the first condition. I have no faith or confidence at all in the ACCC and I will not go through the reasons for that, because they are in my speech during the second reading stage. The fact is that the ACCC does have some powers. It is not entirely a toothless tiger; it is a tiger that does not know whom to bite. Rather than failing to have teeth at all, it tends to bite the wrong people. However, in the state jurisdiction we have considerable powers in this area. Perhaps since the existence of the ACCC we have not regarded the powers within the state legislation as highly as we should. We have powers through the Ministry of Fair Trading, which include powers that the ACCC does not have. Again, if we are jointly prepared to use the capacity of the Ministry of Fair Trading, we can assure people that if the potential misuse of market power in relation to processors and retailers taking marginal adjustments effectively out of the pockets of dairy farmers does occur, we can identify that and prevent it from occurring. At the end of the day, the principal concern about the reduction in the average price of milk, regardless of whether it is market milk or manufacturing milk, amounts to a concern about somebody else taking the margin out of the industry which previously accrued to the producer. It is about that famous phrase that Hon Ken Travers used - margin realignment in the supply chain which is about the person with the market power stealing from the person who does not have the market power. The fact is that despite some deficiency in both our commonwealth and state laws, there is potential for commonwealth and state jurisdictions to be used in a manner which can largely prevent that from occurring. Again, we have a strong commitment and we intend to ensure that is followed through.

The third and final point relates to the agreement between the Government and the Opposition for the establishment of a task force to examine and report on the dairy industry's operations in the deregulated environment and to make recommendations on measures needed to ensure its long-term future. Today the industry is composed of the market milk sector and the manufacturing milk sector. Although these definitions will disappear, on 1 July the same quantity of milk will end up in the same places for the same reasons. The capacity of the industry to pay remains the same. All that will change post-deregulation will be the ability to identify who gets which part of that premium market share. That is a problem. I do not for a moment walk away from that being a problem. There is a capacity, however, to ensure that when the industry breaks up into its new components - that is, that part of the industry which will be subject to import price parity and that part of the industry which will be subject to export price parity, and there is a gap of some 10¢ to 15¢ between those two indices - the greatest part of Western Australia's milk production, which ends up in what we now call the market sector, is paid at a price that is as near to the import parity price level for that day as is humanly possible.

During the second reading debate I indicated that I had spoken to Danny Harris about how we could go about doing that.

I know that Mr Harris is working very hard to get some means within the industry structure to accommodate that situation. I certainly support what Mr Harris is doing. However, if we had a difference at all in our early discussions on the matter, it was that I felt that, left to the free hand of commerce and perhaps to an amount of goodwill which exists in the processing sector, such arrangements would ultimately fail. That remains my view, and certainly that has been the case in the United Kingdom. It is my view, however, that the State's price-fixing powers - let us not forget that the State has price-fixing powers - can be used to ensure that, first, the import price parity for the day can be identified, and, secondly, that the price that is paid for milk does not fall further than it needs to and can be maintained above that line. There is no reason to simply accept import price parity. A price can be set a little above that line, because there is no way that any competitor will move milk physically across the continent to compete with someone for the 1¢ or 2¢ above that line at which the price may be set. There is a price which can be maintained. I am not suggesting that this forms part of the agreement between the Government and us. However, that is a logical consequence of moving that agreement forward and legislating in that manner in the future. We can say that that would simply be going back to regulation; in fact, it is. Any price control mechanism or the use of existing mechanisms is a form of regulation. However, it is not a form of regulation which is excluded by the commonwealth Act. I have seen nothing in the commonwealth Act which prevents the States from using their existing price-fixing mechanism in a manner which is consistent with the national competition principles. Indeed, if the price line is set at the point determined by import price parity, it will be entirely consistent with national competition policy.

I spoke for longer than I intended and I apologise for that. However, I wanted to make the point that the three principal components of the agreement between the Opposition and the Government have considerable potential provided we enter into it in good faith. I understand that people will be disappointed by our choice to vote the way we did this evening. All I can do is humbly apologise to them. We made a decision on a very difficult issue, and we will stand by that decision one way or the other. People should not let anybody ever suggest that the agreement which has come out of our undertakings with the Government to get to this point is in any way a phoney agreement. It has great potential to prevent many of the issues which I and other members have raised about the concerns which genuinely flow from deregulation. It can address many of those issues, provided we have a bit of goodwill, a bit of hard lobbying and maybe even a little bit of luck. Certainly, we cannot make promises on any of those things, but that is where the potential lies and that is where we can deliver a better outcome than we initially thought we might have been able to.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: I have heard Hon Kim Chance speak on the agreement reached today, and I totally disagree with him when he said it is not a phoney agreement. In the past couple of hours, I have had the opportunity to look at the three conditions the Australian Labor Party claims to have obtained from the Minister for Primary Industry. It is interesting that Hon Kim Chance said the minister agreed to those conditions without too much difficulty. I can tell him why; these matters had already basically been put in place through discussions at the commonwealth level some months ago.

The first issue raised in the agreement between the Government and the Australian Labor Party is a requirement that the State Government approach and work with the other States to look at the tax windfall. It is totally wrong for the member to think this is the first State to have suggested that the tax windfall be returned to it. It has been negotiated ad infinitum at the national industry level and the commonwealth level, and the Commonwealth Government has refused to budge on the issue. It is denying there is a tax windfall. I wish the member luck if he thinks he will be more successful than my federal colleagues so far.

About the same time the Labor Caucus was deciding to accept this phoney agreement as satisfactory compensation for selling out dairy farmers in the south west, my federal colleague Senator John Woodley was moving a motion in the Senate recognising the strong vote against dairy deregulation in the recent ballot, congratulating the Australian Milk Producers Association on its initiative, and calling for a crisis meeting of state and federal ministers. Guess what? Both government and opposition senators indicated they would not support a motion calling for a crisis agreement. What makes the minister think he will be any more successful in getting people together to talk about returning to the dairy farmers in Western Australia, who most need it, a surplus which the Commonwealth Government does not even acknowledge exists?

The second part of the agreement is that the State Government will approach and work with the other States and the Commonwealth to ensure the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission and relevant state agencies establish a proper process to ensure there is no misuse of market power. That sounded familiar, so I went to the Senate committee report on the inquiry into the dairy industry. Recommendation 5 of that report is that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, in accordance with subsection 17.1 of the Prices Surveillance Act, monitor costs and prices in the dairy industry so that dairy farmers are not unfairly burdened with the cost of the proposed levy. The committee actually managed to get agreement to that. This negotiated outcome the ALP has achieved today is negotiation of a point to which the Federal Government agreed five months ago. It is a really good achievement!

Hon Kim Chance: Did that refer to the Minister for Fair Trading?

Hon HELEN HODGSON: It refers to the ACCC.

Hon Kim Chance: We all knew that.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: In that case, why gloat about it? The press release refers to negotiation with the ACCC to monitor the situation, as though it has just been thought of by the ALP.

Hon Kim Chance: It involves the use of the Minister for Fair Trading.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: The third agreement is that the State Government will establish a task force to examine and report on WA's dairy industry in the deregulated environment. So far all the reports, social impact studies and so on have indicated that up to one-third of dairy farmers across the country will walk off their farms as a consequence of this deregulation. By the time one-third of farmers have walked off their farms, perhaps the task force will report that it was not such a good idea. Hon Kim Chance then expanded on that at the committee stage, and suggested we could scale back deregulation. We are going ahead with deregulation of the industry, and saying our dairy farmers will become price takers instead of price makers, but he said we can still watch the import pricing and regulate the price of milk. There is a huge inconsistency in that argument. How can we say we shall deregulate, but will consider re-regulating in the future? How can we say we are deregulating because it is inevitable, but we will watch the import prices to make sure they remain fair to our farmers? Believe it or not, that is regulation. It is totally inconsistent to say, on the one hand, we are deregulating because it is inevitable but, on the other hand, we will scale it back as soon as we get the chance when the task force has reported on the number of farmers who have gone broke. In the meantime, the others may be doing reasonably well so it may not be necessary to do anything after all. That is the final outcome of the review by this task force.

I agree it is a difficult issue. I agree that it has not been easy to find a position and stick to it. The Australian Democrats did their analysis some time ago, and decided deregulation was not justified in the form presented to us. I hoped the ALP would also hold the line and would work for the dairy farmers and the rural communities who will suffer as a result of deregulation. At the very least, I expected an agreement that actually delivered something. Instead, this agreement is on the basis of three undertakings, which basically mean the minister will talk to and lobby people. The whole industry has been doing that throughout this period, and it still has not achieved a satisfactory resolution of these issues. How will that suddenly become achievable just because the minister has said it in this place, bearing in mind that people have been working on this for so long and have achieved nothing? For those reasons, I think it is a phoney agreement that will not ameliorate the impact of deregulation in this State. The losers will be dairy farmers and dairy producers, and we shall look back on this in two years and say that we were wrong.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I was confused when Hon Kim Chance talked about the difference in the levy between \$170m and \$109m, and the tax accrual. That taxation on the \$109m depends on when it is taken - whether over eight years or a shorter period. It will be taxed at that time and we are talking about negotiating the accrual into the future. I hope that is his understanding.

Hon Kim Chance: Yes, I think we have a common understanding.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: That package was negotiated by the industry, and Victoria and Tasmania got the larger portion and the other States got a lesser share than might have been appropriate.

Hon Ken Travers: Why did the State Government agree to that? It might have been negotiated by the industry but why did the Government agree?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: It is an industry negotiated arrangement, and it was based on that. The experts will take up the opportunity to get the best possible result from the industry group negotiations, and everybody in the industry will look forward to the best possible outcome in returns. They must negotiate for the best possible advantage for the industry.

Hon Helen Hodgson discussed the function of the ACCC. The function of the dairy industry in Western Australia will also be overseen and there will be surveillance of its prices. Although Hon Kim Chance does not have confidence in the ACCC, he put forward an interesting suggestion about the Minister for Fair Trading which may well be taken up. Hon Helen Hodgson obviously has very firm views on the issue. I wonder what the other side of the equation is from her point of view, and whether she has a solution to the problem. She said that in a couple of years we may realise we were wrong; we may also realise that we were right. We do not know what the future might bring. Export markets fluctuate in the industry that I belong to. Who knows what the price of milk might be in the export market in the future and whether it might give some advantage to producers? I look forward to an improvement rather than looking at the negative side of this.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The position taken by the Australian Labor Party on this matter is one, as I said last week, that is difficult for members on this side of the House. The Bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs and a number of issues were raised during the committee's hearings that I thought required an answer. I realise that, as the Bill has been given a second reading, it may be too late. As a matter of principle I think ministers should be held accountable and that the questions should be answered. Why did no-one from the Government provide advice to the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: It is a valid question. In this case the Government is facilitating a Bill on behalf of the industry. It is for the industry to put its position to the committee.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: In the light of the comment that it is an industry Bill, did the Government at any time consider suggesting to the industry that it introduce it as a private Bill rather than as a government Bill? I assume that once a Bill is introduced by the Government it becomes a government Bill. The mechanisms of this place allow for a private Bill to be introduced.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I am not the minister who made that decision.

Hon Ken Travers: You are the minister answering questions here tonight.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: The Minister for Primary Industry has indicated that he is not interested in amendments unless they

are brought forward by the industry. I understand what the member is saying but he has to take into account that the original decision to go ahead with this Bill was based on a request by the industry.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I apologise to members for taking up time but I think it is an important issue and I would have preferred to ask these questions at the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs' hearings. If it is an industry Bill, can the minister advise us whether the second letter sent to the Minister for Primary Industry from the Western Australian Farmers Federation was the result of any discussions between the Government and the Western Australian Farmers Federation requesting that second letter?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I do not know what conversations were held as I was not involved. The member can ask the minister himself. I was not involved in that intricate negotiation and no-one would expect me to be involved.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind Hon Ken Travers that this is not question time. The short title debate is not the appropriate time to ask questions to which the standing committee did not receive satisfactory answers or to revisit what the committee did not succeed in doing. The member may perceive that if he proceeds along this line, he will be ruled out of order.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I have one final issue that I wanted to raise. This Bill will remove the value attached to quotas. Does the minister believe there may be private property rights attached to the removal of quotas?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: My understanding is that the Government received advice that there was no property right.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 2 put and passed.**

**Clause 3: Arrangements for commencement of Part 2 -**

Hon KIM CHANCE: I have not had the opportunity to speak to the minister but at one stage he said that we had an agreement to proceed without amendment. I was not aware of that aspect of the agreement.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: That is what I was told. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition and the minister had come to that arrangement.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That may have come from an understanding about amendments central to the core issues of the Bill. We have an amendment that has been on the Supplementary Notice Paper for some time and no-one has told me that it is a component of an agreement. I have to continue in order to keep faith with the people who asked me to move this amendment.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: My clear instruction was that an agreement had been reached and that there would be no amendments - full stop.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee can only proceed -

Hon KIM CHANCE: All I can do is deal with the amendments as expeditiously as possible, and having no other instructions I will proceed to do that. I intend to speak to the amendments to clauses 3 and 4 on Supplementary Notice Paper No 37 cognately because they have the same effect and the same meaning.

The amendment to clause 3 in the first instance deals with the position in which a number of Dairy Industry Authority employees find themselves. The Government's Bill has progressive transition provisions for the staff of the DIA. Without meaning to, I am sure, the provisions exclude a small number of DIA employees in that under clause 3(e) those persons are referred to, and are those designated, under sections 17, 19 and 85 of the Dairy Industry Act 1973. The people excluded number three in total. They are people who were public servants and who were required to resign from the Public Service in order to sign workplace agreements on the basis that those were the conditions of employment with the DIA. They were permanent career public servants prior to that date. The only reason they surrendered their status as permanent career public servants was to get particular jobs. To get the jobs, they were required to resign and sign a workplace agreement. I feel certain that it is not the Government's intention to single out these three employees who simply complied with the requirements the Government placed on them.

I am sure the Government does not want to treat them differently from all the other Dairy Industry Authority employees. An issue may arise with amendment 1/3, which relates to the permanency of their employment. Under the Public Sector Management Act, in lay terms the word "permanency" simply means a public servant who is not confined by a fixed-term contract. It does not mean that this amendment is some kind of job-for-life proposition. Other than that, nobody has indicated to me that they have a problem with the amendment. I move -

Page 3, line 4 - To insert after the word "the" the word "permanent".

Page 3, line 6 - To insert after the word "or" the figure "(ii)".

Page 3, line 7 - To insert after the word "by" the word "the".

Page 3, after line 8 - To insert the following subparagraph -

- (iii) for the purposes of this Act, persons employed on a fixed term contract pursuant to section 17, 19 or 85 of the repealed Act, regulation 4(d) of the Public Sector Management (Redeployment and Redundancy) Regulations 1994 shall not apply; and

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: Is Hon Kim Chance referring to the three staff?

Hon Kim Chance: Yes.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I understand that their permanent status has been acknowledged.

Hon Kim Chance: In the Bill?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: No; staffing issues with the Dairy Industry Authority have been fully addressed. Of the 18 affected staff at the authority, six are permanent employees and 12 are contract staff, three of whom raised the concerns, and all of whom were previously permanently employed in the public sector. They claim that when they accepted the fixed-term contract with the Dairy Industry Authority they did not realise they were giving up permanency. Consistent with our aim to ensure that all staffing aspects were dealt with fairly, these staff have been given the benefit of any doubt. Their permanent status has been recognised.

Of the nine remaining fixed-term contract staff, four will go to the Health Department on fixed-term contracts and two will be offered employment in the new entity, Dairy WA. That should address Hon Kim Chance's concerns.

Hon Kim Chance: You will have no problems supporting the amendments.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: No; we will oppose the amendment because it will be fixed.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: During the second reading debate I referred to the conditions of employment. I thank the minister for his comments. I do not have the detailed knowledge of the three workers' situation that Hon Kim Chance and the minister have. However, I would like a related issue addressed before we vote on this clause.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: Did I not explain the situation to satisfy your concerns?

Hon HELEN HODGSON: I will still support the amendment because it is better to have the arrangement in legislation than on an administrative understanding.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: It is now in *Hansard*.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: In an earlier briefing I briefly raised the superannuation arrangements for these people. When Westrail, Transperth and AlintaGas employees move out of the public sector superannuation scheme, some penalties will be applied before they can roll over their superannuation to a fund with their new employer. Has that situation been addressed? If not, can the minister give an undertaking to ensure that all the employees who have superannuation entitlements - they will vary according to the scheme they are in - will not be penalised because their job has been transferred to a private sector employer, rather than their making a voluntary decision to move to a non-government employer?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I understand that only one person will be affected by this and he is working it out with the transition advisory group.

#### **Amendments put and passed.**

Clause, as amended, put and a division taken with the following result -

#### **Ayes (14)**

Hon Kim Chance  
Hon J.A. Cowdell  
Hon Cheryl Davenport  
Hon G.T. Giffard

Hon N.D. Griffiths  
Hon Helen Hodgson  
Hon Norm Kelly  
Hon Mark Nevill

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich  
Hon J.A. Scott  
Hon Christine Sharp

Hon Ken Travers  
Hon Giz Watson  
Hon Bob Thomas (*Teller*)

#### **Noes (14)**

Hon M.J. Criddle  
Hon Dexter Davies  
Hon B.K. Donaldson  
Hon Max Evans

Hon Ray Halligan  
Hon Barry House  
Hon Murray Montgomery  
Hon N.F. Moore

Hon M.D. Nixon  
Hon Simon O'Brien  
Hon B.M. Scott  
Hon Greg Smith

Hon W.N. Stretch  
Hon Muriel Patterson  
(*Teller*)

#### **Clause, as amended, thus negatived.**

#### **Clause 4: Arrangements for commencement of Part 3 -**

Hon KIM CHANCE: A matter has arisen concerning the amendments which it seems has not been entirely clear; therefore, so that those matters might be resolved, I ask that the Chairman leave the chair until the ringing of the bells.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: That would be a wise move.

*Sitting suspended from 8.41 to 9.29 pm*

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not intend to proceed with the amendment standing in my name on clause 4.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 5 to 8 put and passed.**

**Clause 9: Performance of necessary transitional functions -**

Hon HELEN HODGSON: The amendments that stand in my name are basically to do with the potential liability owed to the former milk vendors who were affected by the amendment to the dairy industry legislation deregulation in 1994. As members in this Chamber will be aware, an ongoing discussion has been taking place on the rights of the vendors and the fact that although they have been processed under the dairy adjustment assistance scheme, in fact they have not been fully compensated for the loss of their businesses. There has been ongoing discussion and debate as to whether further compensation should be available. Three reports of the Standing Committee on Public Administration have dealt with this. Following the third of those reports, this Chamber passed a motion which said that the matter should be reviewed and, if necessary, ex gratia payments should be made to those milk vendors to ensure that they received proper compensation for the businesses they lost as part of the deregulation.

The context in which that is relevant is that this Bill transfers all of the net assets of the Dairy Industry Authority to the new company, Dairy Western Australia Ltd, which will then be made available to the industry. When I asked a couple of questions about that earlier this year, I was dismayed to hear that no provision was being made for any potential outstanding claims by the milk vendors. In fact in question without notice 905 on 29 March of this year I asked about the net asset value of the DIA and whether anything would be available for milk vendors. It was a bit of a nothing answer because, as usual, the minister was very good at producing an answer that did not answer the question. However, it was clear that the DIA is budgeted to have the net assets of the new company.

The money was raised through a levy on consumers for the purpose of compensating the vendors, yet because it is held in the DIA, it will be used as a partial payment to the milk producers by way of the interest they will obtain in the company. This Chamber should not be sanctioning that. I sympathise strongly with the milk producers, as I have said throughout this debate, because they are not being compensated sufficiently. However is it fair to take a levy that was raised to compensate one group of people in the dairy industry, to give a little more compensation to another group in the dairy industry? To be honest, that amount will not make a huge difference because of the number of farmers it will be spread among.

The amendments that stand in my name seek to deal with that situation. The two amendments to clauses 9 and 12 relate to the same issue. The first amendment provides that the DIA will continue to distribute the funds collected in accordance with the levy mechanism imposed in 1994. My further amendment, which I will move at the appropriate time, will ensure that those assets are held in the DIA, as it will remain, and will not be transferred to the new company in the way that the rest of the net assets of the DIA will be made available to the milk producers.

Having said that, it is a question of whether we compensate the vendors or the producers. None of the producers wants to see somebody else done out of his or her business. They have watched the fight in which the dairy vendors have been involved and they have learnt from that how the whole matter should be managed. The milk producers would be willing to ensure this matter is resolved prior to the assets being distributed through the new company. For those reasons, I move -

Page 5 - To insert after line 22 the following new paragraph -

- (d) distributing funds collected and held by DIA for the purposes of section 91 of the *Dairy Industry Amendment Act 1994*.

*Point of Order*

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I wonder if these amendments would be introducing money clauses in this House?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not take the view that they are money clauses. Of course the minister will be aware that I have taken a very restrictive view in respect of this, which has not always been the view the Assembly has taken. It clearly does not involve the raising of additional funds. Therefore, the amendment is in order and I will put it.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Australian Labor Party will not be supporting this amendment for a very clear reason. It relates to the agreement we have entered into with the Government which - I apologise for not being aware of it at the time - includes matters which are peripheral to the core of the Bill as well as matters at the core of the Bill. I had misunderstood the nature of the agreement.

Perhaps, on consideration, we might not have supported these clauses in any case for two reasons: First, the case that exists with the DAAS group B people is a genuine case which does not need to be amplified in this Chamber, since this Chamber has given support without dissent for the recommendations contained in the Standing Committee on Public Administration's report No 10. The case is very clear. I believe, and I think this Chamber believes, that we have a responsibility to make



good that compensation for those people. As I have said, we made that decision without dissent in this Chamber. That case stands on its own merit; it does not require that the funds of the DIA be sequestered in any way, because that case stands against the Crown and the people of Western Australia. It is a fair and just claim which will one day be paid. I have no doubt about that. The Minister for Primary Industry's argument is that if the case is good it will stand regardless of whether the distribution adjustment assistance scheme refunds are requested in this amount or in this manner. If there is a case, it will be paid. I mention it for another reason that we may have considered not supporting this clause. While I am not permitted to refer to later clauses in detail, I ask members to read clause 12(2), and it refers to the business of the DIA -

The net asset value of the business is the total value of the assets and rights transferred to the Company under section 11(1), determined on the basis of their market value as at the appointed day, less the amount of the liabilities transferred to the Company under section 11(2).

That is a very clear recognition that there may be contingent liabilities. I am aware that the DAAS group B claimants have lodged claims against the Dairy Industry Authority, and that in all likelihood that amount of money will need to be set aside to meet the contingent liabilities, regardless of what this Bill does. It may be that this amendment is unnecessary for that reason. I have to say that this issue has caused us to look again at the matter, even though I referred to the matter in the second reading debate. I believe there is a legitimate claim and I acknowledge that my party, the Australian Democrats and the Greens have always felt that this claim will need to be paid. I believe I am authorised to give an undertaking that, in government, the Australian Labor Party will establish a means by which this case can be heard free of the constraints that have been imposed in the past under the mechanism which has been used to put in place payments under section 91 and which has prevented payment over and above those payments which might be enabled by the limited scope of the DAAS. I think that is a better undertaking to give to the former milk vendors than supporting this amendment.

Hon CHRISTINE SHARP: I support the amendments moved by Hon Helen Hodgson and congratulate her for her perseverance in these matters in that she has sought to include mechanisms in this repeal legislation to deal with a long-standing matter which the Minister for Primary Industry has failed to resolve satisfactorily on behalf of many people.

Members will have noticed the milk vendors in the public gallery during the course of other debates, as well as other aggrieved members of the public who are here tonight, and who were present over a very long time. The matter has still not been resolved by the Minister for Primary Industry. It is excellent that the member has found a way, under the provisions of this Bill, to protect some funds so that a mechanism is available to resolve this matter. I am appalled, given Hon Kim Chance's interest in this matter and his experience gained in hearings of the Standing Committee on Public Administration, that he is choosing to pass by an opportunity that is provided by these amendments to bring this matter to resolution. He is passing by a very important opportunity and one that I am sure will not be missed by the dairy farming community when it seeks to put its trust in the next round of negotiations. It will hope to see the milk producers dealt with fairly. I understand now why we suspended for such a long time tonight. I understand that it would have taken Hon Kim Chance some time to come to terms with the full ramifications of the deal reached between his leader and the Minister for Primary Industry and with where it leaves him now. I think those members who will not accept the amendments should feel ashamed of themselves.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I have been involved with this issue from the early days. There have been three reports to the House regarding the DAAS arrangements. An independent arbiter has looked at it several times and the Ombudsman is currently looking at it. We await the outcome of that with a great deal of interest.

Hon Ken Travers: Does he have the ability to do it?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: As I said, I await with interest the outcome of his deliberations. We will know when he reports. On 30 June 1999 in a statement to Parliament the minister made very clear his views on the matter. The Government will not support these amendments.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: I find this interesting because on one hand we had Hon Kim Chance saying that he was authorised to say that the Government and the Australian Labor Party would be working together to find a mechanism to deal with this, but on the other hand we have the minister representing the Minister for Primary Industry saying that the avenues have been exhausted, that the Ombudsman is now looking at it and that the minister has made his views very clear.

Hon Kim Chance: I was talking about a future Labor Government.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: I am sorry; I missed the member's comments about a future Labor Government. However, that makes me feel worse about what is happening because it means that the dairy vendors do not have anything to fall back on. The Ombudsman is looking at it and there could be a liability against the Government, but what does that mean if the funds have been disbursed in another manner? This is what it is intended to do. The amendment does not say that the vendors will be compensated by a particular amount of money; in fact that was one of the issues in drafting - we could not define a liability because we did not know what the extent of that liability would be. It is saying that the funds were raised by way of a levy to provide industry assistance to the people who were being affected by deregulation. The Government and the Opposition are now saying, "Sorry, we know that they are not happy and that they have not been fully compensated, but we do not agree with the basic premise; therefore, we are going to give all the money raised by the levy to another group of people who are affected by deregulation." It is time that members woke up to what is going on here. These are real people and real businesses with real costs. For those reasons I hope that other members will reconsider their positions on this amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (5)

Hon Helen Hodgson  
Hon Norm Kelly

Hon Christine Sharp

Hon Giz Watson

Hon J.A. Scott (*Teller*)

Noes (20)

Hon Kim Chance  
Hon J.A. Cowdell  
Hon M.J. Criddle  
Hon Cheryl Davenport  
Hon Dexter Davies  
Hon B.K. Donaldson

Hon Max Evans  
Hon G.T. Giffard  
Hon N.D. Griffiths  
Hon Ray Halligan  
Hon Barry House

Hon Murray Montgomery  
Hon M.D. Nixon  
Hon Simon O'Brien  
Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich  
Hon B.M. Scott

Hon W.N. Stretch  
Hon Bob Thomas  
Hon Ken Travers  
Hon Muriel Patterson  
(*Teller*)

**Amendment thus negatived.**

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 10: Purposes of this Division -**

Hon HELEN HODGSON: This is not a matter of amendments; it is a matter of clarification. Clause 10 deals with the transfer of the assets and liabilities of the Dairy Industry Authority of Western Australia to the company. I want to explore some issues about the way the company is being structured. To begin, I refer back to a question that I asked the minister. On Wednesday, 5 April, I asked the minister about the transition advisory group, and I was given the identity of the members of that group. Is my understanding correct that the members of that advisory group will be the first directors of the company?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: That is the situation.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: The names I was given were: Stuart Hicks, Graham Ravenhill, Danny Harris, Eric Biddulph, Jim Watts and Sarah Clancy. Do any of those people have a vested interest that may be required to be disclosed under Corporations Law?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: By way of clarification, Sarah Clancy and Jim Watts will not be members of the advisory group.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: Could I have an answer to the question about whether the remaining members have a pecuniary or financial interest that will be required to be disclosed to shareholders in the corporation under Corporations Law?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: If they did, they would.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: How long will it be before the transfer of shares occurs and the shareholders have the opportunity to select their own directors of this company?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: The share transfer will happen as soon as is practicable and the election will be carried out by the third annual general meeting.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: Therefore, the minister is looking at a period of three years during which this minister-appointed interim committee members will be the directors of this company, even though it is being transferred across to industry by way of various dairy farmers having an interest in the company.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: It will be a commercial company, so I guess it can happen as soon as the directors wish it to happen.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: Under Corporations Law, the company must adopt a constitution. However, certain parts of that constitution are known as replaceable rules; that is, the constitution may have alternative clauses, some of which relate to the appointment of directors, alternative directors, the powers of directors and so on. I am curious whether the constitution has been drafted for this company, and which of those rules with respect to the directors' powers and obligation to members may be altered. Will they be as they appear in standard corporations law?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: My understanding is that the constitution has been drafted, but it has not been incorporated. That decision will be made when the organisation gets into full steam.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: Is there no intention at this stage that the constitution as drafted, and as handed over at the time of the transition, will have no changes made to make it vary from the strict black letter of Corporations Law in respect of appointment of directors, resolutions and the procedures relating to the directors' appointments and obligations?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: The company is in the process of being incorporated, as I understand it. This Bill has not gone through yet; we have a process to go through, obviously.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: The minister said that the constitution has been drafted. The issue of what some of these rules will be is raised at the point of drafting the constitution. It is endorsed by the original members, which comprise the interim committee, as the potential first directors -

Hon M.J. Criddle: Is that your opinion?

Hon HELEN HODGSON: That is my understanding of the way a company is incorporated. We are transferring the assets into the new company, which will be incorporated under Corporations Law. The original signatories will sign off the constitution. Mechanisms are used to change the constitution if members of the company see fit. The issue is that when the company is created, its members are to be the steering committee.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I understand that the Australian Dairy Industry Council has looked at this matter, and is happy with it. They are issues for the industry to take forward, not the Government. Surely it is an industry matter.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: I would agree with that point except that the minister is to transfer a publicly owned asset into a corporate structure. I hoped that in order to protect the interests of dairy farmers, whom this structure is intended to protect, the minister would at least satisfy himself on some of the issues which relate to the corporate governance documents.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: That is the issue. We are satisfied with those issues; that is why we are going forward with them. The transition advisory group has been advised by the senior legal people on the transition.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 11 put and passed.**

**Clause 12: Determination of amount of consideration for sale -**

Hon HELEN HODGSON: I move -

Page 7 - To insert after line 21 the following new subclause -

- (5) The net asset value of the business determined under this section does not include an amount equal to that collected and held by DIA for the purposes of section 91 of the *Dairy Industry Amendment Act 1994*.

This is the second part of the amendment that I moved and to which I spoke earlier, and I commend it to the Chamber.

*Point of Order*

Hon BARRY HOUSE: This issue has already been decided in principle. It is my understanding that the amendment is out of order.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: There are clearly two amendments: One relates to the functions of the DIA in the shell that is left; the other relates to the transfer of the net assets of the business. Although there may be a connection between the two in that they stem from the same point of view, the two stand independently and, as such, the Chamber is entitled to vote on them separately.

The CHAIRMAN: I find the amendment to be in order,

*Debate Resumed*

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: There is no doubt that the Chamber is entitled to vote on it; far be it from anyone to dispute that. For the reasons that I outlined previously, the issue of the DAAS arrangements will be dealt with under the arrangements that I mentioned previously.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (5)

Hon Helen Hodgson  
Hon J.A. Scott

Hon Christine Sharp

Hon Giz Watson  
Hon Norm Kelly (*Teller*)

Noes (21)

Hon Kim Chance  
Hon M.J. Criddle  
Hon J.A. Cowdell  
Hon Cheryl Davenport  
Hon Dexter Davies  
Hon B.K. Donaldson

Hon Max Evans  
Hon G.T. Giffard  
Hon N.D. Griffiths  
Hon Ray Halligan  
Hon Barry House  
Hon Murray Montgomery

Hon N.F. Moore  
Hon M.D. Nixon  
Hon Simon O'Brien  
Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich  
Hon B.M. Scott

Hon W.N. Stretch  
Hon Bob Thomas  
Hon Ken Travers  
Hon Muriel Patterson  
(*Teller*)

**Amendment thus negated.**

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 13 to 47 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

**Bill reported, with an amendment.**

*Recommittal*

On motion by Hon M.J. Criddle (Minister for Transport), resolved -

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of reconsidering clause 3.

*Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Hon J.A. Cowdell) in the Chair; Hon M.J. Criddle (Minister for Transport) in charge of the Bill.

**New clause 3: Arrangements for commencement of Part 2 -**

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: I move -

To insert a new clause 3 as printed in Bill 110-2.

**New clause put and passed.***Report*

Bill again reported, with a further amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

**HON M.J. CRIDDLE** (Agricultural - Minister for Transport) [10.09 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a third time.

**HON HELEN HODGSON** (North Metropolitan) [10.09 pm]: The third reading is the point at which we can review the shape of the Bill as it has come out of Committee. I throw a challenge to the Australian Labor Party: When we went into Committee on this Bill, the ALP spokesman said that there were still some issues he wanted to see changed in the Bill during the committee stage. Those were the issues that were on the Notice Paper in his name. Due to circumstances that are not totally within his control - I acknowledge that - there has now been a change in the position as it was put when we went into the committee stage on this Bill. It has now come out unamended and I challenge the ALP to stick with what it was saying; that is, that the Bill as originally presented was inadequate and therefore should not be accepted at the third reading stage.

**HON KIM CHANCE** (Agricultural) [10.10 pm]: I must respond to those remarks. In point of fact the Australian Labor Party moved one amendment. That amendment was defeated in committee on the numbers.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

*Ayes (21)*

Hon Kim Chance  
Hon J.A. Cowdell  
Hon M.J. Criddle  
Hon Cheryl Davenport  
Hon Dexter Davies  
Hon B.K. Donaldson

Hon Max Evans  
Hon G.T. Giffard  
Hon N.D. Griffiths  
Hon Ray Halligan  
Hon Barry House  
Hon Murray Montgomery

Hon N.F. Moore  
Hon M.D. Nixon  
Hon Simon O'Brien  
Hon Ljiljana Ravlich  
Hon B.M. Scott

Hon W.N. Stretch  
Hon Bob Thomas  
Hon Ken Travers  
Hon Muriel Patterson  
(*Teller*)

*Noes (5)*

Hon Helen Hodgson  
Hon Norm Kelly

Hon J.A. Scott  
Hon Christine Sharp

Hon Giz Watson

(*Teller*)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**BILLS - RETURNED**

1. Statutes (Repeals and Minor Amendments) Bill 1998.
2. Child Support (Adoption of Laws) Amendment Bill 1999.
3. Restraining Orders Amendment Bill 2000.
4. Liquor Licensing Amendment (Petrol Stations and Lodgers' Registers) Bill 2000.

Bills returned from the Assembly without amendment.

**GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY BILL 1998***Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

# **APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED FUND) BILL (No. 2) 2000**

## *Second Reading*

Resumed from 22 June.

**HON MARK NEVILL** (Mining and Pastoral) [10.15 pm]: I draw to the attention of the House the purchase of Roebuck Plains station just south of Broome by the Indigenous Land Corporation in 1999. Great concern and disquiet surrounds the terms of that purchase and the secrecy associated with it. The Roebuck Plains Pastoral Company was owned in recent years by Lord McAlpine and was operated by Roebuck Plains Holdings Pty Ltd. In 1996-97, Kimberley Pastoral Company (Leasing) Pty Ltd leased the property from Roebuck Plains Holdings for \$5m for one year. That amount was paid in four quarterly payments of \$1.25m. It seems very strange that someone would lease a cattle station for \$5m for one year. In truth, it was a blatant and crude mechanism to avoid tax. The lessees were primarily interested in tax avoidance. Roebuck Plains Holdings Pty Ltd, which owned the station, had tax losses of nearly \$3m. In 1997, Roebuck Plains station was sold to Birchwood Pastoral Pty Ltd for \$1.3m, and it continued to own the station for 18 months. That \$1.3m turned into \$8.2m in 1999, when the Roebuck Plains station was sold to the ILC. That is a massive jump in value in 18 months. The cattle on the station were not counted before it was purchased. I read in a recent edition of the *Broome Advertiser* that the manager of the station - Mr Illingworth - said that delayed cattle musters were not unusual. That is absolute rubbish. I have never heard of a station being bought and the cattle being counted afterwards. If that buyer did the mustering, it would be easy to drop off a few hundred head of cattle.

In October 1997 there were 11 700 cattle on Roebuck Plains. That was a result of a very accurate count. That means there were between 8 000 and 8 500 adult cattle on that station. In 1999 when the station changed hands, there were said to be 15 000 adult cattle units. If the juveniles were added to that - approximately 3 000 - that would make a total of 18 000 head of cattle. In that case, in 18 months the number of cattle jumped from 11 700 to 18 000. In the dry season of 1998, the owners would have turned off between 2 000 and 3 000 cattle. We also know they purchased 1 000 breeders. If they had a calving rate of 90 per cent, that would have produced 900 calves. That would give an additional 1 900 cattle in total. It is still difficult to work out how that figure of 18 000 head of cattle was reached. It seems the purchase price was based on 15 000 head of adult cattle, or 18 000 head of cattle in total. Some questions need to be asked, particularly when the station was purchased before the cattle were counted.

How can that discrepancy be explained? We know the ILC bought Myroodah and Luluigui stations for approximately \$2m. Both those properties were in an extremely run-down condition and were worth in the vicinity of \$700 000. An investigation of stock waybills should indicate which cattle have been moved into Roebuck Plains from Myroodah and Luluigui. They may have been used to inflate the numbers as they currently stand today.

I know a number of cattle have been trucked from Billiluna station to Roebuck Plains, and the Aboriginal community was paid \$75 a head for the cattle delivered by the Aboriginal owners at Billiluna. These cattle would be valued at \$280 a head at Roebuck Plains. I would like to know who counted the cattle after the purchase of Roebuck Plains by the ILC, and how those cattle were counted. It takes quite some time to count cattle on a station, and if people do not know what they are doing, the same cattle can be counted twice. Taxpayers' money is being spent, and that money is set aside for the benefit of indigenous people. It seems to me it is not being spent very carefully.

I am told by experienced cattlemen that the carrying capacity of Roebuck Plains when fully developed is 14 000 cattle. When the last cattle count was done in October 1997, there were 11 700 cattle on the property. The property is breeding country, not fattening country. It is unsuitable for feedlots, and properties in the Kimberley should always be run to their drought potential. We cannot afford to run larger numbers of cattle because they will damage the country. The Roebuck Plains land is unsuitable for fattening cattle, which process must be undertaken near markets. Part of the Indigenous Land Corporation strategy is flawed.

No plan for traditional-owner living areas has been included in the purchase arrangement. The management plan contains no jobs or training programs for Aboriginal people; yet this ILC money is supposed to be for the benefit of Aboriginal people. I do not think the purchase complies with the ILC's Act. Section 191D of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Act reads -

The *land acquisition functions* of the Indigenous Land Corporation are as follows:

- (a) to grant interests in land to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Corporations;
- (b) to acquire by agreement interests in land for the purpose of marking grants; . . .
- (c) to make grants of money to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander corporations; . . .

That is important.

Under subsection (3)(a) the Indigenous Land Corporation must give priority to pursuing a policy of acquiring interests in land and granting the interests to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander corporations. Under subsection (3)(b) the grant should be made within a reasonable time after acquisition.

No Aboriginal people were consulted prior to the purchase of Roebuck Plains. Nor have Aboriginal corporations been appropriately established to which that land can be transferred. A government valuation of Roebuck Plains was about \$3.6m. Experienced cattlemen tell me that the most profit that can be made out of Roebuck Plains is about \$300 000 a year - the 15 per cent return on capital. That valuation of \$3.6m is reasonable.

It seems to me that Roebuck Plains was not purchased for any valid reason. Expressions of interest in the land should have been sought prior to its being purchased. Aboriginal corporations should have been established in which the land could have been vested. None of that occurred. In fact, the property was purchased shortly before the expiry of the terms of the Chairman of the Indigenous Land Corporation, David Ross, from Alice Springs and the Deputy Chairman, Peter Yu, from Broome.

A Roebuck Plains working group for indigenous people was subsequently established. However, I have copies of letters in my possession that suggest very little occurred and that the working group was abandoned some months later. These traditional owners were locked out of negotiations. They felt their heritage was being traded off without their consent. Little progress was made on a draft constitution. Although that working group was abandoned, recent attempts have been made, because of the publicity, to revive it.

The next matter I want to talk about is the management agreement for Roebuck Plains station. I understand the manager, John Wilson, wrote the agreement. This agreement with the Great Northern Pastoral Company Pty Ltd is for 15 years. The management experience of the principals is very thin. Mr Vereker is an accountant and Mr McCoy is a solicitor. Both of those men are from Melbourne and have no experience in the pastoral industry. Mr Illingworth has recently become the manager of Roebuck Plains station and prior to that worked on Roebuck under supervision for three or four years. I would not call that a great deal of management experience. The Indigenous Land Corporation should have conducted a proper search for people to manage the station. Part D of the management agreement states -

The Manager has particular expertise in relation to the management of cattle breeding and trading operations on pastoral properties in the Kimberleys and is skilled and experienced in activities of a kind necessary to manage such operations upon properties acquired there from time to time by ILC.

As I said, I do not believe those three men have that expertise. There are far more competent people who could have undertaken the management of that property. Land Enterprise Australia Pty Ltd is a subsidiary of the ILC. The agreement further states -

LEA agrees to engage the Manager to provide certain management services to LEA as administrator of ILC's pastoral assets on the terms and conditions set out in this Agreement.

It appears that the managers are guaranteeing themselves. There appears to be no provision in the agreement for checks of their performance. The ILC, having spent such an enormous amount of taxpayers' money on this pastoral lease, should have highly experienced cattlemen or pastoralists on its staff to scrutineer and protect the ILC's asset and its interest in the business.

A number of definitions are very poorly worded. I will not read them but they are definitions 1.1.13, 1.1.14 and 1.1.15. The management agreement was vetted by an Australian government solicitor and a private solicitor in Adelaide. Frankly, it is a very inadequate document written to favour the management group and not the ILC.

Section 1.1.20 reads -

"Improvements" includes installation of and/or repairs to infrastructure, pastoral development and/or rehabilitation and any other works undertaken on the Property with the objective of improving or maintaining the Properties and/or the Herd and/or the profitability of the Operations in accordance with an Operations Program approved by LEA;

Who sets up the program and then checks to see that it has been carried out? I can almost guarantee that no-one will. Who checks to see that moneys are being spent and indeed on what? Section 1.1.25 reads -

"Net Profit" means all income from Operations less agreed expenditure as disclosed in the audited financial statements in respect of Operations. In particular Net Profit will be calculated either inclusive or exclusive of items respectively set out in Schedule 1 (as the case may be);

The way the net profit is calculated needs to be closely examined by whoever is overseeing the people undertaking the management because of the nature of the profit-sharing arrangement. This seems to be a conflict of interest because the managers will benefit from the profit sharing and quite clearly will put their own interests before those of the Indigenous Land Corporation. The objectives of the agreement seem to be more about providing benefits for the management before the ILC. They seem to have nothing to do with the desires of the traditional owners; they are not even mentioned. I cannot imagine the traditional owners deliberating on the benefits of putting together a number of stations that would in total own 50 000 head of cattle. It seems to be completely contrary to the way the ILC should be operating.

The engagement of the manager is covered by section 3.2, and the manager is Mr Illingworth, who was the person charged with having possession of the dinosaur footprint. An appeal against his acquittal came before the courts last week and the judgment is pending. Also a very large, sophisticated marijuana plantation was growing on Roebuck Plains station right under the nose of management. Section 3.2 reads -

The Manager shall not engage in any other business or activity without the prior consent in writing of the LEA, which it may grant or withhold as it sees fit. However, as Messrs J. Vereker and Mr P. McCoy are not restricted from involvement in any other business or activity and nor is Mr R. Illingworth provided that he retains effective oversight of the provision of the services day to day.

I see a conflict of interest arising there, particularly if Mr Illingworth gets involved in off-station activity, such as the stockyards near the Broome jetty of which Mr Illingworth is part owner. He could spend time and energy there advancing his own interests to the detriment of the station. These sorts of problems have been encountered in the past. These sorts of arrangements do not work. A considerable amount of hay is supplied to those stockyards. Where does the hay come from? Would the Indigenous Land Corporation know if it came from Roebuck Plains station? I doubt it very much. Yet, this management agreement allows Mr Illingworth to run the cattle stockyard, in which he has at least a one-third interest, near the Broome jetty. The agreement also includes the provision for the ILC to buy him out at an egregious amount. The term of the management agreement is 15 years, which seems an inordinate amount of time. What benefit is that to local Aboriginal people? They pay out the money, but the managers get half the profits for 15 years without putting in any capital. That sounds like a good deal.

Under the section dealing with the manager's obligations, section 6.1.17 provides that the ILC will be influenced by the judgment of the managers of the property when acquiring further property. The agreement contains a proposal to buy Yeeda station. The ILC will be influenced by the judgment of Mr Illingworth, Mr McCoy and Mr Vereker in that decision. I do not think they have much cattle experience between them. What other stations have they purchased? Other people in the northern pastoral industry are far more competent and the ILC should deal with them. I cannot work out what section 6.1.19 means. It seems the managers are able to sell stock to whomever they choose. Livestock should always be sold through a reputable stock agent. Writing that sort of provision into this agreement is asking for trouble. The management agreement contains no requirement for the managers to return the herd at the end of the 15 years in the condition in which it was received. The assets and the herd should be kept at a high standard. Young cattle are worth more than old cattle. The profile of cattle and the break-up of ages is important. The price of 18 000 head of cattle varies depending on the age of the cattle. Nothing in the contract mentions that. The managers are able to sell off land. I think that is designed so the managers can sell off land near the Broome airport, from which they would benefit. The management agreement does not consider the traditional owners of the property. I have skipped over the management agreement because I do not have the time to go into it in detail.

The membership of the board of the Indigenous Land Corporation changed last May. Sharon Firebrace is the new chairperson. She is a prominent person who has represented Australia in two sports - netball and volleyball. She queried the purchase of Roebuck Plains station and privately raised claims of improper conduct by board members and their staff. The group has some seedy links. Max Green, who was murdered in Cambodia, was a partner in Aroni Colman, the money-laundering law firm in Melbourne. A lot of people involved in tax avoidance schemes with that company lost money. The \$5m lease fee in the agreement is a tax avoidance scheme. There is no doubt about it. A director of the ILC, David Baffsky, who is a Chairman of Accor Asia Pacific, is one of the people who presided over the purchase. He was the personal solicitor for Abe Saffron for many years. Mr McCoy has links to the firm Aroni Colman. It may be that the links are tenuous, but when one sees \$8.2m being paid for a station that is worth less than half of that, one wonders whether there is some money laundering going on. Ms Firebrace wanted an investigation by the National Crime Authority and she was supported in her call for an investigation by ATSIC's office of evaluation and audit. What did ILC board members do? They declared no confidence in her and demanded her resignation. They suspended her phone and fax at her rural Victorian home. They took her mobile phone from her; they closed her account; they locked up the Roebuck Plains station file so that she cannot get access to it; they took away her personal and executive assistants; they advised her that she was not required to be in Canberra and that the only time she would be required was to chair board meetings - and there is one on Friday. As chairman, she has to chair the board meetings. She has been stripped of her travel allowance to Canberra and she can no longer charter to Albury. She has to drive from Benambra over Mt Hotham to get to Albury to catch a plane. It is a seven-hour drive in snowy weather.

It is odd for the board of the Indigenous Land Corporation to be doing that. At least three of the seven directors were board members when the purchase was approved. They obviously do not want it examined. The package was given to Ms Firebrace because she agreed to work at home rather than to travel around the country as did David Ross when he was Chairman of the ILC. The package that was negotiated with her would have been much cheaper than the previous chairman's cost to the corporation. Senator Herron even asked her to resign and stand aside. For five months she has been harassed. About one month ago Senator Herron wrote to the board urging them to hold an inquiry into this matter. He refused to order an inquiry - I am not sure whether he has the power. He ordered an inquiry into the board's workings and that is being undertaken by a private solicitor. I put a press release out about two weeks ago, but before its release an inquiry was announced into the sale of Roebuck Plains station. That inquiry is to be an internal ILC inquiry - not a public one. I have seen the terms of the inquiry and I think it should be broadened to see whether the management agreement benefitted Aboriginal people and whether any Aboriginal people have been employed on the station since it was transferred.

A number of questions need to be asked. What were the number and type of consultancy arrangements? A number of people have got fat consultancy fees from this deal, but for what? How much did they get? Were these consultancies properly set up? Were bids called for from a variety of people, or were they given to selected people? As I said, what were the details of the consultancies and what was the extent of the consultancies? I want to see all the details fully declared. I want to know whether the traditional owners had any knowledge that these consultancies were to be put in place and whether they had any involvement in them. If the property was bought at well above the market price, what has happened to the money? Were there any side arrangements? The press release I put out about 10 days ago contained a series of 16 questions. I will read my note of those questions into *Hansard* and that will just about complete my speech. The first question was -

- 1 Why were the ILC's own rules breached in the purchase of Roebuck Plains Station?

Those involved did not go through the proper procedures. I do not believe they even complied with the Act. My note of the questions continues -

- 2 Who were paid commissions, how much money were they paid and what work was done?
- 3 Why was \$8.2 million paid in May last year for Roebuck Plains Station when the vendors purchased the station in 1997 for \$1.3 million?
- 4 Why were the purchase negotiations not done in the usual way and the price appeared to greatly exceed the valuation?

The valuation was \$3.5m to \$4m. It continues -

- 5 Why was \$8.2 million spent on Roebuck Plains Station for Aboriginal people when there was no registration of land need?
- 6 Why was it regarded as difficult to identify traditional owners with a demonstrated attachment to the Roebuck Plains Station area when the Kimberley Land Council has received \$19.4 million plus other funding over the last six years?

I have read in a couple of documents that it is being claimed that it was too difficult to identify the traditional owners. What has happened to all that money? What have these anthropologists been doing for the past six years? I would not feed most of them - I am talking about the anthropologists. The Aboriginal people deserve to have a competent record of the anthropology of that area. If that has not been done, it is an indictment of those anthropologists. My note continues -

- 7 Why weren't relevant local Broome Aboriginal people and groups consulted prior to the purchase?
- 8 Why didn't the proposal follow the standard format for land acquisition proposals?
- 9 Why was there no documented assessment of the property against the ILC's own criteria, prior to the preparation of the proposal to the ILC Board to purchase Roebuck Plains Station?
- 10 Was the value of the stock on Roebuck Plains Station and other stations deliberately understated to give a tax advantage to the vendor?

That question applies particularly to the purchaser of Cardabia station near Carnarvon, because the information I have is that in that case the value of the stock was understated. My note continues -

- 11 Why was a 15-year management agreement put in place with its previous Melbourne-based owners?
- 12 Why was it that although more than half of the \$8.2 million was paid for cattle, these cattle were not counted until after the sale?
- 13 Why under the 15-year management agreement with the Great Northern Pastoral Company was it to get half the profits without having to put up any of the capital?
- 14 Why was so much public money spent on land that remains in the hands of its Melbourne-based previous owners?
- 15 How will local Aborigines benefit from the purchase while control is under the previous owners under the special management arrangement that was in place until 2014?
- 16 Did the Australian National Audit Office find in its draft report that the ILC's records were so poorly kept that "there was some confusion surrounding the names of some of the properties purchased"?

That does not relate to Roebuck Plains but to some of the other properties.

When Ms Firebrace raised questions about the purchase of Roebuck Plains station, the management people from Roebuck Plains were summoned to Canberra for an urgent, extraordinary meeting. The ILC made an offer to buy them out. I am told they offered \$920 000, plus they were to be absolved from any wrongdoing that might have been involved. An emergency meeting was called to ratify the offer, although I understand that the offer has not been ratified. I am not sure about the reasons for that situation as it is hard to get information, but it may be that the chairperson has not called an emergency board meeting for that purpose.

Ultimately, the Indigenous Land Corporation used taxpayers' money to purchase the property for \$8.2m. Also, this inexplicable jump in cattle numbers needs to be explained. The increase in cattle numbers helps to explain partly why the inflated price was paid; however, those numbers are well above the carrying capacity of that station and, frankly, I doubt whether those cattle are there. If they are on the property, they were brought in from other Aboriginal stations to inflate the numbers. The number can be determined from stock weigh bills, which are required if stock is moved around the country.

We need an open and transparent inquiry into this purchase. It should not be an internal inquiry within the ILC by the directors who have put the chairperson into Coventry because questions were dared to be asked. It must be a frank and transparent inquiry. Those former board members need to answer some of these questions not to the inquiry, but to the public. They should have no fear of answering these questions if they have done nothing wrong. Many Aboriginal people



in this State have requested the ILC to purchase properties for them, but have been knocked back. No-one requested the purchase of this property. No process was undertaken by which Aboriginal people had to put a good case together, form a corporation and show traditional ownership of the land before the land could be purchased. It was simply bought. The public deserves answers.

The treatment of Sharon Firebrace, the Chairperson of the Indigenous Land Corporation, is scandalous. It is time that the dogs on the Indigenous Land Corporation Board were called off, and that it opened its books to the public. If it has done nothing wrong, that can be demonstrated. It seems that a lot of money has been siphoned out of the ILC and I for one, like the public I am sure, would like to know where the money has gone.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Bob Thomas.

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [10.59 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

*Department of Conservation and Land Management, Media Release - Adjournment Debate*

**HON NORM KELLY** (East Metropolitan) [10.59 pm]: I feel compelled to comment on a joint media release circulated today by the Ministers for the Environment and Forest Products titled "Greens, ALP and Democrats stall public demand to split CALM". I am aware of the legislation and the committee report on the subject before us, so I must comment on the material contained in the media release. It is extremely disappointing to see that the Government is using taxpayers' money to put such misleading and distorted information into the public arena.

First, this idea of stalling public demand to split CALM is totally counter to the effort of the non-government parties to expedite matters by agreeing to a speedy committee inquiry in recent weeks. The media release also states that this legislation has been around for a long time; that is, the Government introduced the legislation into Parliament last November. Unfortunately, it made no mention of the substantial amendments the Government incorporated as recently as late March in the other place.

It goes on to talk about this being very straightforward pieces of legislation. Once again, it does not refer to the 40 government amendments which appear on the Supplementary Notice Papers for these two Bills. What is of even greater concern is that while the Government accuses the non-government parties of stalling, the Democrats have been very keen to engage the Government in negotiations. I refer to a couple of letters that I have sent to the Government. The first of these letters is dated 30 May this year and was sent to the Minister for the Environment. The letter was with regard to the Forest Products Bill, but I sent it to that minister because I had been told that my first point of contact should be through the Minister for the Environment. I state in that letter -

I am attaching a copy of the Australian Democrats' amendments to the Forest Products Bill 1999, which will be appearing on the Notice Paper today. I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss the intent of these amendments with you and/or your staff as soon as possible.

Unfortunately, three weeks later I had to send another couple of letters dated 20 June this year - one to the Minister for Forest Products and the other to the Minister for the Environment. I reiterated in those two letters my desire to engage the Government in some discussions about the Democrats' plans for these Bills, and I also explained the amendments that had been circulated and the intention of other amendments which we were in the process of having drafted. The letter to Hon Paul Omodei states -

I have previously written to Cheryl Edwardes (on the 30 May), including my initial amendments to the Forest Products Bill, and requesting an opportunity to discuss these. I have learnt today that this correspondence has been passed on to yourself, but I have not received any correspondence from your office in regard to this. My office has attempted to make contact with Paul Biggs of Mr Omodei's office today, but promised return calls from Mr Omodei's office have not resulted.

It is necessary to put on the public record that it is not due to any inaction or stalling tactic from the Democrats that these Bills have not been debated and are not progressing. We have been very keen to engage the Government in these discussions; unfortunately, the Government has reneged on promises that it made to discuss with us these amendments.

One other part of this media release which I find particularly disturbing is that it refers to the report of the Standing Committee on Ecologically Sustainable Development and totally distorts what is contained in that report. I realise it is probably not within my bounds to refer to that report, but I will refer to the media release and the way it portrays that report. The release refers to the Minister for Forest Products as saying -

"Even the Legislative Council's own Ecologically Sustainable Development Committee has acknowledged this point."

In its report, the committee examined the issues and said the requirement that the two Ministers agree to the contents of a management plan was *prima facie* evidence of the equal status of the two Ministers within a framework of separated functioning.

I refer members not only to this government media release but also to the ESD committee report to see what the reality is.

If members read pages 14 and 15 of the report of the Standing Committee on Ecologically Sustainable Development they will realise that the argument portrayed in the media statement is a counterargument, because contrary arguments are put forward in that committee's report. It was clearly stated that if the committee were unable to come up with a unanimous position, it would put both sides of the argument so that other people could make a determination. It is unfortunate that these two ministers have chosen to be selective in the way they have put out for public consumption only one argument, which is a counterargument in this case. That does not assist the wider community debate on these issues. Unfortunately, it reinforces in the minds of many people in the general community the degree of suspicion and wariness of what the Government might be trying to achieve with these two Bills. It is unfortunate that when there has been a deception - whether it has been a real conflict of interest in the Conservation and Land Management Act or the perception of a conflict of interest, which we will leave for another day - when the Government is supposedly trying to heal the wounds of some of the things that have occurred over the past 10 years within the Department of Conservation and Land Management, and particularly in the actions of the previous Executive Director of CALM, that the two ministers who are responsible for the current legislation and the new legislation coming through choose to use selective arguments and misleading statements to further the Government's cause. It is unfortunate because this will have the counter effect of increasing that degree of suspicion of what the Government is trying to achieve.

I am not sure that today's media release is not a preemptive strike. We are all aware of how extensive is this legislation. We can see the number of amendments on the Supplementary Notice Papers. There are 40 coming from the Government alone for these so-called straightforward pieces of legislation. I am concerned that at some level this is a preemptive strike to butter up the public and say that if this legislation cannot easily pass through this House it may be the fault of the non-government parties.

Hon M.J. Criddle: That is a cynical view.

Hon NORM KELLY: I am not being cynical at all. I am not saying this is the intent of the Government. I am concerned that such misleading statements are being used. One could easily use the other arguments contained in the ESD report, and I encourage members to read the report to see how explicitly misleading is this media release.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Hon Norm Kelly may take some comfort from the fact that the people of Western Australia have never blamed the Legislative Council for blocking legislation.

Hon NORM KELLY: I am glad we have progressed and become a more relevant part of the legislative program. It is unfortunate that at this late hour I have to raise this point. However, it is imperative that before people start to believe what they read in government media releases they refer to the report contained in this release and look at the counterarguments that it contains before determining their position. I look forward to the upcoming debate on the Bills.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.09 pm*

---

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, YEAR 2000 COMPLIANT

723. Hon E.R.J. DERMER to the Attorney General:

I refer to the Auditor General's December 1998 report on Audit Results 1997/98 as that report relates to the preparedness of Government agencies to address the Year 2000 computer problem. Of the Government agencies for which the Attorney General has Ministerial responsibility -

- (1) Which agencies have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant?
- (2) Which agencies do not have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant?
- (3) Which agencies have completed inventories of systems and equipment?
- (4) Which agencies have not completed inventories of systems and equipment and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have completed these inventories?
- (5) Which agencies have indicated that their current funding is sufficient for addressing the Year 2000 computer problem?
- (6) Which agencies have indicated that their current funding is insufficient for addressing the Year 2000 computer problem and for each of these agencies what action is being taken to address the funding insufficiency?
- (7) Which agencies have developed appropriate contingency plans for dealing with the Year 2000 computer problem?
- (8) Which agencies have not developed appropriate contingency plans for dealing with the Year 2000 computer problem and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have developed appropriate contingency plans?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

As at October 1999, the following information is accurate.

- (1) Western Australian agencies are required to be Year 2000 'ready' not 'compliant'. That is, agencies must be able to continue providing their services in the year 2000. Agencies are required to undertake remediation actions and prepare contingency plans to ensure continuity of services across the transition period. If it is appropriate not to be compliant in some areas, then that is the decision and responsibility of the agency Chief Executive Officer. As at October 1999, Western Australian Government agencies have reported an average state of readiness of 94%.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Western Australian agencies are required to report on their planned inventory processes. As at November 1999, 82% of agencies have reported that they have completed 100% of their inventory process with a further 17% reporting 90-99% completion.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) Budgetary allocation of funds for Year 2000 activities is the responsibility of each agency. In their monthly reports to the Deputy Premier, agencies are required to provide an estimate of the amount spent on Year 2000 activities (budgeted and non-budgeted) and an estimate of the amount (budgeted and non-budgeted) further required to expend on Year 2000 activities. As of the end of October 1999, an estimated total of \$143,444,420 was reported by agencies to have been spent on Year 2000 activities with a further \$18,792,648 required to be spent to complete Year 2000 activities.
- (6) Not applicable.
- (7) All agencies are required to prepare contingency plans to ensure continuity of services into the Year 2000. As at October 1999, agencies have reported an average completion of contingency plans of 87%.
- (8) Not applicable.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, YEAR 2000 COMPLIANT

724. Hon E.R.J. DERMER to the Minister for Justice:

I refer to the Auditor General's December 1998 report on Audit Results 1997/98 as that report relates to the preparedness

of Government agencies to address the Year 2000 computer problem. Of the Government agencies for which the Minister for Justice has Ministerial responsibility -

- (1) Which agencies have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant?
- (2) Which agencies do not have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant?
- (3) Which agencies have completed inventories of systems and equipment?
- (4) Which agencies have not completed inventories of systems and equipment and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have completed these inventories?
- (5) Which agencies have indicated that their current funding is sufficient for addressing the Year 2000 computer problem?
- (6) Which agencies have indicated that their current funding is insufficient for addressing the Year 2000 computer problem and for each of these agencies what action is being taken to address the funding insufficiency?
- (7) Which agencies have developed appropriate contingency plans for dealing with the Year 2000 computer problem?
- (8) Which agencies have not developed appropriate contingency plans for dealing with the Year 2000 computer problem and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have developed appropriate contingency plans?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I refer the member to my answer given to Question on Notice 723.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, YEAR 2000 COMPLIANT

725. Hon E.R.J. DERMER to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts:

I refer to the Auditor General's December 1998 report on Audit Results 1997/98 as that report relates to the preparedness of Government agencies to address the Year 2000 computer problem. Of the Government agencies for which the Minister for the Arts has Ministerial responsibility -

- (1) Which agencies have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant?
- (2) Which agencies do not have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have their mission critical systems Year 2000 computer problem compliant?
- (3) Which agencies have completed inventories of systems and equipment?
- (4) Which agencies have not completed inventories of systems and equipment and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have completed these inventories?
- (5) Which agencies have indicated that their current funding is sufficient for addressing the Year 2000 computer problem?
- (6) Which agencies have indicated that their current funding is insufficient for addressing the Year 2000 computer problem and for each of these agencies what action is being taken to address the funding insufficiency?
- (7) Which agencies have developed appropriate contingency plans for dealing with the Year 2000 computer problem?
- (8) Which agencies have not developed appropriate contingency plans for dealing with the Year 2000 computer problem and by what date is it estimated that each of these agencies will have developed appropriate contingency plans?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I refer the member to my answer given to Question on Notice 723.

#### ALBANY HIGHWAY, BLACK SPOT FUNDING

884. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

Further to parts (3) and (5) of question without notice 429 of October 26 1999 -

- (1) What was the cause of the delay described in part (3)?
- (2) Will you confirm that there have only been six reported accidents on this stretch of road?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1)-(2) On 26 October 1999, I answered a Question without Notice number 429 in relation to accidents on Albany

Highway from Narrikup to seven kilometres south of Mt Barker. In the course of the reply, the answer to part (5) of Question 429 stated, inter alia, there had been six reported accidents on this section of road in the past three years. I have now been advised by Main Roads that incomplete statistics were inadvertently supplied. There have been 24 reported accidents on the 10 kilometre section of road on Albany Highway from Narrikup to a point seven kilometres south of Mt Barker between October 1996 to October 1999. Of these, three required hospitalisation, seven required medial attention, and fourteen involved property damage.

#### MINISTERS OF THE CROWN, VEHICLE ALLOCATIONS

1124. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

For each of the officers working in the Minister for Transport offices who have been allocated a vehicle -

- (a) what is the type of vehicle;
- (b) is the vehicle private plated; and
- (c) what payment is the officer making for the use of the vehicle?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (a)-(c) There are five vehicles, one Ford Falcon, three Holden Commodores and one Toyota Camry each private plated that are allocated to the staff within the Minister's Office. All officers make payment in accordance with the Government Vehicle Scheme.

#### NARROWS BRIDGE ROAD CONSTRUCTION, CONTRACTS

1229. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many contracts have been let by Main Roads since 1993 for planning, construction or any related works for the Narrows Bridge road construction projects?
- (2) For each of these awarded contracts, will the Minister table -
  - (a) when was it awarded;
  - (b) what is the name or number used to identify the contract;
  - (c) what is a brief description of the work involved in the contract;
  - (d) who was the successful contractor;
  - (e) what is the anticipated date for completion of the contract;
  - (f) what is the original value and what were the final costs of the contract; and
  - (g) is it a fixed price contract or does it allow for variation from the contracted price?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

As at 30 April 2000

- (1) According to Main Roads' records twenty one contracts have been let since 1993 for planning, construction and other related works for the Narrows Bridge road construction projects.
- (2)
  - (a) 8 September 1997.
  - (b) 222/97.
  - (c) Central Perth Access Plan including assessment of Narrows Bridge.
  - (d) Egis Consulting.
  - (e) 12 March 1999.
  - (f) (i) \$12 290.  
(ii) \$62 761.43.
  - (g) See footnote.
  - (a) 1 May 1998.
  - (b) 1011/97.
  - (c) Geotechnical Studies Narrows Bridge Duplication.
  - (d) Coffey Geosciences.
  - (e) 10 December 1998.
  - (f) (i) \$139 835.  
(ii) \$184 675.58.
  - (g) See footnote.
  - (a) 11 May 1998.
  - (b) 1043/97.
  - (c) Aboriginal heritage consultation services with approach works to Narrows Duplication.
  - (d) Richard Wilkes.
  - (e) 6 July 1998.
  - (f) (i) \$12 000.  
(ii) \$12 600.
  - (g) See footnote.
  - (a) 12 May 1998.
  - (b) 1035/97.
  - (c) Archaeological study for approach roads to Narrows Duplication.
  - (d) Monique Pasqua.
  - (e) 28 May 1998.
  - (f) (i) \$2 050.

- (g) (ii) \$2 045.80  
See footnote.
- (a) June 1998.
- (b) CNB628.
- (c) Investigation provision of rail system - Narrows.
- (d) Connell Wagner.
- (e) 14 July 1998.
- (f) (i) \$10 000.  
(ii) \$8 051.25.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) June 1998.
- (b) CNB677.
- (c) Stage 2 Draft design Road Safety Audit.
- (d) R Morgan.
- (e) 8 July 1998.
- (f) (i)-(ii) \$5 750.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) June 1998.
- (b) CNB538.
- (c) Load Ratings Narrows Bridge.
- (d) Halpern Glick Maunsell.
- (e) 2 November 1998.
- (f) (i) \$8 750.  
(ii) \$11 500.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) 11 June 1998.
- (b) 1139/97.
- (c) Preparation of Conservation Plan for Narrows Bridge.
- (d) Ronald Bodycoat Architect.
- (e) 27 July 1998.
- (f) (i) \$5 000.  
(ii) \$5 060.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) 17 June 1998.
- (b) CNB682.
- (c) Narrows Environmental Assessment.
- (d) EM Goble-Garrat.
- (e) 30 July 1998.
- (f) (i) Hourly Rates.  
(ii) \$3 934.70.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) 27 August 1998.
- (b) 234/98.
- (c) Detailed survey of road surface at Narrows Bridge.
- (d) Whelans Survey and Mapping.
- (e) 30 September 1998.
- (f) (i) \$14 925.  
(ii) \$17 575.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) 8 September 1998.
- (b) 299/98.
- (c) Geotechnical Advisory Services Narrows Duplication.
- (d) Advanced Geomechanics.
- (e) 25 March 1999.
- (f) (i) \$10 000.  
(ii) \$18 015.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) 8 October 1998.
- (b) 229/98.
- (c) Geotechnical Investigations Narrows Bridge.
- (d) BHP Engineering.
- (e) 22 December 1998.
- (f) (i) \$194 063.  
(ii) \$218 632.75.
- (g) See footnote.
- (a) 21 October 1998.
- (b) 444/98.
- (c) Inspection of major drainage pipe at Narrows Interchange.
- (d) Underwater Video Systems.
- (e) 15 March 1999.
- (f) (i) \$33 740.  
(ii) \$10 620.
- (g) See footnote.

- (a) 19 November 1998.
- (b) 356/98.
- (c) Construction preload embankments for approach roads to Narrows Duplication.
- (d) CSR Limited.
- (e) 19 May 1999.
- (f) (i) \$882 404.
- (f) (ii) \$610 083.36.
- (g) See footnote.
  
- (a) 25 November 1998.
- (b) 520/98.
- (c) Survey monitoring services, foundation improvement earthworks.
- (d) GHD Surveys.
- (e) 17 June 1999.
- (f) (i) \$36 300.
- (f) (ii) \$40 287.47.
- (g) See footnote.
  
- (a) 2 December 1998.
- (b) 592/98.
- (c) Survey services, foundation level audit on batters and settlement plates.
- (d) John Bullock and Associates.
- (e) 27 June 1999.
- (f) (i) \$5 000.
- (f) (ii) \$4 395.
- (g) See footnote.
  
- (a) 3 December 1998.
- (b) 492/98.
- (c) Specialist technical support during evaluation and award of C16/98.
- (d) (Panel contract) – Gutteridge Haskins and Davey and Shawmac.
- (e) 25 March 1999.
- (f) (i) \$30 000.
- (f) (ii) \$20 719.29
- (g) See footnote.
  
- (a) 23 December 1998.
- (b) CNB1134.
- (c) Specialist Advice during C19/98 RFP Award.
- (d) J G Marsh.
- (e) 31 March 1999.
- (f) (i) \$8 000.
- (f) (ii) \$1 000.
- (g) See footnote.
  
- (a) 1 February 1999.
- (b) 724/98.
- (c) Provision survey services, foundation level audits on batters and settlement plates.
- (d) John Bullock and Associates.
- (e) 1 July 1999.
- (f) (i) \$5 000.
- (f) (ii) \$2 937.50
- (g) See footnote.
  
- (a) 25 March 1999.
- (b) 16/98.
- (c) Design and Construction of Narrows Bridge Duplication.
- (d) Leighton Contractors.
- (e) February 2001.
- (f) (i) \$41 865 995.
- (f) (ii) Contract not yet completed.
- (g) See footnote.
  
- (a) 11 May 1999.
- (b) 810/98.
- (c) Technical support services during construction of Narrows Bridge Duplication.
- (d) (Panel contract) – Gutteridge Haskins and Davey, Halpern Glick Maunsell and Kinhill Engineers.
- (e) 15 February 2001.
- (f) (i) \$110 000.
- (f) (ii) Contract not yet completed.
- (g) See footnote.

## Footnote:

All of these contracts can be varied from their original contracted price.

## GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, STAFF NUMBERS

1421. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

For each department or agency under the Minister's direction as at March 1 2000 -

- (1) How many staff are employed in total and at each level?

- (2) How many permanent staff are employed?
- (3) How many non-permanent staff are employed?
- (4) How many substantive positions are vacant?
- (5) How many substantive positions are filled in an acting capacity?
- (6) How many substantive positions have been filled in an acting capacity for longer than three months?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

Albany Port Authority

- (1) 27. Under the Port Authorities Act 1999, positions within Port Authorities do not relate to Public Sector 'levels'.
- (2) 27.
- (3) 25 casuals.
- (4)-(6) One.

Port of Broome

- (1) 12. Under the Port Authorities Act 1999, positions within Port Authorities do not relate to Public Sector 'levels'. In addition about 12 casual workers are employed to cope with peak shipping loads.
- (2) 11.
- (3) One.
- (4) Nil.
- (5)-(6) One.

Bunbury Port Authority

- (1) 13. Under the Port Authorities Act 1999, positions within Port Authorities do not relate to Public Sector 'levels'.
- (2) 13.
- (3) 0.2 (one day per week).
- (4)-(6) Nil.

Dampier Port Authority

- (1) 11. Under the Port Authorities Act 1999, positions within Port Authorities do not relate to Public Sector 'levels'.
- (2) Ten.
- (3) One.
- (4)-(6) Not applicable.

Eastern Goldfields Transport Board

- (1) 1 x GOSACC Level 3.1.  
1 x GOSACC Level 3.3.  
1 x GOSACC Level 7.1.  
1 x Engineering Trades person Level 2 (classification C9).  
19 x TWU award (Eastern Goldfields Transport Board) award 23.
- (2) 12.
- (3) 11.
- (4)-(6) Nil.

Esperance Port Authority

- (1) 35. Under the Port Authorities Act 1999, positions within Port Authorities do not relate to Public Sector 'levels'.
- (2) 35.
- (3)-(6) Nil.

Fremantle Port Authority

- (2) 167.
- |                     |     |         |       |
|---------------------|-----|---------|-------|
| Level 1             | 11  | Grade 1 | Nil   |
| Level 2             | 14  | Grade 2 | Nil   |
| Level 3             | 14  | Grade 3 | Three |
| Level 4             | 21  | Grade 4 | 44    |
| Level 5             | 24  | Grade 5 | Five  |
| Designated Officers | 22  | Grade 6 | Nine  |
| CEO Special 5       | One | Grade 7 | Two   |
| Total 170           |     |         |       |



(3) Three.

(4) Five.

(5)-(6) One.

#### Geraldton Port Authority

(1) 32. Under the Port Authorities Act 1999, positions within Port Authorities do not relate to Public Sector 'levels'.

(2) 32.

(3)-(6) Nil.

#### Main Roads Western Australia

(1)	914 comprising:	
	Level 1	47
	Level 2	73
	Level 2/3	Five
	Level 2/4	28
	Level 3	94
	Level 4	53
	Level 5	139
	Level 6	112
	Level 7	75
	Level 8	45
	Level 9 +	Eight
	Wages employees	235

(2) 883 permanent staff.

(3) 31 non permanent staff.

(4)-(5) 149.

(6) 97.

#### MetroBus

(1)	Levels	Number of Staff
	Level 8	One.
	Level 7	One.
	Level 6	Two.
	Level 4	One.
	Level 3	Three.
	Level 1	One.
	Total	Nine

(2) Five.

(3) Four.

(4) Nil.

(5)-(6) Four.

#### Port Hedland Port Authority

(1) 17. Under the Port Authorities Act 1999, positions within Port Authorities do not relate to Public Sector 'levels'.

(2) 17.

(3)-(4) Nil.

(5) One.

(6) Nil.

#### Department of Transport

(1)	Levels	Number of staff
	Level 1	346.
	Level 2	182.
	Level 2/4	Six.
	Level 3	133.
	Level 4	72.
	Level 4/5	Eight.
	Level 5	71.
	Level 6	64.
	Level 7	38.
	Level 8	22.
	Level 9	15.
	Class 1	Five.
	Class 2	Two.
	S6	Two.
	Other	11.
	Total	977

- (2) 790.
- (3) 187.
- (4) 212.
- (5) 61.
- (6) 54.

## Westrail

- (1) Westrail has a workforce of 1 560 people. The job classification structures at Westrail are not congruous with Public Service classification levels, therefore, a breakdown of staff numbers in this context is not possible.
- (2) 1 529.
- (3) 31.
- (4) 69.
- (5) 34.
- (6) 33.

## GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, STAFF NUMBERS

1432. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Resources Development:  
For each department or agency under the Minister for Resources Development's direction as at March 1 2000 -

- (1) How many staff are employed in total and at each level?
- (2) How many permanent staff are employed?
- (3) How many non-permanent staff are employed?
- (4) How many substantive positions are vacant?
- (5) How many substantive positions are filled in an acting capacity?
- (6) How many substantive positions have been filled in an acting capacity for longer than three months?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

Department of Resources Development:

- (1)
 

Level 1	6
Level 2	24
Level 3	6
Level 4	12
Level 5	9
Level 6	12
Level 7	23
Level 8	10
Level 9	1
Class 1	3
CEO	1
Total:	107
- (2) 95
- (3) 12
- (4) 15
- (5) 12
- (6) 11

## DERBY-WEST KIMBERLEY GAS-FIRED POWER STATION, ROAD DAMAGE

1525. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Energy:

I refer to the proposal for a gas fired power station to supply electricity to the West Kimberley and ask -

- (1) Was the cost of potential road damage caused by the trucking of gas factored into the costs of a gas fired power station?
- (2) If yes, was the cost of potential damage to both State and Federally funded roads taken into consideration?
- (3) If Federally funded roads were not taken into consideration, why not and will the Minister for Energy be instructing the proponents to provide an estimate of those costs?

(4) If the Minister for Energy won't be instructing the proponents to do so, why not?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

(1)-(4) The costs of trucking LNG, LPG and diesel are costs which the power supplier is required to factor into its bid. All bidders are required to comply with relevant standards with respect to vehicle loads and road safety considerations.

#### WESTERN POWER, CONNECTIONS IN REGIONAL AREAS

1532. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Energy:

(1) What number of residential connections does Western Power have for each of the following regional systems -

- (a) Camballin;
- (b) Cue;
- (c) Gascoyne Junction;
- (d) Nullagine;
- (e) Sandstone;
- (f) Wiluna;
- (g) Wittenoom;
- (h) Yalgoo; and
- (i) Lake Argyle?

(2) What number of commercial connections does Western Power have for each of the regional systems in (1) above?

(3) What number of other connections does Western Power have for each of the region systems in (1) above?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

(1)	(a)	Camballin	27
	(b)	Cue	132
	(c)	Gascoyne Junction	17
	(d)	Nullagine	34
	(e)	Sandstone	30
	(f)	Wiluna	61
	(g)	Wittenoom	23
	(h)	Yalgoo	34
	(i)	Lake Argyle	11
(2)	(a)	Camballin	5
	(b)	Cue	25
	(c)	Gascoyne Junction	9
	(d)	Nullagine	12
	(e)	Sandstone	14
	(f)	Wiluna	30
	(g)	Wittenoom	5
	(h)	Yalgoo	19
	(i)	Lake Argyle	7
(3)	(a)	Camballin	7
	(b)	Cue	18
	(c)	Gascoyne Junction	6
	(d)	Nullagine	5
	(e)	Sandstone	6
	(f)	Wiluna	7
	(g)	Wittenoom	2
	(h)	Yalgoo	10
	(i)	Lake Argyle	4

#### MILK VENDORS, DISTRIBUTION ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE SCHEME

1535. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

Will the Minister for Primary Industry table full details of every assistance payment, on an individual name basis, that has been made to each individual milk distributor and vendor or former distributor or vendor under the Distribution Adjustment Assistance Scheme (DAAS)?

**The paper was tabled. [See paper No 1107.]**

#### DERBY-WEST KIMBERLEY GAS-FIRED POWER STATIONS, STORAGE CAPACITY

1536. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Energy:

(1) What is the proposed gas storage capacity at each of the gas fired power stations proposed for the Derby West Kimberley region, under the current proposal?

(2) For what number of days will this stored gas capacity enable power generation if road supplies of gas are cut off?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

(1) Gas storage capacity sufficient to ensure that reliability of supply is maintained is a factor that the preferred bidder

has been required to incorporate into its bid. However, the details of the fuel storage arrangements are at this stage commercially sensitive and therefore I must decline to disclose the information.

- (2) Fuel storage capability at each location will equal or better that currently available. The bidder has provided contingency plans which the bidder undertakes to implement to ensure that electricity supply requirements are met.

#### REGIONAL POWER AGREEMENT, CONTRACTS WITH INDEPENDENT POWER PROVIDERS

1537. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Energy:

- (1) Since June 1998 how many large customers have secured new contract arrangements with Independent Power Providers in any of the areas covered by the Regional Power Agreement?
- (2) Will the Minister for Energy table the locations in which each of these contract arrangements have come into place?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) Open access arrangements have only been in place since 1 January 1999. Whilst no new contract arrangements have been established with independent power producers, the Government understands that the element of competition has enabled some customers to negotiate a more favourable contract with Western Power.
- (2) Not applicable.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, TENDERS, COSTS AND COMPLETION DATES

1565. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) In 1998/99 what contracts did Government departments and agencies under the Minister for Resources Development's control award to -
- (a) O'Keefe & Gee;
  - (b) Picton Press;
  - (c) Frank Daniels;
  - (d) Vanguard Press;
  - (e) Advance Press;
  - (f) Muhlings Print; and
  - (g) Lamb Print?
- (2) For each contract, what was -
- (a) the original tender cost;
  - (b) the actual final cost;
  - (c) the award date; and
  - (d) the completion date?
- (3) For each contract, how many companies tendered for the contract?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) None.
- (2) Not applicable.

#### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE, UNANSWERED

1717. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Energy:

- (1) Will the Minister for Energy table answers to my questions on notice numbers -
- (a) 1517;
  - (b) 1521;
  - (c) 1525;
  - (d) 1532;
  - (e) 1536;
  - (f) 1537;
  - (g) 1538;
  - (h) 1539;
  - (i) 1540; and
  - (j) 1541?

- (2) If not, why not?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.

## GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS EXPENDITURE

1727. Hon E.R.J. DERMER to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Resources Development:

For each of the Government agencies for which the Minister for Resources Development has Ministerial responsibility -

- (1) What was the total recurrent expenditure on telecommunications in the 1998/99 financial year?
- (2) What was the total capital expenditure on telecommunications in the 1998/99 financial year?
- (3) What is the total estimated recurrent expenditure on telecommunications in the 1999/2000 financial year?
- (4) What is the total estimated capital expenditure on telecommunications in the 1999/2000 financial year?
- (5) What was the total recurrent expenditure on information technology in the 1998/99 financial year?
- (6) What was the total capital expenditure on information technology in the 1998/99 financial year?
- (7) What is the total estimated recurrent expenditure on information technology in the 1999/2000 financial year?
- (8) What is the total estimated capital expenditure on information technology in the 1999/2000 financial year?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) The total recurrent expenditure by the Department of Resources Development (DRD) on telecommunications for the 1998/99 financial year was \$140,449.69.
- (2) The total capital expenditure by DRD on telecommunications for the 1998/99 financial year was \$6,895.00.
- (3) The total estimated recurrent expenditure by DRD on telecommunications for the 1999/2000 financial year is \$109,897.00.
- (4) The total estimated capital expenditure by DRD on telecommunications for the 1999/2000 financial year is \$12,900.00.
- (5) The total recurrent expenditure by DRD on information technology for the 1998/99 financial year was \$341,392.00.
- (6) The total capital expenditure by DRD on information technology for the 1998/99 financial year was \$112,766.22.
- (7) The total estimated recurrent expenditure by DRD on information technology for the 1999/2000 financial year is \$313,843.00.
- (8) The total estimated capital expenditure by DRD on information technology for the 1999/2000 financial year is \$123,278.00.

## BROOME PORT AUTHORITY, CYCLONE PREPARATION

1862. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What cyclone preparation was carried out by the Broome Port Authority in preparation for *Cyclone Rosita*?
- (2) Can the Minister confirm that the Broome Port Authority left five pontoons floating on inadequately secured moorings and that two broke free causing damage to a number of boats?
- (3) Will the Broome Port Authority be providing compensation to any vessels damaged by property belonging to the authority, including these moorings?
- (4) If not, why not?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) The Broome Port Authority carried out all actions prescribed in its Cyclone Contingency Plan.
- (2) The Broome Port Authority had five pontoons secured to cyclone moorings in Roebuck Bay. During Cyclone Rosita two broke free of their moorings as did six other vessels. There is no evidence that the pontoons which broke free caused damage to any vessels. An inspection of the pontoons showed no evidence of any collision.
- (3) If any evidence comes to light that the pontoons caused damage to any other vessels, the matter will be referred to the port's insurers for deliberation.
- (4) Not applicable.

## BROOME, SAFE HARBOUR ANCHORAGE

1937. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the number and total estimated value of the vessels that were lost in the Broome harbour anchorage during *Cyclone Rosita*?

- (2) What steps is the Government taking to fund the construction of a safe anchorage area, with a marina breakwater and lock system in Broome, for the protection of vessels during storm conditions and for the safe mooring of vessels, and of the safe loading and unloading of vessels?
- (3) What funds were spent on the pontoon construction for the Broome Port?
- (4) Why is the pontoon jetty loading facility not functional?
- (5) What steps are being taken in reference to the pontoon facility?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Six vessels with an estimated total value of \$3 million.
- (2) The Department of Transport has commenced a process to investigate the options and feasibility of a safe anchorage in Broome. Importantly, the views of the community will be fully considered prior to the estimation of costs, location and funding sources.
- (3) \$972 000.
- (4) The Broome Jetty experiences a unique set of conditions as a result of the large tidal range and exposed location. Events have shown that the design prepared by a consultant did not fully account for the unique conditions and as a result the facility has experienced problems.
- (5) Following an Expression of Interest process, Transport has very recently invited tenders from three consultants to review the situation and determine how the needs of users can best be met. Consideration will be given to modifying the pontoon facility as part of this work.

#### GREAT NORTHERN HIGHWAY, WYNDHAM-KUNUNURRA

1940. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With the completion of the major upgrade on that section of the Great Northern Highway between Wyndham and the Kununurra turn off, when will the lane markers be completed for this road?
- (2) In view of the increased pressure on this road with the end of the wet season and the increased tourist traffic and other road pressures, will the Minister ensure that the road is lined and marked urgently?
- (3) Why have these road lines not been included when the road upgrade was completed?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1)-(3) The section of the Great Northern Highway between the Kununurra turn-off and Wyndham was recently upgraded and primersealed however, the works will be completed when resealing and line-marking is undertaken in October. In the interim, the road section is signed to indicate 'New work – no lines – Caution'.

#### INDUSTRY SECTOR EXECUTIVE OFFICER SCHEME

1947. Hon MARK NEVILL to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Commerce and Trade:

- (1) How many associations or organisations have been given grants under the Industry Sector Executive Officer Scheme?
- (2)
  - (a) Of these how many have run for three years;
  - (b) how many for two years; and
  - (c) how many for one year?
- (3) Of those stopped -
  - (a) how many for non-compliance;
  - (b) how many for lack of departmental funds to continue;
  - (c) how many had their main emphasis on regional and rural areas; and
  - (d) who made the decision to stop them and in each individual case on what basis?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) 8.
- (2)
  - (a) Nil.
  - (b) 1.
  - (c) 7 (all these grants are in their first year).
- (3) No grants have been stopped.

#### CYCLISTS, FATALITIES

1950. Hon MARK NEVILL to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many adult bicyclists have been killed in bicycling accidents in each financial year since 1985?

- (2) How many juvenile bicyclists have been killed in bicycling accidents in each financial year since 1985?
- (3) How many in (1) were wearing a bicycle helmet when they had their accident in each financial year since 1985?
- (4) How many in (2) were wearing a bicycle helmet when they had their accident in each financial year since 1985?
- (5) How many bicyclists in (1) died of head injuries?
- (6) How many bicyclists in (2) died of head injuries?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

(1) Financial Year	Adult Cyclists (Aged 16 and over)
1985/86	4
1986/87	4
1987/88	2
1988/89	5
1989/90	6
1990/91	6
1991/92	3
1992/93	2
1993/94	5
1994/95	5
1995/96	5
1996/97	6
1997/98	2
July-December 1998	4
Unallocated	1
Total	60

(source: Hospital Morbidity Data Base)

\* Information for 1999 is not available.

\* It is likely that some of these fatalities were first admitted to hospital and later died from their injuries. Hence there may be some overlap between these numbers and the numbers of hospital admissions.

(2) Financial Year	Juvenile Cyclists (Aged 15 or under)
1985/86	9
1986/87	4
1987/88	2
1988/89	1
1989/90	3
1990/91	4
1991/92	2
1992/93	1
1993/94	0
1994/95	0
1995/96	3
1996/97	3
1997/98	1
July-December 1998	1
Unallocated	2
Total	36

(source: Hospital Morbidity Data Base)

\* Information for 1999 is not available.

\* It is likely that some of these fatalities were first admitted to hospital and later died from their injuries. Hence there may be some overlap of these numbers and the numbers of hospital admissions.

- (3)-(6) It is not possible to obtain information on helmet wearing head injuries from available data. Head injuries are not mentioned in death registration data. Cause of death is coded as 'bicycle accident'.

#### CYCLISTS, HEAD INJURIES

1951. Hon MARK NEVILL to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many adult bicyclists have received serious head injuries from bicycling accidents in each financial year since 1985?
- (2) How many juvenile bicyclists have received serious head injuries from bicycling accidents in each financial year since 1985?
- (3) How many in (1) were wearing a bicycle helmet when they had their accident in each financial year since 1985?
- (4) How many in (2) were wearing a bicycle helmet when they had their accident in each financial year since 1985?
- (5) How many bicyclists in (1) died of serious head injuries?

(6) How many bicyclists in (2) died of serious head injuries?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

(1) Financial Year	Adult Cyclists (Aged 16 and over)
1986/87	5
1987/88	16
1988/89	24
1989/90	13
1990/91	23
1991/92	16
1992/93	10
1993/94	9
1994/95	9
1995/96	30
1996/97	16
1997/98	10
July-December 1998	8
Total	189

(source: Hospital Morbidity Data Base)

- \* Injury severity scores could not be calculated prior to September 1987.
- \* Information for 1999 is not available.
- \* It is likely that some of these cyclists admitted to hospital later died from their injuries. Hence there may be some overlap between these figures and the death data.
- \* Cyclists were included in this table if they had a head injury that was classified as serious, severe or critical.

(2) Financial Year	Juvenile Cyclists (Aged 15 or under)
1986/87	5
1987/88	18
1988/89	18
1989/90	10
1990/91	15
1991/92	8
1992/93	5
1993/94	8
1994/95	9
1995/96	14
1996/97	12
1997/98	8
July-December 1998	6
Total	136

(source: Hospital Morbidity Data Base)

- \* Injury severity scores could not be calculated prior to September 1987.
- \* Information for 1999 is not available.
- \* It is likely that some of these cyclists admitted to hospital later died from their injuries. Hence there may be some overlap between these figures and the death data.
- \* Cyclists were included in this table if they had a head injury that was classified as serious, severe or critical.

(3)-(4) It is not possible to obtain information on helmet wearing from available data.

(5)-(6) It is not possible to obtain information on deaths as a result of head injuries from available data. Head injuries are not mentioned in death registration data. Cause of death is coded as 'bicycle accident'.

#### SALINITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES, FUNDING

1959. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

(1) What salinity management strategies have been included within -

- (a) Main Roads; and
- (b) Westrail's,

operations since 1993?

(2) What funds have been allocated specifically on those strategies?

(3) What specific local or statewide salinity program has -

- (a) Main Roads; and
- (b) Westrail,

implemented or participated in since 1993?



Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

Main Roads Western Australia

- (1) (a) Main Roads' salinity management strategies include regulatory compliance stipulated by agencies such as Department of Environmental Protection, Water and Rivers Commission and Conservation and Land Management. Its management strategies are also built into its standards in the design of drains, bridges, culverts and floodways. In salinity affected areas particular attention is paid to ensure efficient drainage, to limit backwater and to prevent ponding and scouring of surface soil. Main Roads also contributes its expertise to community groups such as Land Care, Catchment Management and agencies such as Agwest by running workshops, seminars and giving advice on surface water hydraulics, hydrology and drainage design.
- (2) Apart from contributing the cost of professional time Main Roads contributed \$60 000.00 to the State Salinity Action Plan.
- (3) (a) Main Roads has participated in the following programs:  
State Salinity Action Plan.  
National Dryland Salinity Program.  
Commissioned the Road Research Board to study the impact of salinity on its assets.  
Landcare and Catchment Management groups program on adjoining lands to main roads.  
Land Monitor Projects.
- (1) Nil.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Westrail is committed to nature conservation by managing remnant vegetation on its 5 500 kilometres of rail reserve. Where reserves are seriously degraded it is intended to promote tree planting in association with local communities and landcare groups. A pilot tree planting program involving 10 000 trees along the rail reserve between York and Springhill commenced in June 1999 and National Heritage Trust funding is currently being sought for the protection and revegetation of further sites along rail reserves in the Albany - Gnowangerup area, totalling some 104 hectares. Although this program was not specifically adopted as a "salinity program" it will of course be of assistance in the quest to combat the salinity problem. It is Westrail's intent following success in these areas to progress to other saline affected areas.

#### MT CHARLOTTE REWARD AND NORTHERN ORE BODY, NOTICE OF INTENT

1970. Hon TOM HELM to the Minister for Mines:

I refer to question on notice number 1753 of Thursday April 6 2000 and the Minister's answers.

- (1) In relation to the answer for part (1) can the Minister state what specific "variations exist between the NOI and the Environmental review" given that the Department of Minerals and Energy sent a letter to KCGM dated September 7 1999 which in part stated "Given that variations exist between the NOI and the Environmental Review,..."?
- (2) If not, why not ?
- (3) Can the Minister state what the matter of KCGM "attending to issues with adjacent residents prior to replying to the letter" has to do with delaying and responding to the departments concerns raised in the letter dated September 7 1999?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) In relation to the answer for part (3) can the Minister explain why the department only realised in September 1999 that "Additional geotechnical information" was required given that the Original Document (Notice of Intent) was submitted and received by the Department in December 1997 approximately 21 months earlier in time which "contained limited information of a geotechnical nature"?
- (6) If not, why not?
- (7) In relation to the answer for part (5) can the Minister state why the proponents Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd with Normandy Mining Ltd and Homestake Gold are required to have "Approval of a Notice of Intent by" the "DME"?
- (8) If not, why not?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) The variations between the NOI and the Environmental Review can be explained as follows. The NOI was submitted as a trigger document to start the assessment process and as such contained only broad details of the project. The Environmental Review was a more detailed document in response to guidelines prepared by the Environmental Protection Authority and supersedes the initial NOI. The Department of Minerals and Energy required greater detail pertaining to decommissioning and rehabilitation, some additional geotechnical information in support of KCGM's proposal plus copies of other approvals to complete the Department's records.

- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) KCGM has continuous and intensive consultation programs with the community both keeping them informed and responding to their concerns. It was appropriate to complete part of this, as it may have had some impact on part of the process.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) As stated in the answer to question 1, the initial NOI was a trigger document with limited detail. The request for additional information reflects the development of the project and the flow and assessment of more detailed information. This process takes time.
- (6) Not applicable.
- (7) Every mining lease has a standard condition requiring the submission of a plan of proposed operations and measures to safeguard the environment to the State Mining Engineer for his assessment and written approval prior to commencing any developmental or productive mining or construction activity.
- (8) Not applicable.

#### REGIONAL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SCHEME, BIDYADANGA COMMUNITY

1978. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

Given the additional funding in the 2000/01 Budget for the Regional Airport Development Scheme, will the Minister advise -

- (1) Will Bidyadanga Community in the Kimberley be considered for this funding?
- (2) When and how will information about funding applications be released to remote communities?
- (3) When is it proposed that the application for funding under this scheme will close, given that the 1999/2000 RADS funding closed on April 30 1999?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) The Bidyadanga Community is welcome to submit an application for funding along with any other airport owners or operators.
- (2) A direct mail-out was sent to all local governments, Regional Development Commissions and key government agencies such as the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) and the Ministry for Housing. It is usual that these agencies alert the remote communities that they work with that the Scheme is seeking submissions. An advertisement was placed in The West Australian on Saturday 3 June 2000.
- (3) Applications will close on 17 July 2000. This was slightly delayed from the previous year given State Budget considerations.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, RELOCATION OF OFFICES FROM CARNARVON

1991. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Have any Agencies under the Minister for Employment and Training's control relocated their offices from Carnarvon to other major town centres since 1993?
- (2) If yes, which agency has relocated?
- (3) To which town has the agency relocated?
- (4) What was the cost of the relocation?
- (5) What was the basis for the decision to relocate?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) No agencies under the Minister for Employment and Training's control have relocated from Carnarvon to another major town centre since 1993. However, the non-Department-funded Gascoyne Employment Skills Training (GEST) and KARU (an ATSIC funded resource centre) were operating as Group Training Schemes in Carnarvon until the second half of 1999. Both ceased Group Training Scheme operations due to not being financial viability. The Department-funded Apprenticeship and Traineeship Company (ATC), trading as Midwest Group Training, did set up a part time office in Carnarvon for a short period, the head office being in Geraldton. This office was closed during the 1996/97 financial year due to it being financially unviable for its continuation. However, ATC still provide an outreach service with visits on a six-weekly basis. JobLink Midwest, based in Geraldton, also provides an outreach service on a quarterly basis, as well as assisting Carnarvon's young school leavers to find training and employment placements as part of the Department's School Leaver Program.
- (2)-(5) Not applicable.

## GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, RELOCATION OF OFFICES FROM CARNARVON

2000. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Have any Agencies under the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs' control relocated their offices from Carnarvon to other major town centres since 1993?
- (2) If yes, which agency has relocated?
- (3) To which town has the agency relocated?
- (4) What was the cost of the relocation?
- (5) What was the basis for the decision to relocate?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

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

## GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, RELOCATION OF OFFICES FROM CARNARVON

2014. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) Have any Agencies under the Minister for the Arts' control relocated their offices from Carnarvon to other major town centres since 1993?
- (2) If yes, which agency has relocated?
- (3) To which town has the agency relocated?
- (4) What was the cost of the relocation?
- (5) What was the basis for the decision to relocate?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

- (1) Neither the Ministry for Culture & the Arts nor any of its agencies have relocated offices from Carnarvon to other major town centres since 1993.
- (2)-(5) Not applicable.

## SOUTH METROPOLITAN COLLEGE OF TAFE, BUDGET

2033. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Can the Minister for Employment and Training advise the budget for the South Metropolitan College of TAFE for the year 1999/00?
- (2) How much of the 1999/00 budget has been spent to date?
- (3) Can the Minister advise if Program Managers have been directed to make cuts to their programs?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) An academic calendar year is used by all TAFE Colleges for budget allocations. The budget for South Metropolitan College of TAFE for the year 2000 financial period is \$49 502 771.
- (2) Expenditure for the first third of the year, to 30 April 2000, was \$12 980 011.
- (3) No, Program Managers have not been directed to cut programs.

## WEST COAST COLLEGES OF TAFE, OPERATING COSTS

2034. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Can the Minister for Employment and Training advise the annual cost of the directorate/administration section at each of the West Coast College of TAFE's campuses?
- (2) Can the Minister advise the annual operating cost of each of the West Coast College of TAFE's campuses?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1)
 

Balga	\$ 2.20m.
Carine	\$ 2.02m.
Joondalup	\$ 10.13m (includes College Directorate).

Figures presented above include expenses associated with administrative staff salaries, student admissions and records functions, building maintenance, human resource management functions for academic and non academic

College staff, finance, College information systems, contracts and purchasing regulation, College promotional and advertising budgets, and campus services (cleaning, gardening, security).

- |     |           |   |
|-----|-----------|---|
| (2) | Balga     | \$ 10.34m.                                |
|     | Carine    | \$ 7.63m.                                 |
|     | Joondalup | \$ 16.95m.                                |
|     | Other     | \$ 12.04m (includes Commercial and AMES). |

These figures are based on the Year 2000 budget.

#### BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TASK FORCE, EXCAVATOR SIMULATOR GIFTED TO THE CCF

2036. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Can the Minister for Employment and Training advise the value of the Excavator Simulator that was gifted to the CCF by the BCITF in 1999?
- (2) Can the Minister advise why such a gift was made?
- (3) Was the Minister advised of the BCITF decision prior to approval?
- (4) If not, why not?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) The dollar value of the Excavator Simulator was zero at the time of gifting to CCF. The Simulator was not operative at the time of gifting and had not been used for training for some years.
- (2) The CCF is a representative industry body in the civil contracting sector and the Excavator Simulator is designed for training in that sector. CCF requested the gifting and undertook to attempt repair of the computer software. To date repair work commissioned by the CCF has been unsuccessful. Should CCF succeed in repairing the simulator it will be used for training in the civil sector. The BCIT Board is maintaining a watching brief.
- (3) The BCIT Board views this action as a cost effective way of making the Excavator Simulator a useful training tool once again.
- (3) No.
- (4) There is no requirement for the BCIT Board to advise the Minister regarding the disposal of capital equipment with zero dollar value.

#### COLLEGES OF TAFE, RESPONSE TO LETTER ABOUT OBLIGATIONS OF STAFF

2037. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) What response has the Minister for Employment and Training received from the TAFE College Managing Director in response to his recent letter regarding the obligations of staff under section 102 of the *Public Sector Management Act 1994*?
- (2) Why did the Minister address his letter to College Managing Directors when it is the College governing council who is the employer of the college staff under the *Vocational Education and Training Act 1996*?
- (3) Is the Minister satisfied that all staff who are undertaking paid employment outside of their normal duties have applied for, and being granted, the appropriate approval?
- (4) Has the Minister sought a similar assurance from the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Training and Employment?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1) Responses have been received from all College Managing Directors to the effect that procedures are in place to ensure compliance with section 102 of the *Public Sector Management Act 1994*.
- (2) The letter was addressed to College Managing Directors (MDs) as College Governing Councils have delegated responsibility for operational management to MDs.
- (3) I am satisfied that College procedures and policies are in place to provide adequate notification to staff of their obligations to apply for and obtain approval to undertake paid employment outside of their normal duties.
- (4) No.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, LEASES FOR PHOTOCOPIERS AND FACSIMILE MACHINES

2046. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Commerce and Trade:

For each agency under the Minister for Commerce and Trade's control -

- (1) Does the agency have contracts to lease photocopiers or facsimile machines under any of the following volume based agreements -
- (a) Ricoh - Blue-chip;
  - (b) Konica - Fivestar;
  - (c) Toshiba - Platinum; or
  - (d) Abacus - Copyclub?
- (2) If yes, how many photocopiers or facsimile machines does the agency have?
- (3) With which organization does it have a contract?
- (4) When did the agency enter into this contract?
- (5) What has been the total cost of each contract to date?
- (6) When is the contract due to expire?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

Centre for Application of Solar Energy

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

Department of Commerce & Trade

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

(3) The Department of Commerce and Trade currently lease two photocopiers through Xerox.

- (4) 20 August 1996  
(5) \$162,750  
(6) 20 August 2001

Gascoyne Development Commission

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

Goldfields Esperance Development Commission

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

Great Southern Development Commission

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

Kimberley Development Commission

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

Midwest Development Commission

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

Peel Development Commission

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

Pilbara Development Commission

- (1) No  
(2)-(6) Not Applicable

Small Business Development Corporation

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

South West Development Commission

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

Wheatbelt Development Commission

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

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, LEASES FOR PHOTOCOPIERS AND FACSIMILE MACHINES

2052. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Regional Development:  
For each agency under the Minister for Regional Development's control -

- (1) Does the agency have contracts to lease photocopiers or facsimile machines under any of the following volume based agreements -

- (a) Ricoh - Blue-chip;
- (b) Konica - Fivestar;
- (c) Toshiba - Platinum; or
- (d) Abacus - Copyclub?

- (2) If yes, how many photocopiers or facsimile machines does the agency have?
- (3) With which organization does it have a contract?
- (4) When did the agency enter into this contract?
- (5) What has been the total cost of each contract to date?
- (6) When is the contract due to expire?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

See response to Parliamentary Question No 2046

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, LEASES FOR PHOTOCOPIERS AND FACSIMILE MACHINES

2054. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Small Business:

For each agency under the Minister for Small Business' control -

- (1) Does the agency have contracts to lease photocopiers or facsimile machines under any of the following volume based agreements -
  - (a) Ricoh - Blue-chip;
  - (b) Konica - Fivestar;
  - (c) Toshiba - Platinum; or
  - (d) Abacus - Copyclub?
- (2) If yes, how many photocopiers or facsimile machines does the agency have?
- (3) With which organization does it have a contract?
- (4) When did the agency enter into this contract?
- (5) What has been the total cost of each contract to date?
- (6) When is the contract due to expire?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

See response to Parliamentary Question No. 2046.

#### REGIONAL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, FUNDING APPLICATIONS

2131. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When will applications be called for funding available through the regional airport development program?
- (2) What will be the closing date for applications?
- (3) Will the Minister table the criteria that communities will need to meet to be considered eligible for funding?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Applications were called for funding under the Regional Airport Development Scheme on 3 June 2000.
- (2) Applications will close on 17 July 2000.
- (3) Yes. [See paper No 1108.]

#### WESTRAIL, FLOODS AND WASHAWAYS

2156. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

Further to question on notice 1777 of 2000 -

- (1) What were the repairs undertaken on the Marchagee section?
- (2) What additional work is required to minimise further damage from heavy rainfall?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Culverts and access roads were repaired and sleepers and ballast were replaced. Some earthworks were also carried out.
- (2) The heavy rainfall resulting in the damage to this railway was unusual and it would be difficult to prevent a

recurrence regardless of the level of works undertaken. Accordingly, there will not be any work carried out additional to the repair work already undertaken.

#### WESTRAIL, FLOODS AND WASHAWAYS

2157. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

Further to question on notice 1777 of 2000 -

- (1) What were the repairs undertaken on the Mullewa-Maya section?
- (2) What additional work is required to minimise further damage from heavy rainfall?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Culverts and access roads were repaired and sleepers and ballast were replaced. Some earthworks were also carried out.
- (2) The heavy rainfall resulting in the damage to this railway was unusual and it would be difficult to prevent a recurrence regardless of the level of works undertaken. Accordingly, there will not be any work carried out additional to the repair work already undertaken.

#### WESTRAIL, FLOODS AND WASHAWAYS

2158. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

Further to question on notice 1777 of 2000 -

- (1) What were the repairs undertaken on the Kalgoorlie-Esperance section?
- (2) What additional work is required to minimise further damage from heavy rainfall?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Culverts and access roads were repaired and sleepers and ballast were replaced.
- (2) The heavy rainfall resulting in the damage to this railway was unusual and it would be difficult to prevent a recurrence regardless of the level of works undertaken. Accordingly, there will not be any work carried out additional to the repair work already undertaken.

#### WESTRAIL, FLOODS AND WASHAWAYS

2159. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

Further to question on notice 1777 of 2000 -

- (1) What were the repairs undertaken on the Merredin-Koolyanobbing section?
- (2) What additional work is required to minimise further damage from heavy rainfall?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Culverts and access roads were repaired and sleepers and ballast were replaced.
- (2) The heavy rainfall resulting in the damage to this railway was unusual and it would be difficult to prevent a recurrence regardless of the level of works undertaken. Accordingly, there will not be any work carried out additional to the repair work already undertaken.

#### WESTRAIL, FLOODS AND WASHAWAYS

2160. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

Further to question on notice 1777 of 2000 -

- (1) What were the repairs undertaken on the Hampton section?
- (2) What additional work is required to minimise further damage from heavy rainfall?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Culverts and access roads were repaired and sleepers and ballast were replaced.
- (2) The heavy rainfall resulting in the damage to this railway was unusual and it would be difficult to prevent a recurrence regardless of the level of works undertaken. Accordingly, there will not be any work carried out additional to the repair work already undertaken.

#### ART EXPENDITURE

2166. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts:

Given the comments by the Hon Greg Smith in the Legislative Council that "Throughout history, it has been the Upper

Class in all countries who have spent money on art, not the people in Aboriginal communities”, will the Minister for the Arts confirm that the Government’s arts policies are now being targeted at the oppressed Upper Class and this explains why the Minister has committed an extra \$4.26m of State money (while other States are contributing less than \$2m) under the Nugent Report, to in effect subsidise Major Organisation Board companies in the Eastern States?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

In reference to where Government’s arts policies are being targeted, the arts policies are being targeted at a range of priority groups and areas of activity within the community, including Aboriginal and Indigenous communities. Just two examples of the Government’s targeted activity in this area are:

ArtsWA’s establishment of an Aboriginal Arts panel which supports traditional and contemporary Aboriginal arts and culture. The purpose of having funds dedicated to Aboriginal arts activity is to promote a greater understanding of Aboriginal culture among Aboriginal people and the wider community both in Western Australia and beyond; and

The State Government’s support and recognition of the achievements of two Aboriginal arts organisations Magabala Books and Yirra Yaakin Noongar Theatre Company, two Arts Agencies funded through ArtsWA on a triennial basis.

If required a range of other initiatives can be identified to demonstrate the importance placed on promoting the cultural activities of Western Australia’s Aboriginal and Indigenous people. Other priorities for the State government, through ArtsWA include young people and the arts, regional arts and national and international arts development. In strategic terms, the Government’s priorities include the need to make arts and culture accessible and relevant to everyone in the State.

The Major Performing Arts Inquiry (the Nugent Report) is a national initiative in which WA was involved through the specific examination of four of WA’s major performing arts companies. The Major Performing Arts Inquiry was specifically set up to meet each State’s major performing arts companies’ individual requirements and situations within a national framework, by doing so giving more depth and substantiation for change. Therefore, each state has a package, which relates to its own history and stages of development measured against agreed benchmarks. Thus, both the WA and Commonwealth funding components of the WA package goes directly to the WA companies and WA resources. There is no subsidising of other states in the WA package. In fact WA actually gains additional funding from re-distribution of current Commonwealth funding to central bodies (e.g. Opera Conference) which will now go directly to the WA Opera Company.

It is superficial to judge the WA funding package by only examining the total amount of dollars over a four-year period. It is what these dollars are providing for the WA Symphony Orchestra, the WA Ballet Company, The WA Opera Company and Black Swan Theatre Company and their Western Australian audiences, which must be brought into focus here. In other words, there is much more to the package than the money – there will be stabilisation of the sector, increased performances with better standards, as well as opportunities for better access and a wider reach into the WA community.

#### PUBLIC LIBRARIES, PUBLIC ONLINE ACCESS

2168. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts:

In response to question without notice no 1158 the Minister for the Arts referred to a long standing “partnership” between Local and State Government.

In relation to this “partnership” -

- (1) What is the age of the agreements that govern this “partnership”?
- (2) Do the agreements reflect contemporary strategic and management practices which serve the best interests of our community?
- (3) When will negotiations on a new Public Library Framework Agreement between State and Local Government commence?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

- (1) The partnership is defined in the Library Board Act 1951. The Board has individual agreements with each local government authority depending on when the local government authority established a public library in conjunction with the Board.
- (2) The agreements cover the responsibilities of the respective parties and reflect current library practice and standards.
- (3) The State Librarian is meeting with WAMA in early June to discuss this matter.

#### WYNDHAM COLLEGE OF TAFE, AQUACULTURE COURSE

2169. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) When will an aquaculture lecturer be appointed to the Wyndham TAFE College to ensure current enrolled students in aquaculture can complete these studies?



- (2) When will the Wyndham TAFE library be allocated additional and sufficient aquaculture text books to meet student needs?
- (3) Can the Minister for Employment and Training give an assurance that the aquaculture course will continue at Wyndham TAFE, allowing students to receive their certifications?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

- (1) Kimberley College of TAFE has made a contract offer to an Aquaculture lecturer. This lecturer is expected to commence at Wyndham during the first week in July 2000, following relocation.
- (2) The College's Library Services has quite an extensive range of appropriate textbooks and learning resources to support the Aquaculture programs at both Wyndham and Broome. Such resources will be enhanced as necessary to ensure the students (at Wyndham and Broome campuses) have access to the support they need to complete their Aquaculture studies.
- (3) Yes, Kimberley College of TAFE is committed to continuing the Aquaculture course at Wyndham, so that students will have the opportunity to receive certification in this field. The College realises the importance of this course to both the students and the community of Wyndham.

#### TELECOMMUNICATIONS, REGIONAL WA

2170. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Commerce and Trade:

Phone lines in the Murchison were due to be upgraded on March 28 2000 to improve Internet and fax facilities however, Telstra has written to the Shire of Murchison to say that the job has been put on hold due to budgetary constrictions. Given the Government's expensive launch of WA On-line and feel-good television advertising set on metropolitan beaches, I ask -

Has regional WA yet again been let down by this Government's inability to effectively lobby the Federal Government and Telstra for equal communications access for regional WA?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Western Australian Government has been very effective in its lobbying of the Federal Government in respect to equal communications access for regional Western Australia. As a result, major strategies addressing regional needs are now being implemented. A major strategy to overcome problems of access has been to introduce carrier competition. Other carriers have technologies more suited to meeting regional needs than Telstra does at present. There are three actions now happening, all of which I have been consistently lobbying for. In addition, the following strategies will prove to be a great improvement and have been the subject of discussion with the Commonwealth and Telstra. Firstly, the Commonwealth Government has announced that it will call tenders to select a carrier to deliver untimed local calls to everyone in the extended zones which cover most of Western Australia and in which no-one can currently make an untimed call. The successful tenderer will become the Universal Service Provider for that vast area. Furthermore, the Registration of Interest documentation on which we have been consulted indicates that one of the decision criteria will be delivery of additional services such as high speed Internet access and broadcasting services. \$150million from the sale of the second tranche of Telstra is being used for this purpose. Secondly, the Commonwealth Government is about to introduce Universal Service Obligation (USO) contestability. It has sought the Western Australian Government's views on a discussion paper canvassing how best to conduct trials using two carriers apart from Telstra. Both the above actions will confirm whether other carriers are willing and able to deliver a better service than is now available in regional Western Australia. Thirdly, the Western Australian Government has strongly advocated strengthening the Customer Service Guarantee (CSG). The CSG applies to all carriers, not just Telstra. Improvements which have achieved include:

- (1) From 2 August 2000, telephone companies must automatically pay penalties due to customers.
- (2) The Australian Communications Authority now has the power to direct phone companies to take action to improve service quality or incur fines up to \$10 million.
- (3) The CSG now applies to second lines used for fax or the Internet.

#### SWAN RIVER, INSPECTION AND AUDIT PROTOCOL

2171. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Further to question on notice 1860 of May 3 2000 will the Minister for Water Resources table a copy of the inspection and audit protocol developed by the -
  - (a) Swan River Trust;
  - (b) Waters and Rivers Commission; and
  - (c) Department of Environmental Protection?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Yes, there is one protocol developed jointly by the Swan River Trust, Water and Rivers Commission and the Department of Environmental Protection. [See paper No 1109.]

(2) Not applicable.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, PROGRAMS FUNDED

2302. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Youth:

What funds have been allocated from any department or agency within the Minister for Youth's portfolios, and for what programs, to each of -

- (a) Chamber of Commerce and Industry;
- (b) Pastoralists and Graziers Association;
- (c) WA Farmers Federation;
- (d) Unions WA;
- (e) Chamber of Minerals and Energy; and
- (f) Association of Minerals and Exploration Companies,

for 1999/2000?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

(a)-(f) Nil.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, PROGRAMS FUNDED

2307. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Fisheries:

What funds have been allocated from any department or agency within the Minister for Fisheries' portfolios, and for what programs, to each of -

- (a) Chamber of Commerce and Industry;
- (b) Pastoralists and Graziers Association;
- (c) WA Farmers Federation;
- (d) Unions WA;
- (e) Chamber of Minerals and Energy; and
- (f) Association of Minerals and Exploration Companies,

for 1999/2000?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

Fisheries Western Australia

(a)-(f) Nil.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, PROGRAMS FUNDED

2346. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Youth:

What funds have been allocated from any department or agency within the Minister for Youth's portfolios, and for what programs, to each of -

- (a) Chamber of Commerce and Industry;
- (b) Pastoralists and Graziers Association;
- (c) WA Farmers Federation;
- (d) Unions WA;
- (e) Chamber of Minerals and Energy; and
- (f) Association of Minerals and Exploration Companies,

for the period February 1993 to June 1999?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

(a)-(f) Nil.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, PROGRAMS FUNDED

2351. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Fisheries:

What funds have been allocated from any department or agency within the Minister for Fisheries' portfolios, and for what programs, to each of -

- (a) Chamber of Commerce and Industry;

- (b) Pastoralists and Graziers Association;
- (c) WA Farmers Federation;
- (d) Unions WA;
- (e) Chamber of Minerals and Energy; and
- (f) Association of Minerals and Exploration Companies,

for the period February 1993 to June 1999?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

Fisheries Western Australia

- (a)-(f) Nil.

#### CARNARVON FARM RECOVERY SCHEME, SWEET CRETE'S CONTRACT

2378. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

In relation to the payment of \$115 332 made to the company Sweet Crete for work under the Carnarvon Farm Recovery Scheme -

- (1) What was the nature of the work carried out by Sweet Crete?
- (2) By what process was this company awarded the work?

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

- (1) Excavating, loading and transporting soil.
- (2) Selection of contractors was undertaken under the declared State Emergency procedures whereby contractors were required to undertake the required works at a pre-specified rate of payment for each unit of work. Subsequent to the initial emergency response, advertisements were placed seeking contractors Statewide to provide the works at the pre-specified rates. Sweet Crete is 1 of 30 operators who have provided a service under the Carnarvon Farm Recovery Scheme.

#### ARTS AND CULTURE, FUNDING OF REGIONAL SERVICES

2386. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) What metropolitan arts activities will be cut to enable the Minister for the Arts to fund regional performing arts centres an extra \$150 000?
- (2) If no activities are to be cut, where is this extra funding coming from and where is it contained in the Budget papers?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

- (1) The ministry is reviewing its regional services to look at opportunities for better service delivery. Assistance to regional venues is one element of this, but no commitments have been made and certainly no dollar figures have been allocated. There is no intention to cut services in other areas.
- (2) Not applicable.

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### NATIONAL PARKS AND SALINITY, TELEVISION ADVERTISEMENTS

**1300. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the minister representing the Minister for Forest Products:**

I refer to the Government's latest television commercials promoting its planned 12 new national parks and ask -

- (1) Will the minister table -
  - (a) the cost of producing the advertisements;
  - (b) the cost of running the advertisements;
  - (c) for how long the advertisements are to be run; and
  - (d) any other costs other than production and airing?
- (2) Who produced the advertisements?
- (3) Will the minister table a copy of the script of the advertisement, and if not why not?
- (4) Are these commercials another example of a breach of the federal Broadcasting Services Act and, if not, why not?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

- (1) There are two television commercials on air; one dealing with national parks and the other dealing with salinity.
  - (a) Approximately \$38 000.
  - (b) \$63 698.
  - (c) Currently booked for two weeks. Future phases of the information campaign have yet to be booked.
  - (d) In-house staff time.
- (2) John Davis Advertising Pty Ltd.
- (3) Yes, I will table a copy of the script of the advertisement.
- (4) The commercials comply completely with the requirements of the Broadcasting Services Act.

[See paper No 1105.]

## WESTERN POWER, REGIONAL ACCESS CHARGES

**1301. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Energy:**

In answer to question on notice 1540 the House was informed that Western Power would publish regional access charges in early July and I ask -

- (1) Will the minister table those charges?
- (2) If not, why not?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(2) Western Power has produced regional access prices pre GST which have been approved by the Office of Energy. They are in the public domain on Western Power's web site under "Network Access Charges/Distribution Access Price Summary" and under "Regional Network Prices".

The GST-adjusted prices have now been approved by the Office of Energy and will be published in a pricing supplement and on the Western Power web site.

CASINO CONTROL (BURSWOOD ISLAND) (LICENSING OF EMPLOYEES) AMENDMENT REGULATIONS  
1999, CONSULTATION**1302. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:**

With respect to the minister's answer to question without notice 1283 dealing with the Casino Control (Burswood Island) (Licensing of Employees) Amendment Regulations 1999 -

- (1) Why did no consultation take place with licence holders, either directly or through their union?
- (2) Will the minister table the correspondence between the Gaming Commission and Burswood International Resort Casino referred to in the answer and, if not, why not?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) The Gaming Commission consulted to the extent it considered necessary in accordance with the duties and powers of the commission as provided for in division 2 of the Gaming Commission Act 1987.
- (2) Under the secrecy provisions contained in section 20(3) of the Gaming Commission Act, I am unable to table correspondence.

## KWINANA MOTORSPORTS COMPLEX, IMPACT OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

**1303. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Planning:**

The Hope Valley-Wattleup Redevelopment Bill proposes that an area of Hope Valley will be taken up by heavy industry. As this will be close to the Kwinana motorsports complex and will be incompatible with safety requirements for its patrons -

- (1) What research has been done?
- (2) What clearances have been obtained from the Department of Environmental Protection and Emergency Services?
- (3) What steps will be taken to allow heavy industry into this area while ensuring the safety of patrons?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(3) The heavy industrial proposal in the Fremantle Rockingham Industrial Area Regional Strategy report is a preliminary proposal. This will be further explored in the preparation of the master plan for the area, including more detailed analysis of environmental factors.

#### WORKERS COMPENSATION, COMMON LAW ACTION

**1304. Hon HELEN HODGSON to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Labor Relations:**

- (1) Is the minister aware of any instances in which insurance companies have agreed that an injured worker's injury is higher than the 16 per cent threshold required to take common law action under the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act, despite the fact that the insurer was aware the worker did not meet this requirement and, if so, of how many instances is he aware?
- (2) Is the minister aware of any instances in which insurance companies have agreed that an injured worker's injury is higher than the 30 per cent threshold required to take common law action under the Act, despite the fact that the insurer was aware the worker did not actually meet this requirement, and if so, of how many instances is he aware?
- (3) Has the minister received any complaints or allegations of such practices?
- (4) Is the minister having this practice investigated and, if so, by whom and what is the required report-back date?
- (5) What action can and will the Government take against any insurers found to be operating under the practices outlined in parts (1) and/or (2) of this question?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Yes. WorkCover Western Australia by 30 June 2000.
- (5) If the allegations are substantiated this action will be taken into account when assessing the insurer's approval under section 161(3) of the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act.

#### DRUGS, PSYCHO-STIMULANTS

**1305. Hon MURIEL PATTERSON to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police:**

What campaigns are in place to target the growing usage of psycho-stimulant drugs in the regional areas of Western Australia?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

The Government has recently conducted the drug-aware psycho-stimulants campaign targeting the use of MDMA, ecstasy, amphetamines and LSD by young people. The campaign has consisted of youth press, radio and convenience advertising targeting young people and press advertising providing information for parents.

This is the first such campaign conducted in Australia as part of the continuing drug-aware illicit drug education campaign which has also involved campaigns focusing on the use of heroin and marijuana, and on providing information to parents. The psycho-stimulants campaign and other drug-aware campaigns are continually updated and repeated.

The campaign has been supported by the Alcohol and Drug Information Service and the Parent Drug Information Service providing referral and support; resources and publications distributed through schools, universities, TAFEs, youth centres and alcohol and drug agencies; participation from community organisations such as local drug action groups; a sponsorship competition; and drug aware merchandise.

Evaluation of the campaign among young people aged 14 to 24 has indicated that 76 per cent were aware of the campaign and between 69 and 85 per cent found the advertising believable, and that this resulted in 24 per cent finding these drugs less appealing, 34 per cent being less inclined to use them, 35 per cent expecting a worse experience and 45 per cent expecting greater health harm than they would have otherwise anticipated.

The WA Strategy Against Drug Abuse, "Together Against Drugs", provides a comprehensive context for the psycho-stimulants campaign with school drug education, health and community support services, law enforcement and strong support for action in local communities.

#### WESTERN POWER, ENGINEERING SECTION

**1306. Hon J.A. COWDELL to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Energy:**

- (1) Is Western Power going to contract out its engineering section?

- (2) (a) If yes, will there be any job losses in the south west region?
- (b) Will there be any job losses in the Collie district?
- (3) Is it true that whoever receives the engineering section contract will -
  - (a) be guaranteed 100 per cent of the work in the first year; and
  - (b) be guaranteed 75 per cent of the work in the second year?
- (4) Will the Office of Power Generation be located at Bunbury, given that the power generation centre is in Collie?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a)-(b) No.
- (3) (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (4) No; to be determined by the new owner.

#### QUARANTINE ORDERS, MT BARKER FARMS

**1307. Hon KIM CHANCE to the minister representing the Minister for Primary Industry:**

- (1) How many farms in the Mt Barker area have been subject to quarantine orders for footrot in the past six months?
- (2) Have any of those farms been released from quarantine during the same six-month period?
- (3) What is the shortest period that a farm has been the subject of a quarantine order?
- (4) What were the circumstances of the early release of that quarantine order?

**Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) From 22 December 1999 to 22 June 2000 nine quarantine orders for footrot have been issued to farmers in the Mt Barker area.
- (2) None of those farms has been released from quarantine during the same six-month period.
- (3)-(4) Not applicable.

#### HOME AND COMMUNITY CARE, VOLUNTEER DRIVERS

**1308. Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:**

I refer to the supplementary information provided by the minister representing the Minister for Health following the estimates committee, concerning the licensing arrangements for volunteer drivers of home and community care services and ask -

- (1) Did the minister say in his answer that it is intended that volunteer drivers who collect an identified fare for hire or reward, as is the current situation, will need F-class licences?
- (2) Does this mean that a volunteer driver collecting a nominal payment from a HACC client, but for no personal gain and no gain for the HACC service, will be required to obtain an F-class licence?
- (3) Under what circumstances will volunteer drivers for HACC services not be required to obtain such licences?
- (4) If volunteer drivers do not collect a fare and the client pays into a central fund for such services, will that arrangement avoid the obligation on HACC volunteer drivers to obtain F-class licences?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. Any fees collected under the safeguards policy in relation to the provision of HACC services is a gain to the HACC program, contributing towards the available funds for the provision of HACC services.
- (3) A volunteer HACC driver not providing a direct transportation service for HACC clients will not be required to obtain such a licence. For example, the delivery of meals through the meals on wheels program.
- (4) The requirements under the Road Traffic Act 1974 are that all drivers, including volunteer drivers, with fee-paying

clients must hold an F-class licence; advice provided by the Department of Transport being that the point of collection of the fee is not relevant. The main concern of the HACC program is, however, the safety and welfare of the clients and volunteers involved in transport services and of the duty-of-care requirements ensuring staff, and specifically volunteer staff, are appropriately qualified to provide transport services to the HACC client group.

#### JETTY, DONGARA-PORT DENISON

#### **1309. Hon GIZ WATSON to the Minister for Transport:**

In respect of plans to demolish the wooden jetty at Dongara-Port Denison -

- (1) What sources of expertise have been sought and what advice has been received by the Department of Transport on the state of the wooden jetty at Dongara?
- (2) What is the total amount of money which will be made available to the Shire of Irwin from the State Government through the offer of demolition assistance and the grant to cover the construction of a new concrete jetty, etc?
- (3) How much extra will the Irwin community need to find to complete the construction of a new concrete and iron jetty?
- (4) Given that expert opinion obtained by the community at Dongara indicates that the existing wooden jetty can be repaired for around the same amount of money as is being currently offered just to demolish the existing jetty, what is the justification for the expense of building a new jetty?

#### **Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Various inspections and reports have been undertaken by Transport, and previously by Marine and Harbours, engineering staff experienced in the maintenance of wooden jetties with the latest in-house detailed inspection being in February 1997. A detailed inspection of jetty piling was undertaken in March 1997 by the firm Port Divers, a company experienced in the underwater inspection of maritime structures. Engineering consultants, Egis Consulting Australia Pty Ltd, undertook an inspection and condition assessment of the jetty in February 1999, its report being submitted in April 1999. A copy of the report on the jetty condition and repair options prepared by Bridgecore Engineering Pty Ltd on behalf of the save the wooden jetty committee has also been provided to Transport for information. All of the reports indicate and confirm the deteriorating condition of the jetty.
- (2) A sum of \$120 000 will be provided for the demolition of the old jetty with \$205 000 being contributed towards the cost of the new jetty.
- (3) The member will need to address this matter to the Shire of Irwin as it will depend on the final detailed design of the jetty.
- (4) The member will need to address this matter to the Shire of Irwin which made its decision on behalf of ratepayers after considering the issues raised by the save the timber jetty committee. The proposed new jetty is considered more functional for meeting the needs of recreational boating in the area than the old jetty.

#### FARRALL ROAD-GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY INTERSECTION

#### **1310. Hon NORM KELLY to the Minister for Transport:**

Further to question without notice 1146 asked on 24 May and relating to traffic problems at the intersection of Farrall Road and Great Eastern Highway -

- (1) Is the minister aware that the research used as an argument against the installation of traffic lights is more than three years old?
- (2) Can the minister provide an estimate of the current volumes of traffic using this intersection?
- (3) On what basis has such an estimate been calculated?
- (4) Are there any plans to do further research on traffic volumes before doing road works on this intersection?

#### **Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2)-(3) The latest traffic figures available from Main Roads were recorded in 1998-99. They show that the volume of traffic on Great Eastern Highway is approximately 31 000 vehicles a day and on Farrall Road, approximately 6 500 vehicles a day.
- (4) There are no plans to do further research on traffic volumes before undertaking roadworks on this intersection. The 1998-99 traffic volume on Great Eastern Highway was over 4.5 times greater than the traffic volume on Farrall Road. Main Roads does not consider that the relatively low traffic numbers recorded on Farrall Road in

1998-99 would have increased sufficiently since then to result in any significant change in the proportion of traffic carried by Great Eastern Highway.

#### PLUMBING AND PAINTING TRAINING COMPANY

**1311. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:**

- (1) How many apprentices employed by the Plumbing and Painting Training Company successfully completed a plumbing and gas fitting pre-apprenticeship course in -
  - (i) 1994;
  - (ii) 1995;
  - (iii) 1996;
  - (iv) 1997;
  - (v) 1998; and
  - (vi) 1999?
- (2) For each of these years, how many of these apprentices signed on a four-year apprenticeship term?
- (3) In each case, who in the Department of Training and Employment gave approval to waive the three-year mandatory term?
- (4) In view of the fact that such a waiver is a breach of the Industrial Training Act 1975, will the minister table any correspondence from the Minister for Employment and Training instructing the Plumbing and Painting Training Company to put each of the apprentices on a three-year indentured apprenticeship?
- (5) If not, why not?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question and ask that it be placed on notice.

#### NORTHBRIDGE TUNNEL, REPAIRS

**1312. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:**

- (1) Will the minister confirm when in July or August it is proposed that the Northbridge tunnel be closed for maintenance and repairs?
- (2) Will the minister advise how long the maintenance and repairs will take?
- (3) Will the minister advise who will be funding the cost of the repairs?

**Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) The contractor is proposing to close the westbound carriageway of the tunnel on the night of 5-6 August and the eastbound carriageway on 12-13 August to undertake maintenance. He has indicated that repairs will be undertaken during the first closure.
- (2) Main Roads is waiting on the details of the contractor's program but it is expected the closure involving repairs could be up to 12 hours.
- (3) The cost of repairs is the contractor's responsibility.

#### NORTHBRIDGE TUNNEL, LEAKS

**1313. Hon RAY HALLIGAN to the Minister for Transport:**

I have read Press reports of last week concerning leakage in the Northbridge tunnel. The reports tend to indicate poor design or construction and that the Government will incur additional costs in fixing the problem. Will the minister please advise if this is the case; and, if it is, what is being done to remedy the situation?

**Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

The Northbridge tunnel has been open for nearly two months now and has been warmly embraced by the commuting public of Western Australia, attracting in excess of 3.7 million vehicles since its opening, with traffic flows of some 70 000 to 75 000 vehicles each weekday, and significantly reducing the traffic flows on some of the city's other major arterial roads such as the Causeway and Wellington Street. Because of its location and design it should be recognised that in the main the tunnel is constructed below the existing water table. For this reason, minor seepage through parts of the structure was anticipated and appropriate measures were established to address this during the life of the facility. Independent verification has been undertaken to ensure that the design of the tunnel is appropriate and that durability requirements will be met. This is not an unusual occurrence in tunnels, and it can and will be addressed with minimum disruption to the travelling public. The work can be undertaken in conjunction with regular maintenance which is planned for the tunnel where lights and fans are checked, walls are washed down and safety features are tested, etc.



The first of the routine maintenance work is planned to occur in August. The work will be undertaken at night so that disruption to the travelling public is minimised. It will involve the contractor removing part of the black top and injecting a silicone base sealant into the tunnel floor. Under the contract established with the joint venture company which built the facility and which will maintain the tunnel over the next 10 years, this work will be carried out as part of the normal maintenance program. There is no added cost to Main Roads or the Western Australian public.

#### MARBLE BAR ROAD, UPGRADING

#### 1314. Hon TOM HELM to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the recent Main Roads' budget announcements for the Pilbara and ask -

- (1) Have funds been allocated to improve the Great Northern Highway between Newman and Marble Bar?
- (2) If yes, how much funding has been allocated for this purpose?
- (3) How many kilometres of road will this affect?

#### Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) I presume the member is actually referring to Marble Bar Road, in which case funding has been allocated in the 2000-01 program.
- (2) Funding allocated in the 2000-01 program for the Newman to Marble Bar section of Marble Bar Road is \$1.4m.
- (3) The funding allocated in the 2000-01 program will enable the region to cement stabilise and seal floodways and re-sheet approximately 15 kilometres of road.

#### SOUTH WEST REGIONAL COLLEGE OF TAFE, VEHICLE PURCHASES

#### 1315. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

Further to question on notice 693 of 14 March 2000 -

- (1) Is the South West Regional College of TAFE subject to the Matrix vehicle leasing deal?
- (2) Will the minister table a list of vehicles the college purchased and, in relation to each vehicle, the purchase price, the date sold by the college and the sale price in the years 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999?

#### Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) No.
- (2) I table attachment A, which lists the information.

[See paper No 1106.]

#### TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, BUDGET ALLOCATION

#### 1316. Hon E.R.J. DERMER to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Commerce and Trade:

- (1) How much state money will be committed to the statewide telecommunications enhancement program contract with Telstra?
- (2) Where in the 11 May 2000 *Budget Statements* is the allocation of this money included?

#### Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) An amount of \$1.3m under a development deed yet to be signed will be committed. Individual agencies will spend various amounts with Telstra, if they choose Telstra to meet their needs for delivery of services to rural and remote areas.
- (2) The \$1.3m does not appear in the 2000-01 *Budget Statements* because it is part of the Commonwealth Government's contribution to the commonwealth-state funded telehealth pilot project. Agencies' telecommunications spending is included in their own allocations.

#### WELLINGTON STREET FREEWAY ACCESS RAMPS, MOVEMENT

#### 1317. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to media reports that the Roe Street side of the Wellington Street ramps on and off the freeway has moved four feet and ask -

- (1) Will the minister explain the nature of the problem?

- (2) What steps are being taken to rectify this?
- (3) Who is bearing the cost?

**Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) The bridge is constructed by casting sections at one end and pushing them forward until the bridge is complete. In this case, after pushing the section forward, the section retracted approximately 1.2 metres. The cause of the problem was that the primary braking system failed to hold. Secondary braking mechanisms, together with the primary system, then stopped the section retracting any further.
- (2) The primary braking system has been modified to ensure this event is not repeated.
- (3) The contractor will bear any cost.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT, RESTRUCTURING

**1318. Hon G.T. GIFFARD to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:**

I refer to the recent organisational restructure of the Western Australian Department of Training and Employment. Will the minister table the following information -

- (1) How many occupied substantive positions will be abolished and at what level is each position?
- (2) How many vacant substantive positions will be abolished and at what level is each position?
- (3) How many staff have been classified as redeployees?
- (4) How many new substantive positions will be created and at what level?
- (5) When will the full extent of the restructure be available?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

The Western Australian Department of Training and Employment is undertaking a reorganisation of functional groupings within the department in order to better position the agency for the future. At this stage, the major functions of the agency have been aligned within broad groupings. However, the details of the structure within each group have yet to be finalised. Work on this is progressing and is expected to be finalised by 31 July 2000.

- (1) Four occupied substantive positions have been abolished: One class 2, one level 7, one level 6 and one level 4.
- (2) At this stage, no vacant substantive positions have been abolished.
- (3) Four staff have been classified as internal redeployees and are currently being placed in vacant positions within the department.
- (4) At this stage, one class 1 and one class 2 position have been created to replace the class 2 position which has been abolished.
- (5) It is anticipated that the new organisational structure of the department will be finalised by 31 July 2000.

#### NORTH WEST COASTAL HIGHWAY, TRIPLE ROAD TRAINS

**1319. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:**

- (1) Will the minister confirm that the Government is considering allowing triple road trains to travel south on the North West Coastal Highway as far as Binu?
- (2) If yes -
  - (a) when is this expected to happen; and
  - (b) what bodies have been consulted about this proposed expansion of the area of travel of triple road trains?

**Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

- (1)-(2) Some time ago the department carried out a trial by bringing cattle to Ogilvie. I am not sure if people know where Ogilvie is, but it is north of Northampton, and Northampton is north of Geraldton, for those who do not know.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: We spent days talking about the Northampton Hospital.

Hon M.J. CRIDDLE: When I was first elected, I spent a while dealing with the Northampton Hospital too.

I will deal with road trains travelling south. There is an enormous saving for that road transport if it travels south to Binu. In the area north of Binu, a number of passing lanes have been constructed to allow that to happen. It will be a tremendous

advantage to the transport system. The indications are that the transportation savings will be something like 30 per cent if those triple road trains travel down that highway. They are capable of travelling down that highway. It is my view that the power of the tractor part of the trucks should be great enough to allow them to maintain a reasonable speed, because we do not want a trucking configuration that may disrupt the traffic. Most of those big trucks now have that capacity, and they will travel comfortably down to that area.

#### TRANSPERTH, PASSENGER SATISFACTION MONITOR SURVEY

##### **1320. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:**

- (1) When was the most recent passenger satisfaction survey for Transperth undertaken?
- (2) Will the minister table a copy of that report; and, if not, why not?

##### **Hon M.J. CRIDDLE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) The 1999 Transperth passenger satisfaction monitor survey was conducted in March 1998, with the report produced in May 1999. The 2000 PSM survey was conducted in April-May this year, and the report is expected to be delivered within the next month. Information on the 1999 PSM was provided in media releases in mid 1999. The executive summary of the 1999 passenger service monitor report has previously been provided as supplementary information following the Legislative Assembly estimates committee hearings in May 2000. Both the 1999 and 2000 PSMs have been conducted in an independent manner by Donovan Research Pty Ltd. In fact, it looks at something like 3 300 different people and takes some time to collate the information. Each interview lasts for about 20 minutes, so it is a comprehensive survey.
- (2) Results of the 2000 PSM will be made available to the public via a media release and by publication of key results from the executive summary on the Transperth web site. A copy of the executive summary of the 2000 PSM will be tabled when it is available.

#### RED CROSS TRANSPORT SERVICE, MANDURAH AREA

##### **1321. Hon J.A. COWDELL to the minister representing the Minister for Health:**

- (1) How much did the Government expend in the following financial years on the patient assisted travel scheme or grants for Red Cross Society transport from the Mandurah area -
  - (a) 1994-95;
  - (b) 1995-96;
  - (c) 1996-97;
  - (d) 1997-98;
  - (e) 1998-99;
  - (f) 1999-2000?
- (2) Is Red Cross transport suitable for many patients, given its early departure, multiple pick-ups and late return to Mandurah?
- (3) How much of the total cost of the Red Cross transport service has been recouped from local patients in each of the last three financial years?
- (4) What donation per trip is requested for this government subsidised service?

##### **Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Government expenditure on PATS or for Red Cross transport from the Peel-Rockingham area -
  - (a) 1994-95 (total cost unknown - part of Health Service budget)
  - (b) 1995-96 \$51 000
  - (c) 1996-97 \$51 000
  - (d) 1997-98 \$51 500
  - (e) 1998-99 \$71 600
  - (f) 1999-2000 \$51 500.
- (2) In the 1999-2000 agreement it is stipulated that government funding for the Mandurah Red Cross transport is provided to transport people who are not eligible veteran beneficiaries and have no other means of transport to access specialist services in Perth for radiotherapy or renal dialysis where it cannot be provided at Peel Health Campus or existing clients needing treatment from a Perth specialist for a chronic medical condition.
- (3) The Health Department of Western Australia does not require the Red Cross to report on the total cost of the service only on the components relating to eligible patients as per the agreement between the Health Department of Western Australia and the Red Cross Society.
- (4) As previously said, those who are ineligible may be asked to make a donation to the service. As it is not a part of the agreement with the Health Department, the figure is not available.