

# Legislative Council

Thursday, 12 May 1994

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.30 pm, and read prayers.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR EDUCATION

*State School Teachers Union, TAFE Lecturers, Enterprise Bargaining Meeting*

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Minister for Education) [2.31 pm] - by leave: Members will be aware, from media reports, that the State School Teachers Union held a meeting of TAFE lecturers on Saturday, 7 May, to protest at proposals being put on the table by the Department of Training for discussions on enterprise bargaining. Despite the predictable reaction by the union, I am confident that TAFE lecturers will examine the proposals, the circumstances in which they are made, and respond with mature and meaningful discussion. What are the proposals? Currently, TAFE lecturers are required to work 30 hours a week. The Department of Training is seeking to increase this to 37.5 hours. Members should ask themselves whether this is so different from the rest of the work force. The answer is no. Despite this, the union calls this proposal draconian.

Hon John Halden: So do 678 of its members.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Second, the department is proposing that TAFE lecturers be entitled to six weeks' annual leave. Currently, they receive, with college vacation periods, 12 weeks' leave. Why does the union consider six weeks' leave unacceptable when the majority of the work force expects and gets four weeks? Third, within their 30 hours' work each week, TAFE lecturers have a ceiling of 22 hours actual class time. This ceiling applies whether the lecturer is teaching records management or geophysics. The Department of Training wants to remove this artificial barrier and leave the number of classroom hours for discussion between the college director and the individual lecturer, taking into account the complexity of the subject, the number of repeat classes, and the individual capacity of the lecturer. For years unions have been saying that an organisation's most valuable resource is its employees, yet they want the employer to treat them as an indistinguishable mass, without individual differences and abilities. Such inflexible provisions have no place in a modern organisation, especially one that is expected to be training the managers/employees of the future work force. An obvious response is that it would be possible to have TAFE lecturers doing 37.5 hours' classroom contact. While theoretically that is possible, as a former teacher, I would say that is unreasonable and inappropriate. The quality and efficiency of education would deteriorate and I would oppose such misuse of flexibility.

All these the union considers draconian. However, there are more. Should a TAFE lecturer, as part of his or her classroom contact, have to teach after 5.30 pm on Monday to Friday or on Saturday morning, each hour is counted as equivalent to one and half hours in the weekly total of 22 hours. Remember, we are not talking overtime but 22 ordinary hours. As a consequence, we have TAFE lecturers who can complete their working week in three days, including evenings. What the department is seeking is that there be no equivalent time, and any hour of classroom contact Monday to Saturday means an hour.

Finally, the union finds a performance appraisal system objectionable. According to the union, TAFE lecturers are professionals who do not need appraisals. The union is so out of touch on this issue that it does a real disservice to its membership. It is because the majority of TAFE lecturers are professionals that they want to be appraised. They fear nothing. They are well qualified, good teachers and want to have this recognised formally in an appraisal system. The only request from these lecturers is that the performance appraisal does what it says, and is fair and unbiased. I agree with that. The performance of senior executive service members is appraised, so is that of the college directors. Even we in this Chamber are subject to the appraisal of our constituents. Why

should lecturers be any different? Why does the union oppose a system of performance appraisal? Is it because it wishes to hide the non-performers in the system? For the sake of the few lazy, inefficient and non-interested lecturers, it denies positive recognition of the good lecturers. It is about time the union adopted a professional attitude to this issue.

So much for the draconian proposals. I now wish to turn to the circumstances in which these proposals are being put: First, the need for workplace flexibility has been recognised by governments of both political persuasions, employers, unions and peak councils such as the Trades and Labor Council and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. Despite this, the State School Teachers Union wishes its members in training institutions to be exempted. For them, the world must remain the same. The Government will not allow artificial barriers, rigidities, inflexible workplace conditions and outmoded conditions to remain. TAFE lecturers are surrounded by students who are experiencing workplace change. The students are coming from industries where change is a fact of life. Things can, and must, change. Members may ask where these conditions came from in the first place: They are simply an accident of history. Generally, the conditions of employment for TAFE lecturers are derived from those applicable to primary and secondary teachers. The conditions of classroom teachers had been swung over to TAFE lecturers. Members will immediately recognise the differences between both systems of education. TAFE lecturers do not have classes of school children. By and large, their students are mature and desire to attend TAFE - in fact, have queued to get in. The courses which they undertake, in many cases, enhance their career prospects. Approximately, 70 per cent are part-time students and the numbers in a classroom are smaller than their counterparts in the primary and secondary systems. In short, the student profile, reasons for attending and teaching environment are significantly different from those of school teachers. This difference must be recognised.

Finally, members should be aware that the TAFE training system is operating in a deregulated environment. The near monopoly which TAFE enjoyed in the past is no longer the case. This situation has occurred as a result of the Federal Labor Government actively encouraging, through the Australian National Training Authority, the entry of private training providers into the training markets. The Commonwealth Government claims to be committed to the provision of quality training, and optimising the value of each dollar spent in this area. If private training providers can achieve this, it will be at the expense of this state's TAFE system. The teachers union fails, or does not want, to see this. Inevitably, if the TAFE system is not competitive, training opportunities and jobs will be lost. Once the decline sets in, it will be difficult to stop. I know that individual lecturers are aware of these changes and wish to embrace this challenge. However, those in the union prefer to ignore the structural changes taking place; their leadership is cocooned. The response of the union is to seek refuge in a federal award. Our Government has opposed such a move, believing that state employees' conditions of employment should be determined locally in the state Industrial Relations Commission, and not by tribunals east of Eucla.

Hon John Halden: They've obviously got you scared.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Members of the union should be aware that not only will their conditions of employment be regulated in the east of Australia, but also their union affairs will be run from there. Motions of no confidence and condemnation of me and the chief executive officer of the Department of Training will not assist those lecturers who lose their jobs because of the lack of labour flexibility within the system. I am committed to ensuring that the TAFE training system is an efficient, relevant, customer focused provider of training that meets the needs of students. I trust that all members will support this approach.

Consideration of the statement made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.

#### **PETITION - PORT KENNEDY DEVELOPMENT AREA, NO HOUSING**

The following petition bearing the signatures of five persons was presented by Hon J.A. Scott -

To: The Honourable The President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

The petition of the undersigned respectfully sheweth that no housing be allowed on the land within the Port Kennedy Development area.

Your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Legislative Council, in Parliament assembled should ensure the enactment of the full spirit of the Port Kennedy Development Agreement Act is carried out by confirming the commitment of the Parliamentary Secretary that no residential development would be allowed on land within the Port Kennedy Development area.

[See paper No 45.]

## **WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION AMENDMENT ACT 1993**

### **CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT ACT 1993 ADOPTION ACT 1994**

#### *Referral to Standing Committee on Legislation*

On motion, by leave, by Hon George Cash (Leader of the House), resolved -

That the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Amendment Act 1993, the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Act 1993, and the Adoption Act 1994 be referred to the Standing Committee on Legislation for consideration and report.

## **STRATA TITLES AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Restoration to Notice Paper*

On motion, by leave, by Hon George Cash (Leader of the House), resolved -

That the Strata Titles Amendment Bill 1994 be restored to the notice paper and thereafter dealt with at the stage it had reached in the previous session.

## **MOTION - SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT**

#### *Airports, North West, Greater Use by International Traffic*

Resumed from 11 May.

**HON E.J. CHARLTON** (Agricultural - Minister for Transport) [2.47 pm]:  
Mr President -

#### *Point of Order*

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The Minister had finished speaking at the conclusion of the debate yesterday when I took a point of order, at which time you, Mr President, were about to draw to the attention of the House the time. If members read the *Daily Hansard* they will see that the Minister had concluded his remarks.

The PRESIDENT: Order! My sheet does not indicate whether the Minister was finished.

Hon GEORGE CASH: The Minister for Transport had clearly not finished speaking at 4.30 pm yesterday, one hour after the House had commenced.

Hon John Halden: It was 3.30 pm.

Hon GEORGE CASH: It happened to be 4.30 pm; however, let us not argue about an hour. It was obvious by the Minister's comments that he had a considerable distance to go. More than that, you, Mr President, caused him to sit down when you drew to the attention of the House the time. It was after that that Hon Tom Stephens made certain comments.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not need a debate on it. I have the *Daily Hansard* here. There certainly is nothing to indicate that the member had finished his speech, because I interrupted proceedings. I do not know whether the Minister had finished. I was not interested in that. Page 7 of the *Daily Hansard* indicates that Hon Eric Charlton was

speaking and I then said, "Honourable members", because I was about to draw his attention to the one hour rule. Mr Stephens then raised a point of order.

Hon George Cash: As is reflected on the notice paper.

The PRESIDENT: It is also reflected in *Hansard*. I do not accept the point of order because the Minister clearly indicates that he was not finished.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I do remember what happened yesterday and I recall the comments I was making in response to the motion moved by Hon Tom Stephens. I had reached the point where the clock was ticking up to 3.30 pm and that is why I looked in your direction, Mr President; but I did intend to conclude my remarks today.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the Minister get on with his remarks?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I said yesterday that the motion moved by the honourable member was about a very important issue. I fully agree with his sentiments about the need to address the issues he identified in his motion. However, when he moved a similar motion last year I agreed it was important and should be given high priority. I am sure every member agrees that action should be taken, but it does not require this sort of motion to appoint a select committee. Such motions are moved when an issue which has been brought to a member's attention requires some research before the Government can take any action. Select committees are appointed simply to consider the matter in detail and make recommendations to the Government.

In this case I agree that action should be taken, but it is not necessary to appoint a select committee. The Government has at its disposal a number of options to implement what Hon Tom Stephens outlined in his motion. I explained to the House yesterday that the Government was coordinating a number of actions to ensure that the concerns of not only the member but also the people affected were allayed. These actions will provide the opportunity for new initiatives to be taken in the north of this State. The airport facilities are not the only matter under consideration. Consideration is being given to the shipping services which are required to export products from the north of this state to South East Asia, which is only a short distance away.

I have already referred to paragraph (1)(c) of the motion and I will refer to subparagraph (a) which refers to the current method of costing airport operations and whether that method deters or penalises remote airports in terms of international traffic. I will respond to that for the benefit of Hon Tom Stephens.

Hon Tom Stephens: How long will your response take this afternoon?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Why?

Hon P.H. Lockyer: I hope it is not long because I have a lot to say.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The debate will take longer if members keep interjecting. Will the Minister direct his comments to the Chair?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I certainly want to respond to that part of the motion. I said yesterday that the Government had gone to extreme lengths to address the very issues outlined in the member's motion. I remind members that I referred to subparagraphs (a) and (b) yesterday when I commented on Broome and the fact that the airport was privately owned. Hon Tom Stephens must have been terribly disappointed that Broome was not developed when the Labor Party was in government. He wanted that town developed and I guess he would have supported the establishment of an international-type tourist development. I have discussed the development of the airports at Broome and Kununurra with the Federal Airports Corporation. Obviously, it has resources from which it can draw to establish international standard airports around Australia. As a consequence of the success of the additional runway at Sydney the corporation has the financial capacity to develop new airports. I am supportive of the corporation being involved in that. It is a tragedy when we have this unbelievable opportunity to increase

trade and tourism in the north west of Western Australia that we do not have the support from the private sector to build the runway which is required and the associated accommodation. Immigration facilities must be improved to handle additional tourists entering Australia from the north of the state.

The Government has not only investigated the potential for trade and tourism in that area of the state, but also discussed how the improvements in the north west of the state can be financed. I am sure Hon Tom Stephens agrees that the Government has not sat on its hands in the last 12 months and done nothing. It gathered momentum from the beginning to address all the issues raised in this motion. Only today I announced the next step in correlating all freight exports out of Western Australia, including perishable goods which are produced in the north of the state. The Government is looking forward to another facet; that is, sugar development.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: I would like a copy of that report when it is printed because I am very interested in this subject.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I can provide the member with a copy of the report which identifies the problems, but the Government is going to the next step - to correlate all freight exports. The Government wants to identify every product which is exported out of Western Australia and catalogue where it is produced, the time of production, whether it will be exported to South East Asia as well as Europe and the freezer and coldroom facilities required to ensure that the product leaves Western Australia in pristine condition -

Hon Sam Piantadosi: That is a big problem.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: That is a horrendous problem. I said yesterday that I examined the procedure in New Zealand and the people there are very aware of how much a product will cost and when the products will peak and be ready for export. The airlines obviously do not know when these peaks occur. They cater for passenger services. As a consequence, the airlines do not have the capacity to take those products and they sit in the airports for a long period and lose quality and hence value. We are coordinating a group of people to talk with all producers in the state, particularly those in the north, in order to identify the products involved and other associated aspects. When that is completed, a council representing the producers of flowers, fish, vegetables and other products will be set up so that it will be not a government bureaucracy running the show but rather those people coordinating themselves in order to maximise their effort. We have taken the first and biggest step of identifying the problems. We will then form that council and fund it to get up and running. From there, it will be up to the council to promote those products.

We all know that the cost of operating an airport depends upon the number of aircraft which use that airport per week, month or year. Privately operated airports, such as Kununurra Airport, which is owned by the local shire council, have limited funds in this day and age to be able to extend and make capital improvements. We want to assist the Shire of Kununurra to expand that airport in order to encourage more flights, which is also crucial from a tourism point of view. Significant costs are involved in extending the Kununurra Airport, as Hon Tom Stephens and others would know, because of the limitation in the direction to which the airport can be extended. We have had ongoing discussions with the local shire about that matter. Therefore, we do not need to identify what is required; we only need the money to do it. We are progressing that matter with a range of people, including people from the Tourism Commission, to look for opportunities to fund that expansion.

Hon Tom Stephens would know that there can be a degree of flexibility in regard to the immigration requirements for people who enter Australia from overseas. People from South East Asia who land on the tarmac in Broome, where it can be extremely hot, and alight from the plane -

Hon T.G. Butler: You are pretty lucky to be in Broome at any time of the year.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: But it can be pretty hot. Those people have to go through

Customs in a situation where the premises are not air-conditioned, and that may not be the best situation for people to come into. A select committee will not overcome that problem. We need to have the capital available to build better facilities. Broome has taken the first step towards doing that, and the development of a retail outlet in Broome will be the next step in moving the airport to a new site. That could have been done years ago, had members opposite been able to influence their government to get it right, but obviously they could not do that. They failed to attract the people with the will and determination to do that and missed a wonderful opportunity. We should reflect on that for a moment, because this is what is happening around this state in so many areas. This Government is trying to pick up the pieces of what the previous government failed to do. There were great opportunities throughout the 1980s when a great deal of capital was around for developments such as that, and had action been taken then by the government, the people of Western Australia would now have been able to reap the rewards of international airports at Broome and Kununurra. The funds were there and people wanted to do it, but the government of the day could not get its act together to allow that to happen. Members opposite now want to establish a select committee to find out how that can happen. The hundreds of millions of dollars that were floating around this state at that time would have been chickenfeed to establish those international airports in the north of Western Australia, but nothing was done. Nothing was done to make Stateships viable to transport the produce of the north of the state to South East Asia, where there is a market of hundreds of millions of people. We have only to look at what the Northern Territory has done in the same period to enhance its operations -

Hon Tom Helm: What nonsense! You are making a fool of yourself.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Hon Tom Helm would not know. He floats around the north of the state, talking to his union mates, and never -

Hon Graham Edwards: The Minister for personal abuse!

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: When one hands it out, one has to be prepared to take it. The one thing I can do is take it, but the member cannot.

Hon Graham Edwards: You are constantly making personal attacks on people on this side, and you should be ashamed of yourself.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not let anybody attack anybody.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I cannot let this opportunity go without pointing out that the previous government lost a golden opportunity to put in place some of these things, yet now members opposite say they want to have a select committee to find out the reasons why it did not happen and how we can make it happen. I inform the member, and others who are interested, that we acknowledge that the opportunity was missed, and immediately upon getting into government we took the appropriate action of ensuring that we put into place -

Hon Tom Helm: Poppycock!

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I am not allowed to respond because it could be taken personally, Mr President. I would not like any members opposite to feel that they were being personally attacked by me.

Hon John Halden: Attacked with a wet feather!

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: The Leader of the Opposition's colleague obviously does not think that. He takes it very personally and is hurt to the quick. He cannot handle it, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who is a strong man. It is a shame that the Leader of the Opposition's colleagues cannot take a leaf out of his book and stand up and be counted.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I get very angry when members who seem to take offence at the slightest thing then proceed to disrupt the operations of the Chamber. I do not have a record to defend any more, and perhaps I could create a new record by having the most members at one time out of the Chamber. I do not want to do that.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I have outlined the issue, and action has been taken on every point listed in the motion. We have the total support of the international airlines which want to land in the north of the State. I have mentioned the immigration factor and the cost of those airports. It is a matter of an available capital base. We are dealing with the Federal Airports Corporation, private operators and local authorities. People are already operating in this area privately, and we are trying to encourage investment. The member did not recommend that the Government should direct money in the development of the airports, and I agree with him. Immigration goes hand in glove with everything else which has been done. The accommodation facility is associated with those matters. I will keep the member who moved the motion informed of progress made and will make reports available to him. I look forward to the great benefits which will accrue to the north of the state through these developments.

HON P.H. LOCKYER (Mining and Pastoral) [3.11 pm]: Unfortunately, I was not here yesterday due to other parliamentary commitments, but I have read the *Hansard* and discovered what went on. This is not the first time that the member has moved such a motion. I will not be insulting any members opposite, and I am aware that Hon Tom Stephens is quite serious in moving this motion. However, it is unwarranted. I am surprised that the member was not so vocal when for 10 years he was a member of government and did not secure support for his proposition.

My comments shall fit closely the terms of reference for the proposed select committee. Firstly, paragraph (1)(a) relates to the cost of airport operations. Some years ago the proprietor of the Cable Beach Club, Lord McAlpine, presented a proposal to the local shire of the day. This involved land acquisition of the present airport site and his company would develop an international airport to the benefit of, firstly, the township of Broome and, secondly, the Kimberley. Smart thinking people in the north regarded the fact that as the proposal would have cost the taxpayers of the state not one dollar, it should have been embraced. I am not saying that Hon Tom Stephens did not support that proposal - I have no evidence of that. However, a certain young lady in the town of Broome - whom I was happy to see was displaced as a councillor on Saturday - along with her more vocal friends, was able to persuade Lord McAlpine not to proceed with his proposal. She made it so tough and generated such public feeling around the town that the proposal did not proceed. The long and short of the matter is that the chance has now passed the town by. The present operators have extended the airport and, to their credit, have constructed an international terminal - all that is required now is some international aircraft - but this proposal was not implemented.

I am satisfied that the Minister and his department are looking at the matters outlined in the motion. The government of the day, particularly the incumbent premier, did not give support to Lord McAlpine and private enterprise so that they could get on with the job. Mrs Hannigan, for whatever reason, was absolutely vigorous in opposing the possibility that Lord McAlpine may make money from the current airport site. Members who have visited Broome would know that the airport is located fairly and squarely in the middle of town. This is far from ideal as it is, at least, noisy and may well be dangerous. The opportunity has been missed. A select committee is not necessary to look at all the operations in the north. If Hon Tom Stephens sat down with a pencil and paper, he could produce as much information about the north as the select committee. He has done nothing but represent the area for the past 10 years and he must have learnt much about the north. To give him the respect that his long time in this House demands, he knows what is going on.

I noticed that one of Hon Tom Stephens' colleagues was chastising the Minister for Transport. Obviously, the member was referring to the Curtin Air Base. The decision of the federal government of the day regarding the location of that base represents a culpable offence - it is neither use nor ornament. It is located in the bush out of Derby, and represents no advantage to that town. It has 10 000 to 12 000 feet of runway and is set up beautifully - it is one of the great white elephants of all time! The days have passed of a military airport without civilian use. It is a grossly improper use of taxpayers' money. An exercise is conducted up there about once a year.

Hon Tom Helm: What about Pearce Air Base?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The member cannot compare the two.

Hon Tom Helm: Of course they can - they are both military. I point this out before you make a fool of yourself as usual.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I am trying not to offend the member because he appears to be rather thin skinned today - it is most unusual. The member has never been the same since he took off that pony tail. Pearce Air Base cannot be compared with Curtin as Pearce is a training centre, and probably has more aircraft movement than Perth Airport.

Hon Tom Helm: What about Jandakot, Karratha and Darwin?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: How long is it since the member visited Curtin? It probably handles one aircraft a day at best.

Hon Tom Helm: So?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Curtin represents a massive cost to handle one aircraft a day. Would it not have been better to have located the facility at Broome or Kununurra?

Hon Tom Helm: In the middle of town, or out in the bush from Broome?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I am attempting to explain the matter to the member, who shares my electorate. For instance, if the federal government at the time decided that the Curtin Air Base was to be located at Kununurra, it would have been of mutual benefit to the area. Plenty of land is available in the vicinity, and this would have resulted in substantial benefit to the horticultural industry, which is so important to this State, Kununurra and the Ord Valley. It would have been eminently more suitable to have international carriers from South East Asia and other places overseas transporting our produce from the region. This makes much more sense than the Derby location, where the cost of road transport to the base would make it unviable.

Hon Tom Helm: What is wrong with the airport at Kununurra?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The member has no aeronautical knowledge, as well as his other shortcomings. It is impossible to land an aircraft of the size required for that load on a strip of that size without killing oneself. The member may have noticed on his last trip to the airport that a huge hill is located at the end of the runway. Contact between such a hill and an aircraft is not mutually advantageous! Therefore, that airport is not suitable for that traffic. Hon Tom Helm is making Hon Tom Stephens cringe in his seat, as he knows what he says is wrong. A fully loaded BAe 146 cannot land at Kununurra in summer because of the capacity of the airstrip. I draw these technical matters to the attention of the House.

Paragraph (1)(b) expands my argument. Suppose the Curtin Air Base was located at Broome on the area Lord McAlpine wanted to use. Unlimited area is available - it could be located on Waterbank Station. This would have been of advantage to commercial users and to the tourism industry, which is so important to Broome and the Kimberley. At present it is too far away.

Hon T.G. Butler: Why are you opposed to this?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Because it is unnecessary.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Everyone knows what ought to be done.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: We will find that it is unnecessary from the select committee.

Hon T.G. Butler: How can you be so sure of that?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I have been in the north west for a long time. Like Hon Tom Butler, I have backed myself into a corner on occasions.

Hon T.G. Butler: I am not suggesting you do not know what you are talking about but I am confused about why you don't want this committee.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I am still criticising the decision of the Federal Government of



the day to put the Curtin base where it is. This may well shock Hon Tom Butler, but when these jet jockeys are at Curtin for military exercises they stay at the Cable Beach club.

Hon Graham Edwards: That is the RAAF all over.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I do not believe that is right.

Hon Graham Edwards: They are called blue orchids for a reason.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: That is one sound argument that the Federal Government should have looked at. I was the member representing the area at the time they made the decision, and they did not come near me for any advice.

Hon Graham Edwards: Who would!

Hon Tom Helm: Thank God for that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest to the Opposition Whip that he speak to Hon Tom Helm and remind him of Standing Order No 116(e) because the next time he opens his mouth and interjects I will invoke it.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Paragraph (c) of the motion calls for the committee to inquire into what benefits to the state would accrue from the greater use of north west airports. Apart from the odd military exercise at the Curtin base and an Ansett WA aircraft that lands once a day, the place is an enormous white elephant. It would not be a white elephant if it were in Broome, Kununurra or closer to Derby. I will bet London to a brick on that Ansett WA will make the wrong decision and drop Derby off its network and that a commuter aircraft will use those airports. They will be using the old airstrip at Derby.

Hon Graham Edwards: What is the strategic reason for using Curtin?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Every person I have approached on this has never been able to give me a reason. The best answer is that some bureaucrat in Canberra stuck a pin on a map and said, "This is where we will put it." The air distance between the Tindal air base in the Northern Territory and Curtin, and between Tindal and Broome, is about 25 nautical miles. It is not of any strategic value whatever. They would have taken into consideration that it was Crown land and thought it was a good place to put it. I would have thought they would talk with the people in the north of the state, people within the tourism and horticultural industries. Curtin air base is the laughing stock of the north. Further south is the Learmonth airport, which is 10 000 feet of concrete runway, and already, as the Minister is well aware, steps are being taken to upgrade the airport with international immigration and customs facilities, for a couple of reasons. One is the success last year of flights from Singapore. I commend Hon Tom Stephens, who was one of its great supporters. There are more flights coming this year, but it is important that they have the right sort of customs and immigration facilities. That is already happening. In due course horticultural products from the Gascoyne region may be shipped out of there, although some people in the industry tell me it would be more difficult to do that. There will be an ever increasing volume of traffic from South East Asia as those economies pick up. Hon Tom Stephens is obviously aware that we have had a 110 per cent increase in the number of Indonesian tourists coming to Western Australia. They are our closest overseas neighbour to the north of our state. One does not have to be Einstein to work out that we must target those places. That is already happening in the portfolios of the Ministers for Transport and Tourism. They are actively targeting those markets. Only last week I travelled to Exmouth with the Premier and the Chairman and General Manager of the Tourism Commission, to bring them up to date on the facilities in the town and at the airport.

One of the reasons a select committee is not required is that so few airports are involved. It is really a handful in the north: Carnarvon, Learmonth, Port Hedland, Broome, Curtin, Kununurra, Newman, Paraburdoo and Karratha. Obviously there are problems within all of them, because when most of those airports were built no-one would ever have envisaged that most overseas travel would be in the size of aircraft now used. Very few airports can take a decent sized aircraft. I am sure the member would know. It is simple

to say that we should be bringing people directly in from Singapore to Exmouth or Broome, but there are many logistical problems to be met. For instance, where will they sleep? It is no good bringing more overseas tourists into Exmouth in July, because there will be no beds for them. Accommodation around the town is full with people from down south, interstate and overseas people. From experience, if people are brought to Broome in January it is not advantageous; the weather is inclement. It is hot, and it is the wet season in the Kimberley. Those sorts of things need to be taken into consideration. We should encourage the Lord McAlpines of this world.

Hon J.A. Scott: You mean foreign investors?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Unfortunately, unless we have foreign investment in this country we will not get anywhere. Where does Hon Jim Scott suggest we get the investment from?

Hon J.A. Scott: There are also local investors.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: We had 10 years of Labor government and there is nothing left of the local investors. Yesterday the court put one of them in Casuarina prison.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: He was a mate of one of the former Liberal Premiers.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: He was a mate of mine too.

Hon T.G. Butler: I am glad you're not a mate of mine, if that's the way you would go around talking about me.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Why don't you get your mate to invest?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The investment for these projects is not found in Western Australia.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You made a lot of money in those days.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: We should embrace investors coming from overseas.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: Superannuation funds established under Labor will be a major investment.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Even Hon Phil Lockyer is looking overseas.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The Labor Government went mad with its cheque book up north.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Tell me about the motion you are addressing. I do not want know about superannuation funds.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Hon Phil Lockyer even went to the Philippines.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Hon Sam Piantadosi is a funny man.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: So are you with a monkey on your back.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: There is no need for a select committee. Although the member's intentions may be well placed, if he is patient I am confident the Minister for Transport and his department will take the steps required to assist the future development of the north west.

### *Point of Order*

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Mr President, can I, by way of a point of order, advise the Leader of the House, through you, that the time I would take to respond would be very quick.

The PRESIDENT: No, you cannot do that.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I wonder if I could draw your attention, Mr President, through a point of order -

Hon P.H. Lockyer: I had not finished.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Maybe you will be finishing very quickly. The House gave leave for the Minister to make a long ministerial statement.

The PRESIDENT: Order! You cannot go on about that. I must conform to the rules, because I must conform to them and that is a pretty good reason why Hon Tom Stephens should conform to them. The honourable member knows I have always admired his tenacity for trying, but after a while it becomes tiring.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: So there is no method whereby I can?

The PRESIDENT: Not to put too fine a point on it, no. Yesterday we did this and we took 10 minutes getting round to letting me put to the House that one hour had elapsed. It will get to the stage where I must say that one hour and 15 minutes has elapsed.

*Debate Resumed*

The PRESIDENT: One hour has elapsed since the time set down for this sitting, and leave of the House is required if the debate is to continue.

Leave denied.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I ask that Bills for introduction be now taken.

Hon Tom Stephens: You will never get leave from me again, Mr Cash.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Do not threaten me.

The PRESIDENT: Order! For goodness' sake, there will be several of you leaving involuntarily.

**TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING AMENDMENT BILL**

*Leave to Introduce*

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [3.37 pm]: On behalf of the Minister for Finance, I move -

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for "An Act to amend the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act 1960 to permit the TAB to participate in a combined scheme with a prescribed public company, and for related purposes.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

Hon Tom Stephens: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Mr President, I am not seeking leave at all. I am seeking the motion.

The PRESIDENT: The motion is that you are seeking leave to introduce the Bill.

Several members interjected.

Hon George Cash: You will be very sorry my friend.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The motion is for leave to introduce a Bill.

Several members interjected.

Hon GEORGE CASH: If leave is denied and there is to be a contest, we will see who wins if the member comes to me in tears, as he did last time.

Hon Tom Stephens: It takes both sides of this House to make it work, and as long as you behave as you do -

Hon GEORGE CASH: The Opposition's business gets a go as well.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The smarter we get the more difficult we make it for everybody. I suggest to members that they all take a very good look at themselves and their recent treatment of the rules, conventions and customs of this place. Some people think that they are my rules, my customs and my conventions that they are tampering with. They are not mine at all. You elected me, I gave an oath, and have done so on quite a few occasions - I know it off by heart - in which I undertook to uphold and maintain the rights and privileges of all members of this House. I make no mention in that oath of undertaking that I will single out any particular member or any group of

members or somebody who happens to belong to this or that political party. I sometimes think we would be better off if we did not belong to political parties, but I am a realist and we do. I make no mention in that oath about protecting, maintaining and upholding the rights and privileges in this House that in any way are dealt with from a partisan point of view. Over the past 18 years I have done that with as much integrity as possible, bearing in mind the frailties I might have when things pop up that have not popped up before. It seems that in recent times members have been lying awake at night trying to think of ways to frustrate members. I am a bit behind the times. I have not been used to thinking in those terms in all the years I have been in this place. If we are going to resort to a system whereby an individual is going to say, "If you do not do this for me, I will not do this for you and you are going to suffer and we will take advantage of some other situation", honourable members, I tell you that we are another step closer to having anarchy in our society.

We have to operate this Parliament. I am not about to change my mind and give a different ruling. I have given the ruling. I am not prepared to accept that leave was not denied to introduce a Bill. The Clerk has given me some advice that suggests there may be a way to deal with that Bill now denied leave. I vigorously intend to pursue that. I have made the ruling on the basis of the convention and the way this place operates. At the conclusion of today's sitting, and perhaps over the next week, I will examine very closely the wording of these motions relating to Bills for introduction. It may well be that we may change those words, but while those words remain as they are they will be interpreted by me in the way I have always interpreted the term "seek leave" to do something. In the past I have tenaciously reminded you that when people are seeking leave, one voice is all that is necessary to prevent leave being granted. I happen to be very vigorous in upholding that to maintain justice for the minorities. If you dispense with it for one reason, it will come back to haunt you. I tell the House it will come home to haunt us, because although from time to time people who sit on this or that side of the House change, they cannot change the rules as they cross the Chamber - not while I am here and, I suggest, whether I am here or not. I do not know that we will get a great deal of joy out of this but if we did it again now we possibly would not do the same thing. But we will not get the chance to do the same thing. I will not put the matter again. If somebody asks me to put it somebody else might as well be wearing this gear. We will be going nowhere. I think it is quite sad.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

##### *Motion*

Resumed from 11 May.

**HON B.K. DONALDSON** (Agricultural) [3.42 pm]: It is appropriate that on Sunday a function organised by Hon Roger Nicholls, the Minister for the Family, will be held at Government House for the Year of the Family. In his Address to the House, the Governor said that when travelling around Western Australia he was reminded at first hand of a truth too often forgotten; that is, our most important resource is our people. I was surprised that the Government had to take the initiative of introducing a state-wide campaign to help prevent family violence, backed up by a 24-hour family help line and confidential counselling service. It is a sad indictment of today's society that that sort of initiative must be introduced.

I was disappointed to read a satirical and cavalier report on the opening of Parliament in *The West Australian* last Friday. That article did nothing to enhance the image of *The West Australian* as a newspaper; it did nothing to enhance the moral high ground that that newspaper now occupies, which unfortunately was lamentably lacking in the years between 1983 and 1992. The journalist who wrote that article should understand that he demeaned not only the Governor of the state but also the Parliament. Many people enjoy a joke and satire; however, I was disappointed that a story written in such a manner was printed. It would have made more sense if the article highlighted the depth to which society has degenerated and pointed out that the moral values and principles that we

would all like to uphold have disappeared. Many reasons exist for that, and I will deal with some of them later.

The Year of the Family is important. We should take on board the Governor's comments on the issue. Too often decisions are made in Canberra with no regard for the consequences they will have on the people. Earlier, it was mentioned that the people in Canberra live in a cocoon.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm*

[Questions without notice taken.]

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: After those words "being factual" spoken by the President at the end of question time I feel a bit intimidated, but I will try to continue.

Hon John Halden: It is probably contagious.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: Before the break I mentioned the cocoon, or the vacuum, that probably exists in Canberra. A well known Labor Senator, Jim McClelland, on his retirement said that the greatest single mistake this nation had ever made was the establishment of Canberra. He believed the Federal Parliament was built in a vacuum; it was too far away from reality and should have been sited in Koorda. The truth would have come out and I am sure you, Mr President, who spent some time in my home town as a young fellow, would agree with me. However, I think he was really referring to either Sydney or Melbourne, where the real world exists. I do not know.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister cannot wander around in front of me.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Sorry, Mr President.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: That is quite okay.

The PRESIDENT: It is not okay.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: You are not supposed to tolerate the Executive in that fashion.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: I was talking about the Year of the Family. We all experience the pressures of life today irrespective of social status. Some of us have been touched by events in our family that we understand and as a result think a bit more deeply about some of the issues that affect families. Unfortunately I have had that experience. No doubt other members are in the same position. I realise how the tyranny of distance affects people living in the country, especially when they must care for somebody who has to be moved to Perth. We are affected by changes in our life during that time. The manner in which we adapt to those experiences builds character.

The youth of today have tremendous social pressures on them. They face peer pressure to try illegal substances that are rife within our society, especially in schools, and from which people make huge profits. We see almost daily where a farm, station or shed is raided and an illegal substance found to have been produced or grown there. I do not think anybody denies their prevalence in schools. People tell me that one can buy drugs, amphetamines or speed just about anywhere. I would love to know where the people who sell them can be found, but when one asks the youths, they clam up. It seems to be an unwritten law, even at a young age, not to do in people. The sad part is that the people who appear in our courts are the users - not the sellers, who are inflicting a terrible price on our youth.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: Is it not time we changed the law concerning users?

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: It is time we looked at that. However, that is for a different debate. It is happening at a very difficult age for our children. It is a time when they move from childhood to adulthood - an uncertain time, especially nowadays. Most of our youth are better educated and skilled than many of us sitting in this House. I know that some people in this House are very highly educated, but people like me with just a farming background may not be as well educated today as we would wish. However, I had a choice. Today our children are being educated and skilled, but they cannot be guaranteed that at the end of day they will find a job. When people of my age were ready

to go to work we certainly had opportunities to go each and every way to choose a career in which we were interested. If we did not like the first job, we had an opportunity to move into another field. That is missing today from our society. I do not have the answers, but these are the pressures on our youth and families.

I can understand the reasons for the suicide rate among young people. It is being brought out into the open at long last. Even three or four years ago people in the know could have told us that one of the great turning points among our youth was the increasing suicide rate. That is an indictment of all of us and I do not think any of us can escape that. We also have a system today in which, increasingly, both the wife and the husband, for all sorts of reasons, are in the work force. I guess part of it is the attempt by some families to ensure that their children will be educated to the highest standards, and that costs money. They want to make sure they will leave those children with an opportunity they can utilise one day in the future. It must be very frustrating and can result in a lack of self-esteem when one is skilled after the education process but cannot find a job. I will bet that everyone in this Chamber could relate to that. We know young adults who are highly educated but are unable to pursue the career they chose when they went into their chosen discipline of education.

From that point of view, additional pressure is placed on families that live in rural and remote areas. I do not believe that social pressure changes a great deal. Perhaps people in country and remote areas are not under attack from some of the drugs that are freely available in the metropolitan area. I do not resile from the fact that drugs are still available in country areas.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: Kalgoorlie is the amphetamine capital of Western Australia.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: Drugs have spread everywhere, so there is not a great deal of difference. I was once told that people do not have to live in country areas. I am talking about my own electorate, the Agricultural Region. All I can say is, thank heavens they do.

In the past 80 or 90 years, agriculture, the pastoral industry and mining have played a vital role in the framing of the present economic structure in Western Australia. It is all very well to be able to provide a service dollar, but at some stage there must be a replacement dollar. The only way to have a replacement dollar is by selling the goods that one produces. Those primary industries produce a large multiplier factor. There is a long piece of string between the farm gate and the port; everybody has a grab on the way. Some of those operators use high technology and some are labour intensive. Today, it seems that farmers must use expensive chemicals. People on the land have to put up with the vagaries of the weather. The rain that fell in the lower south west today must be of comfort to many farmers in the outer wheatbelt areas who are waiting for rain. The Department of Agriculture claims that every week after May that no rain falls there is a reduction in the potential capacity for the crop to produce.

The population is shifting. People seem to be gravitating towards the coast. Many reasons exist for that and they cannot be remedied. What has happened is that technology has caught up with primary industry at the same time as it has with the business sector. Technology we did not envisage 30 years ago is available to plant crops. I remember when the Super 70 Chamberlain tractor produced in Western Australia was the king of the wheat lands in the early 1960s. Yet 30 years later people are driving tractors with 450 horsepower. Those tractors are able to pull wide line cultivators and air seeders behind them and can sow 600 or 700 acres in 20 hours. That was unheard of years ago. At that time, farmers would need three or four tractors with people working flat out for 24 hours each to gain that sort of acreage. Farmers have become more efficient and more productive. They did not have to be told by a business management consultant to become more efficient and productive; it just had to happen. If they did not do that, they would not be operating very long. Farmers have had the ability to tighten their belts and to get on with the game.

The shift of population has brought some problems. The Minister for Education and the Minister for Health are aware of the problems. People expect a certain quality of life.

People who live in country and remote areas expect certain standards of education and health. It is hard to attract people to the country. Usually the wife is the homemaker and the protector of the family's health; she also ensures that the children receive a good education. Because of the economic position, it is difficult for government's to maintain the level of services that we would like to see. However, it is an obligation and responsibility of any government to ensure that those fundamental needs of people living in rural and remote areas are being met.

It is interesting to note that at present the average age of farmers is 57 years. What has happened to our youth? They have drifted off to the cities and to other opportunities because there are no job opportunities in the country. We cannot blame the kids. Statistics often reveal that there is no real unemployment in rural and remote areas. Quite frankly, if people cannot obtain a job, they do not stay in a town. They go to where the best opportunities are present, which may be in the metropolitan area or along the coast. That is what has been occurring. We have been seeing an exodus for the past 20 years and it is difficult to arrest. No government wants to see that happen. All governments have tried to arrest the gravitation away from rural and remote areas. I do not know what the answer is.

It was reported recently - it was a pretty sick comment - that the worst form of child abuse is to leave one's farm to one's son. When commodity prices dropped over the last few years, there was a depressed attitude in the wheatbelt and agricultural areas. Those decreased prices were caused by poor seasons. One could say, "Well, I guess that is business." However, it has a compounding effect. Farmers are notorious spenders of money. Usually if they get \$1, they will try to spend \$3. With the multiplier effect, that money is put into the community. It helps provide jobs in the metropolitan area in the service industries and for people who provide services for agricultural pursuits, in the mining industry and the pastoral industry. Unfortunately, in the last few years, jobs have been scarce.

The actions of the Federal Government have not helped people who live in country areas. It is easy to be critical. I do not believe that the Federal Government is consciously trying to harm country people, but the effect of the fuel excise causes great problems for them. Australia is a huge continent. The distance between Sydney and Perth is the same as the distance between the north and the south of Western Australia. The milch cow mentality on fuel excise affects everyone in Western Australia. The majority of our consumer items come from the Eastern States, much of it by road. Those goods are distributed throughout Western Australia by road. The fuel excise adds a cost to everyone in the state, but there is an added burden to those who live in rural and remote areas.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: Doesn't it encourage local industry? Wouldn't it have that effect?

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: Unfortunately, much of the local industry we used to have seems now to be based in the Eastern States. The member probably understands why. The biggest catchment for the goods and services is where the population base is. Those industries found it far better to be positioned in the Eastern States. Unfortunately, that will not change, although there has been a resurgence in investment since we came to government. People have grown more confident as this Government has moved into its second year.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: Isn't that Australia-wide?

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: It is interesting that the member should ask that question. I am pleased that she has interjected. It seems coincidental that the economy is now recovering and we see the Prime Minister and the new Treasurer claiming that they are the ones who turned the Australian economy around.

A change of government occurred in every state except Queensland. It is coincidental that before the sweeping away of the excesses of the 1980s a Labor government existed in every state except New South Wales. I suspect the turnaround in the economy has had

a big effect. It has shown itself to be the case in Western Australia. Some of the measures which have been taken in Victoria and South Australia have been quite radical, but they had to be. Everybody laughed at the jokes about what Victoria was worth; it was not worth anything. It has been stated that during a tram strike in Victoria the tram wheels were welded to the rails. Another comment was made that the Kirner government sold the rolling stock to the Japanese, then leased it back. It has been stated that the trams were welded to the rails to prevent repossession. That demonstrates how broke Victoria was at that time.

Returning to the excise on fuel, I am surprised that Hon Kim Chance, as a person who has lived and worked in the country for many years, has not been more vocal in his criticism of the continual increase in this area. I am not talking about returning all the funds to roads. I am stating how a continuing increase in this area affects everyone in Australia. Australia is very transport orientated. It must be due to the sheer distances. If one lived in Singapore, it would not matter, but it makes a difference to people who rely on road transport in Australia.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask whoever is holding that conversation in the Gallery to remove themselves from the Gallery immediately. I ask one of the attendants to put that into effect.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: The per capita component in Western Australia - that is, the cost we pay due to the distance we travel - means that Western Australians pay more in fuel excise. That is not a total amount because the population numbers are not as great as in New South Wales and Victoria. That affects everyone, not only country people but also persons who live in the metropolitan area. About 12 or 15 months ago, the cost of fuel excise and sales tax on heavy road haulage on a prime mover travelling 260 000 kilometres a year approximated \$1 000 a week. That was the sales tax, which included a payroll tax component. The greatest component was fuel excise, which provides revenue for the government. It cripples the nation because Australia relies on transport. To me, this is a consumption based tax through the back door, perhaps by stealth. I would prefer that sales tax and fuel excise increases be scrapped and a goods and services tax imposed, which most countries have adopted. Australia is one of the few countries in the world that has not adopted that practice. It has been identified that if one has the money and wants to spend it, the tax must be paid. It also improves the cash economy which exists in Australia, whether we like it or not. I think each of us here realises that many services provided to us are not recorded in tax records.

Hon Sam Piantadosi interjected.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: I do not believe the average person farming today is looking for handouts. Farmers are looking to a government to contain some of the costs.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: I thought the Minister might be referring to the American experience where that happens.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: A return is given on farm diesel, which is a benefit. The cost of transport has been mentioned by Hon Murray Criddle. The cost of transporting a single sheep from Northampton to Perth is between \$3.50 and \$4.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan interjected.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: How they are shipped is more to the point. The roads are there and must be there. I am discussing the cost of physically moving one item of stock. Originally it was single decks; now it is double, triple and quadruple. This allows the farming and transport industries to remain competitive on the world market. Problems faced include competition with no subsidies, but a tax on exports. Fuel excise is a tax on exports. Australia relies on exports rather than manufactured goods which are used within the country.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: More than half our exports are manufactured goods.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: It is increasing. Manufactured goods need trucks for transportation.



Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: I agree with the Minister that the cost of building roads needs to be properly incorporated into the price of the product to get an accurate price.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: The point is that if roads do not exist, how will people move around?

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: The Minister recognises that pricing is not an unfair factor.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: If the member were to say that the money raised was spent on the roads, I could understand her argument. I am not saying that all money collected from roads should be returned into roads. That is a fallacious argument. What I say is that it is a cost on exports - that is, fuel excise. It does not provide the family unit with any help. Decisions are made on the one hand, yet on the other hand taxes are implemented on the very things that would make life a bit more tenable and lessen the price of some of the goods we are able to buy. This would help all families, not just farmers.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: The Minister hit the nail on the head earlier when he discussed population; that is the single biggest factor which creates problems in Australia compared with other nations - the lack of numbers to share the burden.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: Some 82 per cent of the road system in Australia is controlled and maintained by local government. A debate occurred yesterday regarding the Federal Government returns to the state from road funds. We are receiving less than our share of the funds proportionate to the population and there has been a diminishing effect on that distribution. Yet when one considers the funds paid to local government through the federal local road funds, Western Australia receives \$57m or \$60m - in that component we receive a greater proportion than other states. That has been recognised because of the length of our roads and isolation. The greatest thing is the lack of population. When the figure was \$51m or \$52m, there was a recognition of \$6.7m in that component which recognised that very fact. That is the reason that country areas receive a greater share of federal road funds than the asset preservation values reveal. That component is there. Successive federal governments have recognised the need to assist the rural and remote areas through road funding. It is a shame that the Federal Government is not applying the same principle to our national highways, but I will not go into that now. We have already had that debate.

When I was involved in local government my catch-phrase was that there is a mismatch between revenue raising capacity and road making responsibility. That is very true of the state as well. The greatest revenue collector is the Federal Government.

I have been diverted from the main thrust of my speech which is about the Year of the Family. The Australian family does rely on our roads for transport of various forms and will be affected if these taxes continue. Children in rural and remote areas have to attend school, usually by bus, and they rely on the road system. In country towns people have to travel long distances to take part in sporting activities. The long distances put added pressure on families. When times are tough the family tries to make ends meet - and members are aware of the very depressed commodity prices. At the end of the year the household budget is generally not very good. It is a very brave mum or dad who will deprive their children of weekend sporting activities because the distances they have to travel are too great.

The fringe benefits tax impacts greatly on country families. It is very difficult to attract people to work and live in country areas. For instance, mum will usually want to know where the closest school is, whether there is a doctor or a hospital nearby, what are the climatic conditions - and if it is hot she will want an air-conditioner - and how much the rent is. An employer in the country may charge \$10 a week for rent if he wants an employee and immediately fringe benefits tax is applied. It does not help to attract people to country areas. It has also affected the fly in, fly out practice for employees in the mining industry. Some minesites have a very short life and it is not economical to establish a townsite. However, little has been done to encourage employees and their families to reside in a nearby country town where employees could commute to the

minesite. It would be much more beneficial than the employees commuting from Perth every fortnight.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: It makes for a less militant work force, which mining companies want.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: I do not think that that is the case. It has become impossible for mining companies to consider establishing townsites and attracting people to reside there because they would immediately have to pay the fringe benefits tax. We are trying to create employment, but the Federal Government continues to impose taxes which prevent that happening.

The zone allowance has been a pittance for many years. Successive governments have continued to commission studies into the level of the zone allowance, but it has not been increased. The Federal Government could do a lot to turn things around.

Decentralisation is a myth because no-one really cares. People believe that so long as the goldmining companies, the iron ore companies and the farmers are producing, things will be all right. The zone allowance presents the perfect opportunity for the Federal Government to make it more attractive to people to live and work in remote areas. Governments are missing these opportunities and the people advising the legislators are missing the point. It concerns me when there is now a second generation of senior public servants in Canberra. They were born in Canberra, married there and their kids will grow up and we will then have a third generation of people who will never leave Canberra, and that is very sad.

The problem associated with Austudy has been well documented in debates in this House and the Federal Parliament. The high cost of education makes it difficult for parents in country centres. It is not getting any cheaper. Country people are struggling because in many areas there are no junior high schools, and I can see Hon Murray Criddle and Hon Murray Montgomery nodding their heads, agreeing with me. Obviously they have constituents making representations to them about this. Two or three years ago I was involved in the rural task force which was established by Hon Ernie Bridge and the greatest concerns that country people had were about education and the lack of counselling facilities. Their concerns were not what the task force anticipated; they were more family oriented. Many parents were depressed because they could not afford to send their children to school. If we really want to do something to help people in rural and remote areas they should be given assistance for education.

In addition, we do not have several medical practitioners in small country towns. Towns are lucky to have one doctor. Most country people have private health insurance, but the Government has it wrong and it should give some form of tax rebate to people so they can remain in the private health insurance area. It would take the strain off the public system which is necessary because many people are not in a position to take out private health insurance cover.

It is not all doom and gloom in the country because the people who live there are very resilient. The amount of self-help provided in country areas is remarkable. I was reminded of self-help, volunteers and people putting up their hands to become involved in community issues during the last visit to Western Australia by Sir Ninian Stephen at which he invited representatives from the different service clubs to a function at the Government House ballroom. He made a statement which has remained with me; that is, "If every volunteer in Australia stopped at midnight, society as we know it in Australia would crumble." When one thinks about that it is obvious he was right. It is obvious that the fabric of our society is being enveloped in a volunteer network. National volunteer day was in November or early December last year - it was the day that some members of this House visited Port Kennedy.

It is pleasing to see that even in these times when many families in country areas are facing difficult financial circumstances, people are still able to smile and still have a vision and huge optimism. I am sure that when the first rain falls, the smiles will become even wider. People in country areas do not have many of the services and recreational facilities that people in the metropolitan area perhaps expect and take for granted. I

wonder how many people would envisage going to Karrinyup golf club and having to prepare the greens or the fairways. That would not happen often. However, people who play golf in country towns often have to get the fairways and greens in order before they can start. I guess that is what country people are all about. It is a great credit to country people that they have weathered one of the deepest recessions within the agricultural industry over the last 10 years. People in country areas have had some terrible ups and downs, some heartaches and some real concerns about whether their children will have a future in farming, and, if not, where they will be able to get a job, and how they can continue to educate them to a standard that will give them those opportunities. I do not think people are talking about handouts in that sense. All they are asking for is a fair go.

I turn now to self-help in the health area. A few years ago, a country medical foundation was established. That was a great credit to all country people and to the generosity of the shire councils, which contributed a large sum of money. We had assistance from Wesfarmers Ltd, Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd and Town & Country Bank Ltd. We were privileged to have someone with the background of Sir James McCusker as chairman of that foundation, and very strong advocates in Harry Perkins and Kevin Hogan, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Wesfarmers. It is pleasing that the former government and this Government have honoured the commitment to provide, on a dollar for dollar basis up to the figure of \$37 500, scholarships in the areas of medicine and now nursing. It is even more pleasing that the first of the scholarship winners are now doing internships at Fremantle Hospital, and in about two years they will go out into country practices. Some of the nurses who were assisted by that foundation are already working in country areas. That foundation is for country students, and we hope that those students will go back to country areas. We will not get 100 per cent of students back, but those who may go on to specialise may one day help a lot of country people in other forms, perhaps in metropolitan hospitals. Therefore, country people, through self-help, set about to ensure that there would be a nucleus of doctors and nurses to work in country practices.

Mr Deputy President (Hon Barry House), I think you would be aware that it is a well known fact that students in country areas have an average tertiary entrance examination score which is lower than that of students from metropolitan high schools. The foundation was able to convince the university to make places available in the medical faculty for students who would not normally have access to that faculty because of their TEE score. That is a great breakthrough, because that is what is done in American universities. That probably stands out as one of the great successes of the country medical foundation.

We have seen the establishment of regional development commissions, which were previously authorities and advisory committees. We have also seen local governments play a role, and they have formed, in many cases, voluntary regional organisations of councils. I would like to think that we will not see competition between the two. It is very important that those regional development commissions and local governments work together closely and that there is a good consultation process. I am sure the Deputy Premier and Minister for Commerce and Trade, and the Minister for Local Government, Paul Omodei, will ensure that is the case.

Another area of opportunity is tourism. We are fortunate to have a coastline that lends itself to tourism. We also have a potential winner in a mariculture industry. Fish farming will probably take place in Jurien Bay in the near future. That will have spin-offs in the supply of fish food. Lupin farmers will probably be pleased to know that a percentage of the make-up of that fish food will be lupins. Aquaculture is also a burgeoning industry. That can be done in farm dams. There will be increasing demand around the world for fish farming as the wild catch, as it is called, diminishes. It is certainly not keeping up with the demand. A recent survey in America indicates that whereas Americans used to eat about 85 per cent or 90 per cent beef and little fish, that has now been turned around and restaurants are reporting that people are no longer eating steak. Whether steak is too expensive, I do not know because I have not been to America, but people are eating more fish. Dietitians and doctors are telling us to eat more fish, because we live in a society which is perhaps not conducive to our good health.

There are opportunities in regional ports, such as Esperance and Geraldton, to reduce some of the high charges that are involved in the export of mineral sands and other products. I hope that the export of iron ore through the Port of Esperance will not create dust problems in Esperance, because we have a fine coastline. I am sure the people who have done the work in that area will ensure that does not happen.

A final insult to country people was to charge them for telephone books. I think there was an administration and delivery charge of \$5.80. Members will be aware that some years ago, Telecom in its wisdom split the single directory into three country telephone directories. A few of us saw an opportunity there when we were approached by a leading stock firm which proposed to provide the funding to produce a single white pages directory, and also the Yellow Pages. We would have made a lot of money out of it, and certainly the marketing and consultancy firms with which we were dealing saw it as a great opportunity. So we took on Telecom. It was a matter of David and Goliath. Telecom threatened us with a copyright infringement. The worst situation would have been that if we printed the books, Telecom would have slapped a Supreme Court injunction on us. In that case we may have had 200 000 or 300 000 telephone directories in a warehouse while we were locked in a legal wrangle for two or three years. The marketing firm and the local government would have been taken to the cleaners.

It was decided to conduct a telephone survey regarding the three books. A marketing firm was engaged to survey some questions, and the answers were inevitably going to be in Telecom's favour. We were successful in having two different questions asked, but it was still decided to go ahead with the three telephone books. I was told a while ago that Telecom was thinking of reverting to a single White Pages, but it did not happen. Anyone who lives in the north west who wants a central west telephone book can get one for \$5.80. An advertisement in the Yellow Pages of a small size will cost approximately \$5 000 - people do not get much for their money.

I was annoyed when a spokesman - a Mr Zanotti, I believe - referred to environment concerns and not wanting to knock down more trees. That was a joke. Telecom introduced three separate telephone books, and most firms had to advertise in each of the three, which resulted in a 63 per cent duplication in those Yellow Pages. The White Pages could fit into one book without the duplication of the introductory pages, which comprise 35 or 40 pages. To speak about environment concerns is a complete joke. It is the final insult by a monopoly. One hopes that Optus Communications can provide the healthy competition required so that such charging will not occur.

Maybe members have friends in country areas. Members may decide to obtain the south west and great northern telephone books so they can call friends in, say, Geraldton and other areas. It will cost \$11.60 to obtain the books. I hope people will roundly condemn Telecom for this practice. It gave an undertaking that those telephone books would be available to all people free of charge. My advice would be for everyone to repeatedly dial the 013 service whenever a number is required. People should say, "I am sorry, but you will not provide the telephone books." This is an indictment of Telecom. It is driving the nail into the coffin of people living in country areas. Telecom produces all kinds of answers, but it is an unjustified practice. If people require and apply for three books, they should receive them free of charge.

I began by referring to the Year of the Family. I am concerned, along with all members, about the current state of our society. Ways and means are available to try to change that situation, but it will not be easy. Some of the initiatives taken with juvenile justice will contribute to this change. I do not believe in locking up a large number of people, but we must ensure that the hard core repeat offenders - the statistics indicate it is not a large number of people - should be removed from society. Importantly, this will remove the peer pressure applied to their mates. Children are adapting to changing circumstances in our society, probably far better than I am in many ways. However, the wheel has gone too far. Discipline is necessary. Nobody was hurt through a whack of a cane from the headmaster or a kick up the backside by a father, and maybe that is missing from our society.

Hon T.G. Butler: You did not receive much of a whack from a cane if you want to restore it.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: I had a few.

Hon T.G. Butler: So did I.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: It is not as bad as the rattan cane. The whacks I received from the cane resulted in a sore backside for a long time. My father also gave me a clip over the ear when I got home. This did not do me any harm, as I am not more violent and have not developed hang ups in later life.

Hon Cheryl Davenport: One solution may be to listen to young people.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: The member is probably right. People in a position to create programs -

Hon Cheryl Davenport: We need diversionary programs before the children reach the court system.

Hon B.K. DONALDSON: That is very important. Hon John Cowdell is aware of the great vacuum and cocoon of Canberra, and he should impress on his colleagues of a few years ago - I am sure he is still in constant contact with them - that they should look at the real issues affecting the family, not the you beaut programs. We must address the fundamentals. The commonsense approach is missing in our society at the moment. I support the motion.

**HON T.G. BUTLER** (East Metropolitan) [5.27 pm]: I join other members in thanking the Governor for his speech on the opening of this Parliament. I have read the speech again, and I shall refer to some aspects of the speech of interest to me.

I was interested to hear Hon Bruce Donaldson express his opinions on law and order. I take a slightly different tack. Although I accept that wide concerns exist in the community about law and order, longer and harsher sentences are not the answer. People who commit horrendous crime must be withdrawn from society, and should be put away for a long time, if not forever. However, if gaol does not include rehabilitation schemes, imprisonment does prisoners no good. In fact, people who commit lesser and non-violent crimes will leave prison as bigger and better crooks due to the skills they acquire from hardened criminals within the institutions.

We need to assure ourselves that when a person comes out of prison he has some form of support within the community and post release schemes are in place that help him get back into society, rather than see him re-offend and go back into the prison system. I will watch with great interest the form of the Government's legislation on law and order. I also have a similar attitude to the boot camp concept that is being spoken about by the Government. The supervision and instilling of self-discipline while these people are in boot camp is of little use if we do nothing to follow that up when they get out. There must be supervision or post release schemes to integrate them back into the mainstream of society when they are released.

I was a member of the Select Committee on Parole which was chaired by the present Leader of the Opposition. We interviewed prisoners from Canning Vale Prison and asked them about the value of parole. One prisoner stated that parole was good only if the authorities supplied a certain degree of support and supervision to ensure that they did not re-offend. The problem this particular prisoner had was that his parole officer never visited him; he was required to visit the parole officer or to telephone. When the parole officer asked how he was going all he said was, "Fine." That seemed to suit his parole officer. He said that had the parole officer visited him, knowing that he was on the dole, he would have been very surprised to find him living in a very large and fashionable house and in its drive a rather large expensive boat and flash motor car. Although he was reporting to his parole officer, he had also been out robbing banks and he finished up re-offending. Had there been personal contact by his parole officer, he would never have been in that situation. I do not excuse what he did, but it highlights the point that people coming out of prison are not supported unless there is proper supervision and post release

schemes. Juvenile offenders especially need that, so when they come out they have the opportunity of being accepted by society.

I will address one other subject that is close to my heart; that is, the question of industrial relations. Because of the changes that have been made to the industrial relations scene in Western Australia we need to keep a constant eye on the situation. We should especially give constant attention to the present Minister for Labour Relations who would dearly love to be taken as seriously by us as he takes himself. I have no doubt that a number of people have signed workplace agreements, and if we take them on face value it may appear that they have achieved higher wages. However, it gets down to the ridiculous when one reads of a rather ruthless employer - as we did in *The West Australian* on 2 April - who offered an apprentice an illegal workplace agreement on the basis that if he did not accept it he would lose his apprenticeship. It was one of those agreements that contained no provision for long service leave and allowed for annual leave, but it was reduced from four weeks to two weeks, which is contrary to the Minimum Conditions of Employment Act that was passed through the Parliament last year.

He was also required to work a 45 hour week. I do not suppose that is in breach of the Workplace Agreements Act because it says an employee can be called upon to work any hours that the employer demands. Nevertheless, it is not a proper practice for an employer to carry out with an apprentice. Under the Act, of course, workers not covered by an award are entitled to 10 days' sick leave and four weeks' annual leave, so the contract on offer was totally illegal. It was further illegal on the basis that the apprentice was told that if he did not accept it he would lose his apprenticeship. Mr Kierath's only response to that apprentice's plight was to say that he had the right to reject the offer. There is no doubt about that, but if he had rejected the agreement, in Western Australia he would have had to take the matter to the industrial commissioner or District Court where he would have had to pay a lawyer or receive legal aid and would have been responsible for costs. There is not much hope for that apprentice in that situation and he certainly deserved more from the Minister than, "He had the right to reject the offer." On 20 April *The West Australian* also carried an article stating that the Minister was hailing the success of the Workplace Agreements Act and stating that the Commissioner for Workplace Agreements had registered 1 091 agreements, 20 involving collective deals and 1 071 with individual workers. Having regard to his comments about the apprentice, the question that was exercising my mind at that time was how many of those individual agreements were reached on the same basis as the agreement offered to the apprentice.

I wonder how many of the individual contracts were read by apprentices under the same pressure that apprentice was put under. It is not hard to accept that could happen in a period where there is unemployment. We may never know because of the confidentiality provisions of the workplace agreement, but I have seen a number of these workplace agreements that union members have dropped in for us to examine. On the face of it when one looks at awards it is not difficult to see how workers could be taken in by them. The latest I have received is from a painting contractor, an industry about which I know something. His offer to his employee was \$15.20 an hour for each hour worked regardless of the time of day such work was to be performed. The award rate is \$12.28, so it would appear there is a \$3 difference in the hourly rates. When one starts to look at the provisions of the offer and the method of payment established, they were fairly questionable and at the discretion of the employer. For example, an employee could be paid either by cheque or deposit into a nominated account. I was in the painting industry for a long time and my view of painting employers was that they would often be more able to fly a kite than pay the employee. It is for that reason that the painters' union fought so hard.

Hours were contained in the agreement which meant simply that the employee would work at the request or demand of the employer such hours as he was notified in any one week. There was of course provision in the Workplace Agreements Act for a 38 hour minimum week. It appeared from the agreement that the employer had some assistance in drafting it because it was fairly cunningly drafted. It meant that the worker could be called upon to work 38 hours in one week and work beyond and be paid no additional

penalty rates, just the straight \$15.20 per hour. In theory the employee could be instructed to work 38 hours in two days if the boss wished. The boss could also demand the other days he wanted him to work. The week finished on a Friday and, as there were no penalty rates in the agreement, one would assume the week to finish on Friday and start on Saturday. Again with no penalty rates the difference between \$15.20 and \$12.28 dwindles remarkably and is overtaken by the award rate.

The annual leave clause in this agreement was an absolute ripper and totally contrary to the Minimum Conditions of Employment Act. It provided an acknowledgment between the parties that the employee had been given the benefit of a higher salary in lieu of annual leave and, accordingly, he was not entitled to annual leave. The minimum conditions of employment when dealing with annual leave state that an employee is to be paid for the period of annual leave at the time payment is made in the normal course of the employment, unless the employee requests in writing that he or she is paid before the period of leave commences, in which case the employee is to be so paid. Therefore, the employee could be paid for the period of leave before it commences. I do not think it means the employee receives something higher than the award as compensation for no paid annual leave.

What worries me more about that is that the ability to prosecute that breach falls fairly heavily in terms of legal representation on the worker. In the award system one can prosecute an employer in the Industrial Magistrates Court. That is not the position in the Workplace Agreements Act. We should look at what it is the \$3 per hour is expected to be compensation for. On public holidays a similar situation occurs. The minimum conditions provide that public holidays can be worked and paid for at the same rate as if they were not worked, which means the worker gets public holidays but if he works them he would get no overtime, just that flat rate. One does not have to be a Philadelphia lawyer to work out that if the employer had to pay anyway he would not demand the employee work those public holidays. Of course, he could demand the employee work those public holidays as part of the agreement with him.

The agreement included a couple of other minor provisions, one of which called upon the employee to supply all his own attire. On the face of it, there is no change in that from the building trades award because carpenters, bricklayers and plumbers supply their own working attire. However, in special circumstances they do not. The provision within this agreement provides that all working attire will be supplied by the employee. When the employee is working with toxic paint and other such materials he is required to wear gloves and special head and skin cover. That is a condition of the award. That specialised attire is usually provided by the employer. Nevertheless, the \$3 an hour difference is expected to compensate for that.

The other amazing reference in the agreement is to the supply of tools and equipment. The worker is required to supply all tools, which is a practice and a provision of the award. For that the worker is paid a tool allowance under the award. However, the award provision does not suggest that an employee must supply equipment. One must take into consideration the equipment required by painters. They require different sized step ladders, trestles, planks, cover sheets, rollers, trays, and brushes ranging from 6 inches to about 1 inch. By way of benevolence on my part I leave out any reference to paint because I define paint not as equipment but as material required for the job. If members want an idea of what that would cost they should price a small aluminium step ladder at their local hardware store. Presumably this is all compensated for by the \$3 difference between the agreement and the award.

By this time I fancy that the agreement would have fallen in a heap on the ground because it could not possibly stand up to scrutiny when one takes into consideration all of the award provisions against that one factor in this agreement - \$15.20 an hour. The agreement does not provide for any fares in travel of \$10.50 a day, as does the building trades award. Without doing the arithmetic, which I would be happy to do at some time, the \$3 an hour comes nowhere close to fair compensation for the loss of overtime, annual leave, public holidays, working clothes, fares and travel, tool allowance, and the cost of supplying one's own equipment. The Government seems to think that is okay. The

employees are offered the agreement on a take it or leave it basis, with no penalty against the employer.

I know that the Government will rush in and say that through the diligence of industrial inspectors it has prosecuted employers who have tried to enforce illegal workplace agreements on employees. A barber was recently prosecuted for sacking an employee. Some people have probably been a little ruthless in suggesting to me that those sorts of situations may have been rigged between the Government and the employers. However, I prefer to believe that they acted legitimately. Nevertheless, I cannot necessarily accept, or persuade my friends and supporters, that that was always the situation. The Government defends the system, and so it should because it devised the system and introduced it into this place. The Government encourages selective and individual bargaining for workplace agreements - as long as it does not include the unions. It is not interested in having the unions involved to provide protection for the workers.

The Minister for Labour Relations, Graham Kierath - the Minister from hell as I have heard him referred to - is now more commonly known as "Killer" because of his statement that he would be prepared to pull the lever on a convicted murderer whether he was guilty or not. The Minister has now embarked on a dangerous course, which is not in the best interests of the state; namely, seeking to prosecute employees and unions for reaching agreements on terms favourable to those parties. The union wants to ensure that the jobs which become available through these agreements are preserved for union members, and it is solid on the point that if the union dues have gone towards paying officials to argue and reach agreement on wages and conditions, the people who benefit from that should be the union members. I see nothing wrong with that. For the Minister to suggest that he would prosecute under section 6A of the Industrial Relations Act means that the losers in this game will be just about everybody. The unions will fight for their right to protect and provide employment for union members. The people who will suffer in this dispute will be not only the employers and the unions, but also the Government. The dispute will also deter people from wanting to invest in the state's development. It is a dangerous course for the Minister to be embarking upon. I hope that the wisdom of the Legislative Council and the Government prevails, and that the Minister withdraws from that course. If he proceeds there will be an unnecessary battle which is based on a paranoid hatred of unions by the Minister.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to Standing Order No 61(b).

### **LAPSED BILLS**

#### *Restoration to Notice Paper - Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read agreeing to the request of the Legislative Council that consideration of the following Bills be resumed at the stage they had reached in the previous session -

1. Acts Amendment (Petroleum) Bill
2. Secondary Education Authority Amendment Bill
3. Acts Amendment (Coal Mining Industry) Bill

### **ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - SPECIAL**

On motion by Hon George Cash (Leader of the House), resolved -

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 31 May 1994.

### **ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY**

**HON GEORGE CASH** (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [6.01 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.



*Adjournment Debate - Broome Shire Elections, Hon Phil Lockyer's Comments*

**HON TOM HELM** (Mining and Pastoral) [6.02 pm]: Before the House adjourns I take this opportunity to reply to some of the statements made by Hon Phil Lockyer during debate on the motion by Hon Tom Stephens at the beginning of the business of the House today. I incurred your wrath, Mr President, for a series of interjections I made at the time which were totally unruly and out of order, and I take this opportunity to refute some of his statements. I want to remind the House of the position members hold in being addressed as honourable members. In my view the statements made by Hon Phil Lockyer were far from honourable and he should not use the shelter of this Chamber to attack someone prepared to give a public service. The member is alleged to have said he was pleased that a certain young lady was beaten at the local government elections in Broome. If he thinks that was an honourable statement, he went to a different school than I did.

**Hon P.H. Lockyer:** Your colleague Tom Stephens said it too.

**Hon TOM HELM:** He did not say it in this place while speaking to that motion, as far as I know. Nonetheless, it was said by the so-called honourable Phil Lockyer about a lady by the name of Mrs Hanigan who has been a councillor in the Broome shire for the past three years. She was not successful this year but, nevertheless, she has a record of being an active lady in the Shire of Broome whose decisions and opinions receive much support in that town, although Hon Phil Lockyer may not necessarily agree with her. It is fine for the member to disagree with that person, but it is our responsibility to ensure that such people are encouraged to stand for public office.

In the town I come from a number of people stood for election, some had certain political persuasions and others had none. I have always believed we should congratulate those people for standing as candidates. Without the work of local government and the skills of those people who promote themselves in our community at a local level, we would be a far less dynamic society. It is incumbent on us not to attack those people with whose views we do not agree. Hon Phil Lockyer said ex-councillor Hanigan was opposed to the McAlpine proposed airport development in Broome. That proposal would have established an airport about the same distance from Broome as the Curtin airport is from Derby.

**Hon P.H. Lockyer:** That is not true. It is 10 kilometres.

**Hon TOM HELM:** That is one proposal, but I have heard of another which is further away than 10 kilometres. The issue is that a foreign developer intended to invest money in this State on a project with which Mrs Hanigan and others in the Shire of Broome disagreed.

**Hon P.H. Lockyer:** You supported the proposal.

**Hon TOM HELM:** I was never asked to give an opinion. Perhaps Hon Phil Lockyer did.

**Hon P.H. Lockyer:** You publicly supported it.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask Hon Tom Helm to address his remarks to me.

**Hon TOM HELM:** Contrary to Hon Phil Lockyer's suggestion, it was not a matter of my supporting or opposing the proposal. I was not asked for and did not give an opinion because I do not live Broome. It is the business of Broome and the decision should be made there. The proposal put forward was opposed by the State Government because of the activities of the people in Broome, including Mrs Hanigan. I do not think it is honourable for members in this place to disparage any person because they do not agree with their views. They should not use the shelter of this Chamber to do so; it is less than honourable.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I do not like members making reference to comments made in this Chamber that should be made outside. I cannot stop the member from saying it, but I suggest he does not do so.

**Hon TOM HELM:** I do not think Hon Phil Lockyer was saying anything slanderous and

using this Chamber as a shelter in that way, but he was using the opportunity presented to us all to make statements which are put on the record, and which perhaps would not be on record anywhere else; in other words, statements that may not be reported in the Press, but which go into *Hansard*. It is less than honourable to attack people such as that.

I apologise to the House for wearing Hon Phil Lockyer's tie this afternoon because he said he was able to tell us that Curtin air base was located in wrong place, and should have been in Kununurra, Broome or somewhere else. The strategic defence staff of this nation should have listened to Hon Phil Lockyer's views on how this nation should be defended. Obviously, those people in the armed forces who chose the location of the air base did not know what they were talking about! I do not necessarily argue with the location, but the logistics, tactics and strategic defence of this nation should be left to somebody else because I do not have the knowledge to decide such matters. Hon Phil Lockyer might have, and he may be able to point to a better place in which to invest such a huge amount of taxpayers' money in the north of this state. I am sure the defence chiefs of staff will listen to Hon Phil Lockyer because he used to live in Port Hedland.

That leads me to more of his comments during the debate. He said a great deal about Broome. I do not know what sort of influence or tie-up he had with Lord McAlpine when he was pouring all that money into Broome, which was very welcome at the time.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: I have never met the man.

Hon TOM HELM: That is fine. In his promotion and support for the development of Broome, Hon Phil Lockyer seems to have ignored the developments in Port Hedland where he was once shire president. He seems to fly past that town, does not notice it or does not understand the value or feelings of the people of Port Hedland.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: My time expired and I had to stop at half past three.

Hon TOM HELM: The member mentioned it once in 20 minutes. We were talking about airports that should not be there, and not once did he say anything good about the airport in Port Hedland which has been used for international flights on a regular basis for a number of years.

Hon George Cash: When we come back on Tuesday, 31 May he will probably get to that.

Hon TOM HELM: I invite him to do so. He is, after all, the member representing that area and he was also shire president at one time, but never once during debate on the north west airport did he mention Port Hedland's international airport. He mentioned Indonesians going to Exmouth and possibly Germans going Broome.

He will be interested to learn when he goes to the Pilbara Regional Travel Association in Tom Price next Friday that it is also supportive of an international airport at Broome, if it can possibly be established. Hon Phil Lockyer should visit the Pilbara occasionally and he would learn that all the people involved in tourism in that region would welcome the establishment of some other international airport in the north west. We all agree that the north west needs an international airport. That is one of the reasons that Hon Tom Stephens moved his motion, which members opposite are reluctant to bring on to vote on it. Hon Tom Stephens is upset about that because -

Hon George Cash: We have got other speakers. Hon Phil Lockyer has not finished.

Hon TOM HELM: The Government may have other speakers, but it will not allow that issue to be brought to a vote.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member's time is up. Before the next member's time starts, let me say that again I am getting disturbed at members using the adjournment debate to speak on a matter that is before the House. We have a standing order that says that members cannot make reference to a debate that is going on in the Chamber. During the time before the next sitting, I will examine that matter closely. I will have to, because of the habits of members, because the next stage is that members will speak three or four times on the one Bill and we will defeat the whole basis for the control of our debates. I deliberately did not interrupt Hon Tom Helm because I had not given him any warning

about my attitude, and I let him finish, but I am very disturbed about the new slant that is coming on because it means that every day, a member can get up and make another speech on a question that is before the House. That is not tolerable.

**HON P.H. LOCKYER** (Mining and Pastoral) [6.12 pm]: Mr President, I am glad you raised that matter. I was going to raise it, but I wanted Hon Tom Helm to get it out of his system so that he could have it in *Hansard*. I just want to make one point, and if in the next 25 minutes I do not mention Port Hedland, it will not be my fault; it was always my intention to do so. I want to tell members why Hon Tom Helm is defending Mrs Hanigan, whom, incidentally, I did not attack today at all. I just happened to mention that she opposed the building of this airport at Broome, and the fact that she was defeated last Saturday in the local government election.

Hon Tom Helm: And you were happy about that; you said that.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I was too, because she was not a contributor there. However, that is not the reason that Hon Tom Helm raised that matter. Let me give members the scenario, and Mr Cash will listen to this. It is no secret in the north that the Labor members of the Mining and Pastoral Region will change, because Mr Larry Graham wants to go into the upper House, for lots of reasons - and I applaud his reasons - not the least that he lost his wife last year and wants to shift up. The member who just took his seat a moment ago is in the hot seat. He knows that his behaviour, for a variety of reasons, not the very least that he has stuck to the Pilbara, is under the pump, and guess who is the Broome representative on the selection committee - Mrs Hanigan! She just happens to be the president of the Broome branch.

Let me tell members - and this will make you laugh, Mr President - she does not like Mr Stephens at all. Last Saturday, Mr Stephens worked very hard to get her off the council, and he was delighted when she was defeated. I said to him on Monday, "I'll get you a case of lemons." He said, "What for?" I said, "To get that smile off your face because you got rid of Mrs Hanigan." He said, "You bet I did!" Mr Helm is foolish at times, but he knows that if he can get one extra vote up there, he may not get the boot. I can tell Mr Helm that I have done some numbers for him too, and he does not have them. He is in more trouble than a one armed fiddler with the crabs. He has no hope. If Larry Graham chooses to stand, which he will, Mr Helm is gone. Mr Helm will try to get his seat, but I am told that his faction is the wrong one in the Pilbara, and he is dead. Mr Helm can stand here and defend Mrs Hanigan, but he does not have to worry, because she has told me that she will vote for him anyway because there is only person whom she hates more in the world than me, and that is Tom Stephens. She thinks he eats his young. If she thought there was a way that she could see the back end of Tom Stephens, she would do it. She is more enthusiastic about getting rid of him than I am, and that is saying something!

The fact of the matter is that ex-councillor Hanigan did her very best on the council, and I applaud her for doing her best. I did not agree with her stance on trying to get rid of the airport, and I was perfectly happy to see her get off the council because she has been replaced with a person who I believe will be a bigger contributor, but I am worried about the division between Mr Helm and Mr Stephens. Mr Stephens and I have not agreed very often in this Chamber, but I can tell Mr Stephens that he does not like Mrs Hanigan, and neither do I. I reckon he is on the right track. There is no point in Mr Stephens standing up after me and trying to pat her hair down, because he is dead there. What he should do - and if he likes I can do it over the weekend because I will be in Exmouth - is to get his delegates from Exmouth and Carnarvon -

Hon John Halden: Under our rules, she does not get a vote.

Hon Tom Helm: There is no Broome selection committee.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: That is what it is all about. It is not about defending Mrs Hanigan from getting nailed in this House. She is perfectly able to do that herself, and does so. She does not need people like Tom Helm to stand here and defend her. I see through Mr Helm like a pane of glass, and it fell absolutely on deaf ears.

*Adjournment Debate - Port Kennedy Development, Land Swap*

**HON J.A. SCOTT** (South Metropolitan) [6.16 pm]: I want to bring to the notice of the House that the chicanery and smart deals that have surrounded the Port Kennedy development are still continuing under the present regime. The area of concern I wish to highlight is the swap of the northern conservation zone in Port Kennedy for another area of land once contained in the southern conservation zone. From reading the Environmental Protection Authority's report on that matter, entitled "The Change to Environmental Conditions for Regional Recreation Centre, stage 1, Boundary, Port Kennedy" - otherwise Bulletin 734 - one could easily assume that this was a desirable swap and was fair and reasonable, and that even the ecological change was desirable, and that it was a fact foisted on the developer. However, when we look at the history of that remarkably contorted piece of legislation -

Hon John Halden: I remember it well.

**HON J.A. SCOTT:** Originally the developer, as most people would know, submitted a basic plan. That was followed by an environmental review and management program, and a fairly major change was made to the boundaries of the plan. I have some of these maps in front of me, and I will seek leave to table them at the end of my speech. The map states that the site plan shows the revised concept following the EPA's approval and conditions set by the Minister for the Environment. It shows clearly the area which has now been swapped as being in a conservation zone in the first place. However, when the Bill went through the House, somehow mysteriously this triangular piece of land slipped out of the conservation zone, and it is now the subject of a swap with the northern conservation zone, which is described as not being as good as this little bit down the bottom. Why on earth would someone want to take out of the conservation zone a highly significant piece of land? Bulletin 734 states -

In contrast to the 12.6 ha excised in the northern conservation area, the 17.5 ha added to the southern conservation zone as land exchange has been assessed by specialist scientists, CALM and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Due to the quality of the wetlands and vegetation contained therein, this area is considered to have significantly higher conservation value than the northern land area.

It seems that a terrible mistake was made somewhere. One can only wonder how such a high conservation area may have been moved from the conservation zone and became the property of the developer. I have my ideas about how it happened, because the northern conservation zone proposed for the swap was high land and close to the beach. The Environmental Protection Authority's report on this land change goes to great lengths to assure us that it was not the developer's idea to change it. It reads -

The proponent further points out that the consideration of this exchange was not instigated by the proponent, but was required by the conditions imposed by the Minister and the provisions of the Agreement Act, and was for the purpose of improving the quality of land to be reserved for conservation purposes.

However, the "Background" in the same document reads -

Following the release of the EPA's report and before conditions were set consideration was being given by the proponent to the deletion of part of the northern conservation zone, and its replacement by an area within Stage 2 but adjacent to the southern conservation zone.

I was assured by members of the Conservation Council of Western Australia that when the Bill was going through the House they outlined the situation not only to the then government but also to the then opposition members - such as Hon Derrick Tomlinson, Mr Pandal in the other place, and I think Hon Peter Foss was mentioned. Yet now when this deal is about to go through, no voices are raised in concern about this land swap, adjacent to a very important dune system - the likes of which can be found nowhere else in the world.

Hon John Halden: I made some clear comments about the potential of the swap. I think

I said that it should not happen. I cannot understand the Government's rationale on the swap, or that it would allow it.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: How that land was considered not to be part of the conservation zone is a mystery to everyone. I would like to clear up the situation. Surely some people, either in the Environmental Protection Authority or in the Opposition must know -

Hon E.J. Charlton: Have you asked the local member?

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I have asked questions but I have not received the answers I require. It is a great mystery how this drafting error occurred. That is what it was called by the conservation people. Suddenly a drafting error becomes a free piece of land for the developer to swap for another piece of land which did not belong to him in the first place. At the moment, the developer has a proposition before the Government to develop that northern conservation zone. I hope that the Government will look very closely at the deal, just in case Government members end up with dirty hands as a result of this land swap.

I am concerned also that the reason for the land swap is that there is a problem with the development proceeding without housing being allowed on the land. Without that piece of land I do not think that the development will proceed. The Minister for Planning has said that he had been approached to allow the development to become a housing development. I reiterate that I hope this Government looks very closely at the deal and makes sure that it is not taken for a ride. The member for Rockingham said he was taken for a ride in such circumstances. I hope that the Government is not taken for a ride.

Hon E.J. Charlton: It was an enjoyable ride.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am not too sure about that because the member for Rockingham does not seem to be too happy at the moment. It appears that it was a slippery ride. I hope that the Government examines the situation closely and is careful about the way in which it deals with this matter.

I seek leave to table the documents to which I have referred.

Leave granted. [See paper No 47.]

*Adjournment Debate - Broome Shire Elections*

HON TOM STEPHENS (Mining and Pastoral) [6.26 pm]: I had the misfortune to be listening to debate on the speakers outside the Chamber. Hon Phil Lockyer was doing in this Chamber what he often accuses other people of doing. He was sharing with the Chamber some porky pies - as he frequently calls them in his contributions in this place. It surprised me that his nose had not grown longer. The truth about Hon Tom Helm is just like the remarks by Hon Barbara Scott in reference to a member of her party. The Labor Party is very lucky to be an umbrella party with a range of people as members. Opposition members are very blessed to have the talent of people such as Hon Tom Helm. His is a talent of which we are proud. The preselection of Hon Tom Helm was one I had the opportunity of voting in. I voted for him because I recognised that he represented the industrial wing of the Labor movement and that is most valued in the party and desperately needed in this House.

Members should all know that Hon Tom Helm carries out his task extremely well. No-one - certainly not Hon Phil Lockyer - has any right to criticise Hon Tom Helm. That member cannot hold a candle to Hon Tom Helm for the work he does in his electorate. Hon Phil Lockyer should be the first to hang his head in shame rather than come into this place and attack Hon Tom Helm in this way. The standing of Hon Tom Helm does not diminish in any way because he was the subject of a verbal assault by Hon Phil Lockyer. Instead he rises in my estimation, and that of my colleagues, because he has earned the wrath of Hon Phil Lockyer. Hon Tom Helm's record speaks for itself and will stand at the time of our party's protests. He does not need to be worried about verbal assaults from Hon Phil Lockyer.

Hon Phil Lockyer has taken the opportunity to tell mistruths to the House about what I said to him regarding the Broome Shire Council elections. The words I used were

precise. I chose them well because I know Hon Phil Lockyer. I said the Broome election results were thoroughly tragic. The member can take that how he wishes, but one meaning was that the Broome community is a multiracial community and deserves to have on the shire a mixture of people, such as the Aboriginal and ethnic background of Mrs Robin Hanigan. I am keen to see that - as I was three years ago - and to express support for Mrs Hanigan to be on the shire. I said three years ago that the Broome council deserved to have Mrs Hanigan as a member.

Hon George Cash: Why does she hate you so much?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: That might be her view.

Hon E.J. Charlton: We could give 10 good reasons.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Perhaps the Minister could give her some reasons. However, I had no part in the recent Broome elections.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: Normally you cannot be stopped from supporting someone.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I had no impact on the result. I did not express a viewpoint regarding any of the candidates.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: And you call me Pinocchio.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The election result was entirely tragic.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: You will never go to heaven.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I believe, as I have always believed, that the Broome council should have a broad cross-section of the community represented on it. That is not saying that the good mate of Hon Phil Lockyer - and he is also a good mate of mine - the shire president, is not a good one. His re-election is well deserved.

Hon George Cash: You are digging yourself out of a deep hole.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: He is a good Liberal Party card-carrying member, isn't he? I do not know.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: Unlike you, I don't divulge such things.

Hon Tom Helm: That means you're ashamed of it.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: He has done a good job in that council, and I am pleased he has been re-elected. I know that Lyn Page will do a good job. I will not complain about or praise the result, and will only repeat what I said to Hon Phil Lockyer; namely, that it was a tragic result.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: I never repeat what you have said, otherwise you would be in verbal gaol.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I am always careful in what I say to Hon Phil Lockyer so that he cannot misconstrue my words. On this occasion I said the result was tragic for some of the reasons I have given to the House. In that context, it is unfair to take the opportunity, as Hon Phil Lockyer did, to verbally assault me and Hon Tom Helm. What is Hon Tom Helm's view of the development?

Hon Tom Helm: I don't have a view. He put words in my mouth.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Indeed. The important issue -

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will tell members who has the numbers - it is me. If the member wants to complete his speech, he had better keep in sweet with me.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Thank you, Mr President. The important matter is not the side issue raised by the perennial and eternal backbencher, Hon Phil Lockyer, but resolving the question of north west airports. This matter has been put on the backburner by this Government as a result of recent decisions of this House, although I will not reflect on decisions of this House.

Hon George Cash: You will pay for what you have done to the TAB and punters in Western Australia.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: What has the Leader of the House ever done for the TAB?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the House must adhere to the same rules as Hon Tom Stephens.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I do not know anything about a matter involving the TAB.

Hon George Cash: You will find out.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I have not heard anything in that regard. The Leader of the Government has not said anything about a matter affecting the TAB.

Hon George Cash: You denied leave for a Bill to be introduced, and that action is likely to jeopardise certain matters.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Mr Cash denied that leave. Do you know how that was done, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: I am not remotely interested in that.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The way the Leader of the Government succeeded in jeopardising his own legislation was demonstrated in today's proceedings. Three times the Opposition gave leave for the Government to proceed with its business; we had a ministerial statement followed by two separate motions to introduce matters before the House. However, when it came to Opposition business, and despite the earlier cooperation, leave was denied.

Hon George Cash: We still have speakers on the matter.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: While the Leader of the House chooses to do that, he will not receive my leave on any matter.

Hon George Cash: What you have done could be painful for your side.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: That could be the case; I do not have much to bargain with. However, my leave can be used at any time regarding Government business. This Government has used the gag and guillotine in this place to frustrate the Opposition and to arrogantly ride roughshod over this House.

Hon George Cash: You made a terrible mistake.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The same arrogant leader was trying to filibuster so that the Opposition could not deal with its business. The floor of this House is now reasonably evenly divided due to the unfortunate death of Hon Bob Pike. In those circumstances, the Leader of the Government has converted the guillotine and gag to a filibuster to deny the Opposition an opportunity to deal with some important issues such as jobs, economic development and the reduction of prices of air fares to the north west. The Opposition was attempting to bring focus to those issues for a few moments this afternoon, but instead of allowing that to happen -

Hon George Cash: You made a terrible mistake.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: - the Government arrogantly used a filibuster. Hon Phil Lockyer pranced and promenaded on his hind legs, as did Hon Eric Charlton for two days when saying nothing. The Government chose to use the filibuster and members opposite should be ashamed!

Hon E.J. Charlton: We have learnt a lot from you in the last 10 minutes.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Members opposite have introduced a new tradition to ensure that this House is no more than a rubber stamp for the will of the Executive in the other House, and the Leader of the House should be ashamed of himself. As long the Leader of the House treats me that way, I will not grant leave regarding his business.

Hon George Cash: I hope you do not come to me again in tears asking me to get you out of a hole, as you did last time.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The Leader of the House cannot treat this place in the way he has. On most occasions the Government will have the numbers, and it will in the future; however, at the moment the Government does not have the numbers and cannot treat this place with arrogance.

*Adjournment Debate - Preselection, Hon Phil Lockyer's Comments*

HON JOHN HALDEN (South Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [6.35 pm]: I was about to bring a sedate note to the adjournment debate, but it would not be fair to allow Hon Phil Lockyer's comments regarding preselection matters to go unchallenged by the Leader of the Opposition. He knows something about these issues, but knows nothing about the rules under which the Australian Labor Party operates. I heard you, Mr President, say that you have the numbers in this place. I know the first rule regarding numbers, and I count them well. I have some influence in these matters, and I believe that the Labor Party has no intention to change its three Mining and Pastoral members.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: That is not what I hear.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: If on occasion someone has to be accommodated, we do so. I assure the member that Hon Tom Helm does not need the support of Mrs Hanigan. Hon Tom Helm will remain a member for the Mining and Pastoral Region for a long time by virtue of his efforts inside and outside this place. He will be here for longer than Hon Phil Lockyer, particularly if Hon Norman Moore has his way.

Hon George Cash: Have no fear, we have already arranged our ticket for next time. It is Mr Moore and Mr Lockyer.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I will not go into that, but I indicate that I know the politics of the opposite side of the Chamber, as some members opposite know it on this side. Therefore, members opposite should be a little more careful and circumspect in their comments. If we wanted to go into the games we all play, we could do that. Members should think twice before suggesting that a member who does a particularly reasonable job is under threat regarding his preselection; members should consider their own situation and how much damage could be done through such discussion.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: This is the enforcer making his big speech.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I tell members what I say to the Labor Party; that is, one counts the numbers to be sure of one's position first. Do not spread rumour and innuendo as it may well come home to roost.

Hon P.H. Lockyer: You mean as much to us as a left wing fly.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Hon Phil Lockyer, in particular, should be very careful.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 6.38 pm*

---



## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## HOMESWEST - BROOME, SAVILLE STREET UNITS, FENCING REQUESTS

10. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has Homeswest received requests from residents of the Broome aged person units in Saville Street seeking fencing for the units in order to deter nonresidents from trespassing across the grounds and gardens of these residential units?
- (2) If yes, why has action not been taken to do this fencing?
- (3) Will Homeswest be able to allocate funds in the current financial year to undertake this fencing work?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) When can residents anticipate that the necessary fencing work will be completed?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Homeswest funding is property specific and allocated on an annual basis. This property was not included in the 1993-94 budget.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) Fencing should be completed by December 1994. In addition, Homeswest will be providing key locks to the windows and new security doors to these units.

## ABORIGINES - LAND GRANTS FOR SELF-SUFFICIENCY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

13. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Will the State Government be granting additional land to Aboriginal groups in WA as a way of building Aboriginal self-sufficiency and economic development?
- (2) If yes, which land is being considered for such grants?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) What number of outstanding applications for Aboriginal reserves or special leases are currently before the State Government and what efforts are being made to deal more quickly with these applications?
- (5) Which three properties run by Aboriginal corporations in the south of the State have been identified by the Report on the Task Force on Aboriginal Social Justices (April 1994) as examples of land which could be converted to freehold?
- (6) Is the Minister prepared to grant freehold title to these three properties?
- (7) If not, why not?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Crown lands.

- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Some 130 applications are outstanding under the Aboriginal living area program which is currently under review. On completion of the review - expected by July 1994 - these applications will be considered. The Office of Traditional Land Use has received 14 applications for land grants under the provisions of section 41 of the Act.
- (5) Marribank, Wandering and Mogumber.
- (6) Yes, subject to applicants meeting selection criteria.
- (7) Not applicable.

**SHALAKS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD - ESSCOS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD**  
*Government Assistance*

24. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Commerce and Trade:

Apart from the \$32 500 assistance to industry provided to the Albany based Shalaks essential oil plant in November last year -

- (1) What other State Government assistance has been provided to Esscos Australia Pty Ltd?
- (2) What other State Government assistance has been provided to Shalaks Australia Pty Ltd?
- (3) Has any other State Government assistance been provided to any other related company?
- (4) In each case, what was the amount of financial assistance and what form did it take?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Minister for Commerce and Trade has provided the following reply -

- (1)-(2) No financial assistance has been given. The Great Southern Development Commission assisted Shalaks in meeting relevant departments, giving general advice and information.
- (3) None.
- (4) Not applicable.

**MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS**

40. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Commerce and Trade:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Department of Commerce and Trade to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Minister for Commerce and Trade has provided the following reply -

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds paid to media organisations I will be pleased to respond.

### MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

48. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Department of Minerals and Energy to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds to media organisations I would be pleased to respond.

### MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

49. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Department of Land Administration to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds paid to media organisations I would be pleased to respond.

### MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

66. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Water Authority of Western Australia to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds paid to media organisations I would be pleased to respond.

### MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

67. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Water Resources Council to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds paid to media organisations I would be pleased to respond.

**MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS**

68. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Department of Local Government to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds paid to media organisations I would be pleased to respond.

**MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS**

69. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Keep Australia Beautiful Council to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds paid to media organisations I would be pleased to respond.

**MEDIA ORGANISATIONS - GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS**

86. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Since 16 February 1993 what funds have been paid by the Office of Traditional Land Use to in each case Channel 7, Channel 9, Channel 10, *The West Australian*, *Sunday Times*, community newspapers, Golden West Network and *The Australian*?
- (2) What is the amount contracted in each case to the above media organisations to be paid that has not yet been paid?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has provided the following reply -

The information sought would require considerable research and I am not prepared to allocate resources for this purpose. If the member has a specific question about funds paid to media organisations I would be pleased to respond.

**"GRAFFITI NEWS" - PRINTING DETAILS**

88. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Who printed the leaflet "Graffiti News", Issue No 4, March 1994?
- (2) What was the cost?
- (3) If State Print was not used, why was it not used?
- (4) If it was not used, was it asked to tender?
- (5) If it was asked to tender, what price did it tender?
- (6) What price was tendered by the printer?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

- (1) The newsletter "Graffiti News", Issue No 4 March 1994 is produced in-house by the staff of the Graffiti Program. Copies of the newsletter are run off on an office photocopier.
- (2) Approximately \$40.
- (3) For a newsletter distributed to individuals and organisations on the Graffiti Program mailing list, it was considered cheaper and more appropriate to produce the newsletter in-house rather than call on the services of a printing company.
- (4)-(6) Not applicable.

**MINING ACCIDENTS - FATALITIES, GOVERNMENT ACTION**

101. Hon MARK NEVILL to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What action has been undertaken by the Minister following the two recent fatalities involving the operation of remote controlled mining equipment in underground mines in Western Australia?
- (2) What specific responses have been initiated in respect of regulations or operating requirements and training of workers involved in areas where remote controlled mining equipment is being used?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

- (1) Directives were issued by the Kalgoorlie and Collie regional inspectorates to review work systems, training procedures and equipment in the light of the circumstances of these fatal accidents. The mining operations division has issued a significant incident report - state and Australia-wide - on these accidents. Further advice was directed specifically to underground mines operating remote control equipment, together with a requirement to advise the inspectorate of procedures and systems. Responses have been received and are currently being reviewed. Mining operations division has contacted mining companies, consultancies and regulatory authorities in the USA, Canada, Germany, Poland, UK, South Africa and Australia's Eastern States for their experiences, regulations and advice. All have responded except MSHA in the USA.

Pending development of regulations and guidelines, the fatal accident work party established under MOHSAB has recommended that areas of operation of remote controlled LHD units be provided with fixed lighting for improved all round vision. A mechanical engineer from the mining operations division examined remote control procedures and protection systems at Mt Isa Mines Ltd during a recent visit, and advice on his report will be provided to MOHSAB.

- (2) The review of the regulations being coordinated by the state mining engineer will include the drafting of enabling regulations on procedure for

the use of remote controlled equipment. A guideline is to be developed to support these regulations. A draft Australian standard on remote control of equipment - to which the mining operations division provided input - is in circulation for final endorsement. This will be referenced in guidelines.

**MINERALS AND ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF - MINING TENEMENTS,  
OPERATIONS REPORTS (FORM 5) MONITORING; PROSECUTIONS**

102. Hon MARK NEVILL to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Department of Minerals and Energy been given sufficient resources to ensure expenditure returns (form 5) on mining tenements are not being falsified?
- (2) How many prosecutions have resulted from audit this financial year?
- (3) How many prosecutions have been -
  - (a) successful; and
  - (b) unsuccessful?
- (4) How many tenements were involved in the prosecutions and how many tenements have been forfeited?
- (5) Are random audit of expenditure undertaken to ensure compliance with expenditure requirements?
- (6) What strategies are in place to ensure expenditure requirements are not being falsified?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

- (1) The Department of Minerals and Energy believes it has adequate resources to monitor reports on operations on mining tenements (Form 5).
- (2) None, however audit of compliance with reporting requirements this financial year has resulted in approximately 500 notices of intention to forfeit being issued with 25 tenements being forfeited and 18 tenement holders being fined.
- (3)-(4) See (2) above.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) In most cases mineral exploration reports are cross checked to reports on operations (Form 5).

**MINING ACT - RETENTION LICENCES, APPLICATIONS**  
*Mining Amendment Act, Proclamation July 1994*

103. Hon MARK NEVILL to the Minister for Mines:

How many retention licences have been applied for under the Mining Act?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

None. The Mining Amendment Act 1993 introducing retention licences is due to be proclaimed in July 1994.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

**LAND ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF - ACTIVITIES  
TRANSFERRED TO PRIVATE SECTOR**

28. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Minister for Lands:

Some notice has been given of this question.

- (1) Is it Government policy to ensure that the policy and

administration of Western Australian land and natural resources management remain in the control of the state?

- (2) When did the Government decide to transfer to the private sector from the Department of Land Administration at Midland the activities of: Air photography; geodetic field services; land planning; the search ordering process; and LAN/PABX management?
- (3) Has the Government decided to transfer any other activities of the Department of Land Administration to the private sector and if so, when was such a decision made and what activities are the subject of such decisions?
- (4) By how many full time employees has the work force of DOLA at Midland decreased since 16 December 1993?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes. Land and resource management and administration is the responsibility of the state.
- (2) November 1993.
- (3) Yes. February 1994. The activities involved are: Courier service; LAN support and computer operations; typing of document endorsements; stereoplotting - subject to competitive tendering; PABX switchboard operation; and vehicle fleet management - proposal currently being developed.
- (4) A total of 74 full time employees.

#### INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS - EMPLOYEES COVERED BY FEDERAL AWARDS, STATE AWARDS, AND WORKPLACE AGREEMENTS

29. Hon J.A. COWDELL to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Labour Relations:

Will the Minister indicate the number and percentage of Western Australian employees who are covered by -

- (a) Federal awards;
- (b) state awards;
- (c) workplace agreements; and
- (d) neither awards nor workplace agreements?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

The Minister for Labour Relations has provided the following reply -

- (a) 116 813 employees - 20.8 per cent;
- (b) 321 797 employees - 57.3 per cent;
- (c) 3 994 employees - 0.7 per cent; and
- (d) 118 996 employees - 21.2 per cent.

Please note that the figures for employees under the federal awards and state awards are to 31 May 1990. The figures for employees covered by workplace agreements refer to agreements lodged with the Commissioner of Workplace Agreements up to 30 April 1994.

#### SCHOOL BUSES - PORT HEDLAND, FARES

30. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Education:

Is it true that as a result of a decision made by the Minister for Education,

children who are unable to afford a school bus ticket or have lost their ticket will not be allowed to travel on the Hedland school bus run?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I have given no direction in respect of those matters but I advise the Leader of the Opposition that in Port Hedland, where a regular passenger transport service has been in operation for a number of years, schoolchildren have been exempt from paying a fare. To my knowledge Hedland is the only town with an RPT system in which students do not pay a fare of 50¢ a ride. The previous government decided - I think the Minister for Education at the time was Hon Carmen Lawrence - that students in Port Hedland should pay a fare, in line with the rules that apply to communities with an RPT system. The decision was not implemented at the time because I understand some political pressure was applied by various people, on the basis that the town needed to spend more on improving its footpaths, safety for cyclists and so on. I understand the original decision was made about four years ago. I decided at the beginning of this year that fares would be charged from the beginning of the year. I was requested to defer that decision until the end of the first term, pending consideration of a number of issues raised by the bus contractor. A number of negotiations were undertaken and it was decided that the charge would apply from the beginning of the second term. That brings Hedland into line with all other towns in the state with an RPT system. The only exception is Albany which is just moving to an RPT system. There will be a moratorium for a couple of years to ensure certain logistical matters are attended to before children are required to pay on that service.

The irony is that I am being accused of ignoring my electorate. Had I simply decided that because Port Hedland is in my electorate I would exempt it, I would be rightly accused by the Opposition of pork-barrelling. It seems I cannot win either way. Port Hedland has been brought into line with the rest of the state, and that is how it should be.

#### SCHOOL BUSES - PORT HEDLAND, FARES

31. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Education:

How does the Minister explain that the bus company involved in this matter has issued an instruction to all drivers saying that on the instructions of the Department of Training and the Education Department they shall not allow children on the buses who do not pay fares, and those fares will be collected from a specified date?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

Departments give directives in respect of the areas of operation they cover. I personally have not given a direction.

Hon John Halden: Are you duckshoving?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I have simply advised the Education Department and the Department of Training that they should now charge a fare on school buses in Port Hedland. It is the departments' responsibility to conduct the implementation of that decision.

Hon John Halden: For which you are responsible.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I accept responsibility, but I am replying to the member's question. I did not give a direction but I decided that fares would be charged. The implementation of that decision is in the hands of the department and if it decided children will not ride on the bus without a fare, that is probably in line with the situation in every other part of Western Australia. If I made an exception in the case of Port Hedland on



any grounds which made it different from anywhere else in the state, members opposite would rightly accuse me of looking after my own electorate and politicising education decision making, which is the subject of the first motion on the Notice Paper.

#### CAPEL RIVER - POLLUTION; FISH DEATHS INQUIRY

32. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for the Environment:

Some notice has been given of this question.

- (1) Have the Minister or his department been alerted to fish deaths in the Capel River and white mucous like scum floating on the river downstream from the Capel dairy?
- (2) If so, has the Minister investigated the source of pollution and the cause of the fish deaths and if not, when will he investigate this matter?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

(1)-(2)

I do not have that question and answer, so I cannot reply to the question.

#### WATER AUTHORITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT, CADDADUP

33. Hon J.A. COWDELL to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Does the Water Authority intend to proceed with the construction of a waste water treatment plant within the Caddadup reserve, as indicated by the Minister in this House on 12 April?
- (2) Does this conflict with the reported statement of the Minister in the *Mandurah Telegraph* of 25 April, in which he is quoted as saying that the plant was only a proposal?
- (3) If the Caddadup waste water treatment plant is, in fact, proceeding, why is the Government supporting the Water Authority in its attempt to resume an area north of Tim's Thicket Road from the Yalgorup national park for an additional waste water treatment plant and septic disposal, within a few kilometres of the Caddadup site?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

I will need to do some research in respect of the matters raised.

Hon John Halden: Obviously you will.

Hon GEORGE CASH: The member has raised two sites. I should seek further advice before I answer the question. However, the member will be aware that I attempted to arrange a briefing for him with the Water Authority regarding the proposals at Caddadup. I trust he took up that offer.

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS, ADVICE TO SCHOOLS

34. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Education:

Some notice has been given of the question.

- (1) Has the Minister for Education developed guidelines dealing with teachers' and employees' workers' compensation entitlements relating to travel?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If so, will the Minister provide a copy of the guidelines?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for giving some notice of this question.

- (1) The department has issued an advice to all schools with regard to amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes, and I seek leave to table the document.

Leave granted. [See paper No 46.]

**CONSUMER AFFAIRS - MINISTER FOR FAIR TRADING, WORST RATING**  
*Uniform Legislation, Commitment Refusal*

35. Hon A.J.G. MacTIERNAN to the Minister for Fair Trading:

Today, when being asked about his rating as Australia's worst Minister with responsibility for consumer affairs -

Hon John Halden: We all agree with that.

Hon A.J.G. MacTIERNAN: - and in particular about his refusal to commit to the national consumer credit legislation scheme, the Minister rejected any responsibility, claiming that the Parliament, not Ministers, passes laws.

- (1) Can we expect this extraordinary sophistry to extend into all portfolio areas so that the Court Government will no longer make a commitment to any legislative program, as it is at the mercy of the Parliament?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the Government has the numbers in both Houses of the Parliament?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

(1)-(2)

It is clear that the member was not present in the last Parliament where we had the disgraceful situation where -

Hon T.G. Butler: Answer the question!

Hon PETER FOSS: - in the middle of the night we were called upon to deal with legislation relating to financial institutions. At the time, three Bills were brought into this House from the other place. Only two of the Bills were available for distribution to members. There were a couple of copies of the third Bill. That legislation adopted a very thick piece of legislation from Queensland, of which we did not have a copy. We were expected to make a decision there and then because we were told that if we did not all sorts of dreadful things would happen to Western Australian companies. We asked why it was, when this legislation had been talked about for so long by various people, that the only people who did not appear to have a copy were members of Parliament, whose duty it was to pass that legislation. We were told it was so late coming to Parliament because the Government had been consulting with people. The only people who had not been consulted were members of Parliament.

What I have done scrupulously throughout this is recognise that ultimately this Parliament - and that includes members on both sides of the House - should know that at least members on this side do not regard what the Executive says as necessarily the end of the matter.

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: Members on this side take it very unkindly -

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: Members opposite rely on their own experiences. Members

on this side take it unkindly when Ministers agree to legislation on their behalf without their being consulted. Rather than making snide remarks which derived from the Labor Party way of it - do as you are told when you are told, and never break ranks no matter what the principles - members opposite should be grateful that the final form of this legislation will be a matter to be decided by this Parliament. First, our Government, mindful of the role of Parliament, mindful of the people of Western Australia, has refused to hand over their powers under template legislation -

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: Do members know why template legislation follows this method? It has been used to some extent because they used the Parliament of Queensland. The reason they used that Parliament is because Queensland has only one House. All the Ministers made it clear that no matter what the government may be, or how much it may control the upper House - and all the upper Houses around Australia have an independence of their own -

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: Is it not wonderful to see?

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: We got one comma changed.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If honourable members do not come to order and stop these outrageous interjections, I will not proceed with questions without notice. Certainly, members who are interjecting will not receive the call for any further questions.

Hon PETER FOSS: The reason they chose Queensland for their template legislation - and this was clear at SCOCAM - was they did not believe they could guarantee what the upper House would do. So, the simple way in which it was proposed to be dealt with was that if they could get it through once, they could pass legislation which adopted the Queensland legislation, and once a Minister and, therefore, the Government was committed to a particular type of legislation, Queensland could guarantee that would go through because it did not have an upper House. They did not have to go near upper Houses in other Legislatures. It happened automatically. It then became legislation by Ministers. Our Government does not approve of that. We believe it is appropriate that the parliamentarians be the ones who pass legislation.

Not only do I not apologise, but also I happen to take great pride in the fact that as a Minister I have insisted not only on that but also that a copy of every single document relating to that proposed uniform legislation is passed to every member of this Legislature. Members have received a copy of the agreement and a copy of the draft legislation. As soon as I have information I send it on to members. I hope that the members of this Parliament will thank me for the fact that I take seriously my position not only as a Minister of the Crown but also as a member of this Legislature. I intend not only to follow that procedure in future but also to defend that and the Parliament. First and foremost I am a member of this Legislature and I believe in defending its rights, and the rights of the people of Western Australia to have direct input to legislation. That is something for which the people of Western Australia, as consumers, should be grateful, because their legislation will be subject to proper scrutiny by Parliament. This position will continue.

Several members interjected.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: Do you support this legislation?

Hon PETER FOSS: I do. If the member had read the information that I sent to her she would be well informed. She would know that we agreed to the form of the uniform legislation, and that we have agreed we will not impose any greater form of regulation. It is what is called "alternative conforming legislation". We have preserved the right of the Western Australian Parliament to maintain its position as the Legislature for Western Australia. If the member had read the information she would be aware of the situation; she would know the commitment by the Government; she would know that I looked after the people of Western Australia, and that I maintained the dignity, independence and rights of this Parliament. I think the member should be thankful for that.

The first part of the question relates to the suggestion that I am the worst Minister for consumer affairs in Australia. Let me make this clear: I am the Minister for Fair Trading, not the Minister for consumer affairs.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: We understand that.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am glad the member understands that.

Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan: Do you have a responsibility for consumer affairs?

Hon PETER FOSS: More importantly, I am not the Minister for consumer affairs activists. I have made it clear to consumer affairs activists in Western Australia that I am more interested in the consumers than I am in the activists. The activists tend to be white, middle class, articulate, educated and able to look after themselves. They are the ones who subscribe to these magazines, who happened to be using the former Department of Consumer Affairs. Our research showed that if people were black, did not speak English or did not know how to ring the department, they did not get looked after. I am interested in looking after consumers, and I will put consumers first. I made it quite clear to consumer affairs activists that consumers, not just activists, must be looked after. All of the detail in that report - as members will realise if they happen to look at it - acknowledges that we introduced a kit for Aborigines so that they would get some sympathy in this area; a kit for people who did not speak English; and a kit to ensure that those areas in which the most complaints are received are addressed so that businessmen are shown the right way to deal with their customers and are encouraged.

*Point of Order*

Hon A.J.G. MacTIERNAN: We heard this pontification on the radio this morning and I framed my question carefully so as not to address that aspect of it. This question was directed -

The PRESIDENT: Order! Does the member have a point of order? I do not want to hear this.

Hon A.J.G. MacTIERNAN: The point of order is that the Minister is not addressing himself to the question asked of him.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Alannah MacTiernan, in particular, should not be raising a point of order. She has done nothing since she asked the question but be unruly in her attitude to this Chamber by constantly interjecting and harassing the Minister while he is answering the question. I would have stopped him answering a long time ago but for the behaviour in which she was one of the leading lights. Obviously, Opposition members do not want question time. We need to use up another seven minutes. I thought the Minister was doing a pretty good job at that. If the Minister seriously wants to answer the question, I suggest that he get on with it.

*Questions without Notice Resumed*

Hon PETER FOSS: The essential thing we intend to do - it was recognised in that article - is to have prosecutions, and we intend to eliminate those people who do the wrong thing by consumers, rather than come along later and patch up things for people who have the voice to call out for themselves, not leaving aside those who do not have the voice or do not speak the language or who are accustomed to being ignored. I defend what I have done. I believe we are looking after the consumers and not just the left wing mates of the Opposition members who happen to be very keen on getting everything their way.

**MURDOCH UNIVERSITY - AND FURTHER EDUCATION CAMPUSES,  
ROCKINGHAM AND MURDOCH, FEDERAL MINISTER'S APPROVAL**

36. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Education:

If we are going to make speeches, I have a nine minute question. I think the time taken by the Minister to answer the previous question was an outrage, but I guess the Minister cannot help himself. I ask -

- (1) Is it correct that, in relation to the construction of the joint Murdoch University and further education campuses at Rockingham and Murdoch, the Minister has indicated to his federal counterpart that unless the federal Minister gives his approval to the Rockingham and Murdoch sites, he will not approve the proposal?
- (2) If so, on what authority does the Minister rely that says his approval is dependent upon the federal Minister?
- (3) Is it correct to assume that the federal Minister has no role whatsoever to play in this decision?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

(1)-(3)

Mr President -

Hon John Halden: Do not tell me it is a joint committee, because that is not the truth.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is important that the Leader of the Opposition understand very clearly something about this project. The original decision to locate the campus at Kwinana was made by Murdoch University on its own, having taken submissions from people in Kwinana, Rockingham and Mandurah. It made its decision on the basis that it believed the best site for its campuses was in the south west corridor. When I heard that decision - I was not involved in any way at all prior to the decision being made -

Hon John Halden: It had to be a bureaucrat or a committee.

Hon N.F. MOORE: - I believed it was more important that we look at the total region and the education and training needs of that region beyond simply looking at what Murdoch might want to do. I set up a working party chaired by Professor Gordon Stanley which comprised in its membership a person representing the federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training.

Hon John Halden: After they asked to be included.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Not at all.

Hon John Halden: I have the correspondence.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I requested -

The PRESIDENT: Order! I say to the Leader of the Opposition that I do not care whether he wants the Minister to answer this question, but I am interested in the answer.

Hon John Halden: I would just like the truth.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is not for the Leader of the Opposition to determine what the truth is. He may ask the question. It is a very interesting question and happens to be one to which I want to hear an answer. While the Leader of the Opposition is interjecting, I cannot hear the answer.

Hon John Halden: Perhaps you should talk to me. My version is much better and much more reliable.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will ask the Leader of the Opposition about the question later; in the meantime the Minister is answering the question.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I requested that a working party be established which was to include a representative from the Department of Education, Employment and Training and those Western Australian agencies that had an involvement in either education and training, higher education or planning. The matter was discussed by Professor Stanley with the then Minister, Kim Beazley, who gave a very clear indication to Professor Stanley that he was supportive of two sites: One in the northern part of the corridor and one in the southern part of the corridor. The problem the Leader of the Opposition seems to ignore is that he raises matters in this House which require me to start talking about things that he might not like to hear or that some people might not like to be exposed publicly because they are done in the privacy of committee activities. Professor Stanley has talked to the Leader of the Opposition about the process. He took grave exception - and quite rightly - to the tone of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition on opening day and the suggestion that Professor Stanley was involved in political activities, when clearly he was not. Professor Stanley has talked to the Leader of the Opposition to explain the situation and the process.

Hon John Halden: Does that mean I cannot ask a question?

Hon N.F. MOORE: He has advised me that he believes the Leader of the Opposition now understands what happened. Hon John Halden should also understand that part of the decision making process was the agreement by Minister Beazley, a federal Labor Minister, that this course of action was fine by him. I cannot make the decision about where the Federal Government spends its money. It is putting forward the funds -

Hon John Halden: It is your decision.

Hon N.F. MOORE: - for the building of this -

Hon John Halden: Don't duckshove this one.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Will the Leader of the Opposition just listen to me for a moment?

Hon John Halden: It is your decision.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon N.F. MOORE: I take exception to this man. He casts aspersions and makes statements in this House which, if said outside, would be defamatory. He does it all the time.

Hon John Halden: Which one would you like me to say outside? You made the comment. Which one would you like?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon N.F. MOORE: What happened, Mr President, was that the Commonwealth -

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not know what has come over members. The solution of the problem is, rather than the Minister embarking on the tack that he is embarking on, he should sit down and not answer the question. There is no obligation on the Minister to answer the question. I cannot comprehend why the Leader of the Opposition would ask a question and then proceed to answer it himself.

Hon John Halden: I know the answer. I just want the Minister to confirm it.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon John Halden got it wrong.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Leader of the Opposition asks a question and expects an answer, he should give the Minister an opportunity to answer it. He does not have to expect to get the answer that he wants.

Hon John Halden: That is not an expectation that I have.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Minister subsequently answers the question incorrectly, there are procedures for the Leader of the Opposition to take some action. I have never seen so many people ask so many questions in a Parliament who did not want to hear the answers. It seems to me to be a helluva waste of time. If the Minister wants to answer the question, he should do so; otherwise we will proceed to the next question.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Federal Government made funds available for this campus. On that basis the process was initiated in the first place. As I said earlier in my answer, I was not involved in that process. It was a requirement that the Federal Government agree to the funds. The working party has come forward with two propositions: One that there be a campus at Rockingham and another that there be a campus at Mandurah. Before I make a decision about that I must get the agreement of the new federal Minister, Mr Crean, to the expenditure of the funds. In other words I am asking him, through Professor Stanley, whether he is prepared to follow through the commitment provided by Mr Beazley.

Hon John Halden: That is not in your letter.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Which letter is the Opposition Leader referring to?

Hon John Halden: The one you wrote.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am getting very irritated by this man making assertions about things which are not correct and accusing me of lying to the House, which he has been doing consistently this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT: The solution is in your hands.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am asking the member to table the letter - if I am able to do that.

The PRESIDENT: You are not. You can ask him to table a letter if he is quoting from it, or if he has it in his hand, but he does not have it.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The bottom line is that the decision about whether that money is made available to Murdoch University is made by the federal Minister. I have requested from him his concurrence in the decision made by Mr Beazley. If he does not agree to that, we will start all over again. That is one of the reasons no announcement is being made now. That is what happened and I resent the suggestion it was any other way. If Hon John Halden wishes to say in here what he believes happened and to say outside what he said about me and Professor Stanley, he will see me in court.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I take exception to members inviting people to go outside and say things that they say in this place. It is outside the province

of members to impinge on some other member's right to say what they like in this place. I have said before, if I must guarantee to my own satisfaction that everything that everybody says in this place is factual, very little would be said in the place. We would probably sack half the Hansard reporters!

---