

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, 19 May 1987

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) took the Chair at 3.30 pm, and read prayers.

### DOOR TO DOOR TRADING BILL

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

HON. KAY HALLAHAN (South East Metropolitan—Minister for Community Services) [3.36 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Door to Door Trading Bill has significant benefits for both consumers and, perhaps surprisingly, door-to-door traders as well.

This measure is the next step in a long-term programme of reform with the object of unifying the present diversity of consumer legislation in the various States of Australia.

Each Australian State has or will introduce legislation parallel with this Bill. As a result, the many traders who engage in door-to-door sales will not have to worry about different legal conditions as they cross State borders. In particular, uniform legislation will mean nation-wide operations will require only one set of contractual documentation, staff procedures and identification cards.

The benefits to the industry are obvious, and a good example of tangible results achieved by this Government's commitment to removing unnecessary legislative burdens from small business.

I would now like to say a few words about the benefit of the legislation to consumers. Many consumers, especially in the country, have fallen prey to unscrupulous vendors of video recorders, home cladding, roofing and numerous other consumer goods and services. While many of these operators are honest and respectable, some have been manifestly unscrupulous. Consumers have lost sizeable deposits, and traders have forced the acceptance of contracts by commencing work before the expiration of the cooling-off periods provided by the existing

Act. In other cases deposits have been accepted, and goods or services have been unsatisfactory or simply not forthcoming.

To some extent this problem has been alleviated by the Credit Act of 1984, which places an onus on linked credit providers to be satisfied with the ability of the supplier to deliver. This provision has weeded out a substantial number of disreputable operators, but has no application outside credit contracts, and therefore offers no remedy for the consumer who pays in cash.

Accordingly, this Door to Door Trading Bill differs from the existing legislation in two respects: Firstly, it prohibits the supply or delivery of services during the cooling-off period, thus closing off the loophole I mentioned earlier; secondly, the Bill prohibits the payment of any moneys during the cooling-off period.

At the end of the cooling-off period, the trader will have a binding contract, but if the consumer changes his mind before that time, he will not be faced with the problem of recovering his deposit. This provision will eliminate the second loophole that I have described.

In addition, the contractual documents which will be required under the legislation will now not only specifically require a detailed statement of the right to cool off under the contract, and the provision of a document with which to do so, but will draw the attention of the purchaser in bold print to the fact that this contract is subject to a cooling-off period of 10 days.

Apart from these provisions things will remain much the same. Restrictions will remain on the times at which persons may call at the residence of consumers, requirements to produce identity cards will continue, and traders will still be obliged to announce the purpose of their calls.

This uniform model Door to Door Trading Bill has already been passed and is operative in Tasmania; it is also incorporated in the Fair Trading Bill currently before the Parliament of South Australia. The introduction of this Bill is a further substantial step forward in the progress towards national uniformity of consumer legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. N. F. Moore.

## BUSH FIRES AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan—Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.40 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend the Bush Fires Act 1954, addressing two areas. It seeks to change the present compulsory overriding powers of a forest officer over fire control officers to discretionary powers; and increase the penalty provisions, which have not been reviewed for 10 years.

As the Act now stands, if a forest officer is present at a fire in or near forest or Crown land, he must take supreme control. When this happens, the powers of fire control officers, brigade officers and brigades are removed; they cease to have any authority under the Act. A forest officer must take control—must make all decisions relating to the containment of the fire—irrespective of his level of experience or competence.

These overriding powers were given to forest officers following the devastating fires in the early days of settlement when the first group of settlers began using fire to clear their land. These early protective mechanisms have remained in force so far as State forests are concerned.

However, this situation is clearly in urgent need of remedy since the huge extension of forest officers' jurisdiction to national parks and nature reserves through the creation of the Department of Conservation and Land Management. The question of professional competence may arise should a mistake be made resulting in loss, damage, injury or death. The situation also jeopardises the harmonious working relationship between the Bush Fires Board, the volunteer bushfire organisation, the Department of Conservation and Land Management and other Government agencies with land management interests. They have developed a "mutual aid" approach to firefighting, each assisting outside their area of jurisdiction to maximise all firefighting resources such as vehicles, equipment and manpower. This good working relationship is naturally jeopardised when a senior bushfire control officer is

stripped of power on the arrival of a forest officer who may be much less experienced and competent in firefighting matters.

This Bill removes the mandatory requirements placed on a forest officer to take charge of fires irrespective of the circumstances, replacing them with discretionary powers.

This amendment, requested by the Department of Conservation and Land Management, has been endorsed by the Bush Fires Board in the interests of maintaining effective working relationships between forest officers, local bushfire control officers and volunteers.

This Bill also seeks to increase the penalties for offences committed under the Bush Fires Act. These penalties were last considered by Parliament in 1977 and are now too low to offer a realistic deterrent.

The new penalties have been recommended following a review carried out by the Bush Fires Board in consultation with other States, the Country Shire Councils Association and the Local Government Association. Penalties in Victoria and South Australia have been very substantially increased following the Ash Wednesday fires in 1983.

Examples of the increased penalties sought under the Bill before the House include—

lighting fires during prohibited times—the fine increased from \$800 to \$2 000, with the six-month gaol option remaining the same;

false alarm—from \$200 to \$500;

failure of a landholder to extinguish a fire on his land—from \$400 to \$1 000;

arson—from \$2 000 to \$4 000, with the five-year gaol option remaining the same;

permit related offences—from \$400 to \$1 000.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. W. N. Stretch.

## BOXING CONTROL BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan—Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.44 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to establish the Western Australian Boxing Commission to provide the framework within which professional boxing can operate in this State.

The Bill is a direct outcome of the recommendations contained in the report prepared by the professional boxing working party which the Government established in March 1984 to examine professional boxing in Western Australia and to make recommendations on the future development of the sport in this State.

The working party was chaired by me and its members comprised Hon. Bill Grayden, MLA; Councillor Barry Britton; Mr Denis Heaney; Mr Ian Wedgewood and Mr George Ellis, who represented the amateur referees and judges association; Dr Ken Maguire from the Sports Medicine Federation; and Inspector Bill Fander Linden representing the Commissioner of Police.

The previous Minister for Sport and Recreation has expressed his sincere thanks to the members of the committee for their contribution to the production of an excellent report. Thanks are also due to Mr Alan Tranter and Miss Tessie Dafingas from the Department of Sport and Recreation who provided the secretariat support.

The working party consulted widely with the boxing industry and received unanimous support at the public meeting convened to discuss the report's recommendations. There is no doubt that an independent controlling body is required to ensure that professional boxing occurs in an environment which provides all participants in the industry with protection from unscrupulous behaviour.

This Bill brings Western Australia into line with the other States of Australia where professional boxing is popular. Victoria and New South Wales have legislation and controlling bodies.

I will now deal with specific aspects of the Bill.

The definitions in the Bill clearly delineate the persons and agencies incorporated in the Bill. The Bill will create the Western Australian Boxing Commission which will be charged with the responsibility of not only carrying out the

functions of the Act, but also developing guidelines for proper standards in boxing, advising the Minister on boxing matters and establishing standards for the training of persons involved in boxing. The independence of the WABC is essential and is ensured through the Bill.

Part III of the Bill ensures that all persons wishing to engage in boxing contests be registered. Each boxer will be required to attest to his medical condition which will need to include a medical history at the time of application and at the time of subsequent renewals. The intent of this section is to ensure that boxers are prepared for contest well before the event, that they maintain themselves at appropriate boxing fitness levels and that they box in their professional class or classes.

Part IV of the Bill provides for the registration of all participants in the industry, whether they be promoters, managers, trainers, referees, judges, seconds or any other category determined by the WABC. This should ensure that all persons who wish to participate in boxing are properly trained and retain a high level of performance in their particular area.

Part V of the Bill allows for persons to appeal to the Local Court against decisions of the WABC or the Minister.

A great deal of concern exists about the physical safety of boxers. The Government shares this concern and believes that part VI of the Bill which requires medical record books to be kept will reduce the risk of physical injury. The medical record books will ensure that boxers are thoroughly and regularly medically assessed.

Part VII of the Bill prescribes the conditions under which each boxing contest will be conducted. A permit will be required for each contest or contests held on the one occasion. This will ensure that both promoters and boxers fulfil their contracts, that qualified officials are in attendance and that any other condition, as laid down by the WABC, is carried out. Sham bouts will also be penalised under this part.

Additionally, the methods of conducting weigh-ins and pre-bout medical examinations are established and the duties of promoters and medical practitioners are stipulated. These procedures again add to the protection of the boxers, which is a fundamental concern of the Government and the overall majority of those involved in professional boxing.

Part IX of the Bill contains miscellaneous requirements. Under these requirements certain venues may be excluded from boxing contests and persons registered in other States or overseas may be exempted from the Bill.

When this Bill is proclaimed, professional boxing will have the best possible environment in which to conduct its activities. The Government is committed to the Bill which will enhance Western Australia's reputation as a State in which boxing events of Australian, Commonwealth or world title levels can be staged without fear of any interference from sectional interests. Of equal or even greater importance is the fact that the Bill provides protection for all those involved in professional boxing, be they promoters, boxers or other industry participants.

In closing, I wish to again extend my thanks to Hon. Bill Grayden for his assistance on this boxing control committee. At a time when we often hear of the inability of members of the Government and members of the Opposition to work together for a common cause, it was pleasing for me to have the relationship I had with Bill Grayden. I sincerely appreciate his efforts in bringing this report to fruition.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. P. H. Lockyer.

### **STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan—Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.52 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Stock (Brands and Movement) Act provides for the registration and use of brands and earmarks for stock and the regulation of the movement of stock. Within the Act, stock refers to cattle, sheep, horses, pigs and goats.

The purpose of the Act is to establish the ownership of stock, to assist in the detection and prevention of theft and to identify stock for the control of disease. The Act is policed by officers of the Police Department and Inspectors of the Department of Agriculture.

Sections of the Act set out the individual requirements for branding each species of stock. In the case of pigs, a proprietor must brand all pigs over 10 weeks of age before removing those pigs from the property of origin.

Traditionally, most pigs were moved from farms to saleyards where they were sold by auction. Those that were suitable for slaughter were then moved to abattoirs. Currently, however, some 70 per cent of slaughter pigs are transported directly from the property of origin to abattoirs. These pigs are identified at the point of receipt and so are readily identifiable for the purpose of ownership and disease tracing. This obviates the need to brand the pigs on the property of origin.

The Stock (Brands and Movement) Amendment Bill removes the compulsion to brand pigs consigned directly from the property of origin to slaughter. This amendment to the Act has been supported by all sectors of the pig industry as well as the police and the Department of Agriculture.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

### **TOTALISATOR REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan—Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.56 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill before this House is an attempt to remove an anomaly that has existed in the Totalisator Regulation Act for many years. This loophole permits juveniles to bet on on-course totalisators; that is, on racetracks.

The Betting Control Act and the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act have the necessary legislative controls to stop juveniles from betting, but there is no authority to stop juveniles from betting on on-course totalisators. The Western Australian Turf Club is aware of the situation and has experienced periodic problems. The Turf Club has attempted to combat the problem by drawing to the attention of all clubs the anomaly in the Act and requesting them to prohibit juvenile betting. However,

this strategy has not been altogether successful as letters of complaint have been received by the Police Department regarding betting by juveniles at racetracks.

The Government believes that it is necessary to take corrective action to stop juveniles from betting on on-course totalisators.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. P. H. Lockyer.

## BETTING CONTROL AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan—Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.58 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill deals in part with the question of agents acting in the place of bookmakers in certain circumstances. Under the present Act licensed bookmakers must appear in person to enable them to field on a particular race meeting. Bookmakers have generally not been happy with this situation as it means that if they are ill or away on business or leave they cannot field because they are not present in person.

It is claimed that bookmakers have a certain clientele and if, for any one of the reasons already mentioned, they cannot field at a particular meeting or meetings, their clientele could be lost to another bookmaker, thus affecting their livelihood.

Clauses 9 to 15 of this Bill have been introduced to overcome the problem faced by bookmakers of having to appear in person. It is proposed that licensed agents should be permitted to field at a particular meeting in place of the licensed bookmaker under the following conditions—

- (1) Agents to hold a current bookmakers' employees certificate of authority issued by the Betting Control Board.
- (2) Bookmakers to advise the board of the agent when renewing the annual licence.
- (3) The agent to operate under the same terms and conditions pertaining to bookmakers fielding at a meeting.

- (4) The bookmaker to be fully responsible for actions of the agent relating to the conduct of business.
- (5) The agent to be used as a substitute for the bookmaker on account of sickness, leave or special circumstance approved by the principal club.
- (6) Prior approval to be obtained from the principal club for each and every occasion on which the bookmaker wishes to use an agent.
- (7) A prohibition on bookmakers being engaged as agents for other bookmakers.

These conditions have been endorsed by the WA Bookmakers Association.

A second element of this Bill deals with the restructure and relocation of the Betting Control Board.

The Western Australian Government Functional Review Committee, which completed a report on the functions and activities of the Totalisator Agency Board, drew attention to the fact that the Betting Control Act 1954, which provides for the establishment of the Betting Control Board to license on-course bookmakers, is administered by the TAB which controls the State's off-course betting system. The committee considered that in its present format, there is the potential for a conflict of interest, and recommend that the administration of the Act be transferred to the Office of Racing and Gaming.

The TAB was established in 1961 and the placement of the Betting Control Board within its ambit reflected the conditions at that time. However, there has since been substantial change in both social conditions and the gaming environment.

The Office of Racing and Gaming was established in 1984 under the Public Service Act to provide policy advice, coordination, and administrative support to the Minister for Racing and Gaming with respect to the racing, gaming and liquor industries.

In view of these changes, and the fact that there is a department established to handle all matters associated with gaming, this Bill proposes to give effect to the recommendations of the Functional Review Committee. In essence, the Bill proposes that the Betting Control Act 1954 will, in future, be managed by the Office of Racing and Gaming which will provide the executive and secretarial assistance required for its administration.

The expanded Betting Control Board will consist of—

- (A) The permanent head of the Office of Racing and Gaming.
- (B) An independent person who is not a member of any of the following representative organisations.
- (C) A person nominated by the Western Australian Turf Club.
- (D) A person nominated by the Western Australian Trotting Association.
- (E) A person nominated by the Western Australian Greyhound Racing Association.
- (F) A person nominated by the WA Bookmakers Association Inc.

The three new members of the board are the permanent head of the Office of Racing and Gaming, an independent member and a person from the WA Bookmakers Association. They replace the Chairman and the General Manager of the TAB thus severing any links with that organisation.

By appointment of the Minister, the Chairman of the new Betting Control Board shall be either the permanent head of the Office of Racing and Gaming or the independent member.

A feature of this Bill is that it has a review clause. On 1 January 1991 and every five years thereafter, the Minister charged with the administration of the Act shall cause a review to be conducted with regard to the attainment of the purposes of the Act, its administration, the effectiveness of the operation of the board and the department administering the Act, and the need for continuation of the board. A report shall be prepared and tabled before both Houses of Parliament as a result of each review.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. P. H. Lockyer.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

##### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 30 April.

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [4.00 pm]: At the outset, I wish to congratulate the Leader of the House, Hon. Joe Berinson, on his promotion and to thank him for acting extremely swiftly in a matter that I brought to his attention when he was first appointed. I would also like to congratulate Hon. Kay Hallahan

and Hon. Graham Edwards who richly deserve their positions. I would also like to mention Hon. Des Dans; not enough has been said about the part he played in the America's Cup and the job he did in that portfolio. I believe it is up to this House to thank Des, firstly, for the manner in which he conducted business in this House and, secondly, for the way he ran the America's Cup. Let us hope that in the future he can have a bit of rest and not lose too many sails when he goes to watch certain sailing events.

I wish to refer to small business and the peculiarity of franchise in small business. A franchise Bill is being floated around by the Standing Committee of Attorneys General. It relates to motor car dealers and farm machinery dealers in particular and is extremely important. Unfortunately, the Attorneys General so far have only played around with what I call the hamburger and chicken part of franchise. That applies to those who want a McDonald's hamburger bar, a Kentucky Fried Chicken outlet or a Pizza Hut.

Various associations—the Australian Automobile Dealers' Association, the Farm Machinery Dealers' Association and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce in each State—have approached Governments, given them ideas, and rewritten the clauses for this franchise Bill to give some security to machinery and car dealers.

If a car or machinery dealer is sacked he is given a 30-day period of notice and the company which sacks him then offers 50 per cent, at the most, of the value of the parts the dealer has on his shelves. That seems to be a fairly unfair condition. The companies will not purchase back the special tools that go along with the franchise. Those are a couple of examples the franchise Bill can cover. Let us hope the Attorneys do something about it fairly soon.

I note in a Press release recently that the Minister for Police and Emergency Services has taken over the Bush Fires Board. I hope this does not continue to the stage where emergency services and the Bush Fires Board will both be run by the police. The Bush Fires Board in this State is one of the strongest volunteer organisations. I know my good friend, Hon. Fred McKenzie, would agree with me because we looked at the Bush Fires Board in several Select Committees and Royal Commissions. We have always believed that if the Bush Fires Board is to be controlled by anyone, it should be the Department of Conservation and Land Man-

agement, which is the department that is closest to the Bush Fires Board. We certainly do not believe it should go to the State Emergency Service.

I would like to congratulate Ernie Bridge on his appointment as Minister for Water Resources. He seems to be one of the few Ministers in this Government who understands what is going on in the bush.

A member interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is interesting because none of the others did. When asked by the shire council at Narrogin whether the Water Authority in Narrogin would keep their staff in that town, Mr Bridge said there was no intention of reducing the staff. Whether there was or was not, Mr Bridge understood what the people in Narrogin were complaining about and made a statement there and then. The Main Roads Department is totally different. It is under assessment. This Government is marvellous for its committees. If one committee does not give an answer, another committee is formed so it can have another go. We have only to look at the Select Committee looking at charities. It did not work.

Hon. T. G. Butler interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That may be right, but let us wait to find out the truth about the abattoirs. Hon. Tom Butler can tell us what the lease figure is and the length of the lease and all the questions the public are asking about the abattoirs, but I will not be distracted by his unruly interjections.

I refer to the Main Roads Department assessment which is to be done in June. That is not good enough. The shires around Narrogin should hear that the engineers will be left in Narrogin; but we will look at it when an assessment has been done.

It is very interesting to find out about Westrail. My friend, Hon. Fred McKenzie, before he came to this place, fought a battle in Bridgetown about the transfer of a railway depot.

I wish to refer to how Westrail is going in its comparison between wages and salaried staff. In 1965-66 the bill for salaried staff was 31.76 per cent of the salaries bill. In 1975-76, just after Hon. Fred McKenzie had worked fairly hard on the Bridgetown episode, it went up to 33.13 per cent. In 1985-86 the salaried staff bill was 41 per cent of salaries. I cannot understand why. Railroads are things for people on the ground. I think

Westrail has gone mad; it is far too top-heavy and there are more chiefs than indians.

I now wish to refer to the prices surveillance area and fuel distribution costs. I refer to the Albany Highway. You, Sir, and I see a fair bit of it.

The cost to land petrol in Kojonup is 4.1c a litre. The cost to land petrol in Arthur River is 2.9c a litre. The cost to land petrol in Cranbrook is 2c a litre. So, in 37 miles, from Arthur River to Kojonup, the price goes up by 1.2c, and in 60 miles, from Cranbrook to Kojonup, it goes up by 2.1c. It is ludicrous that someone in Melbourne, who does not know what the situation is, should be allowing this to happen. Arthur River's fuel is delivered from Katanning as is the fuel for Beaufort River and Kojonup, but the rate is taken from Wagin. The people in Kojonup are getting ripped off.

I refer now to the Department of The Arts. Some of us can remember when John Harper-Nelson, with one part-time girl, ran the whole department, and far more efficiently than at present. Now we have something like 27 staff doing things that, in most cases, private enterprise can do far better. It is ludicrous that the department should employ so many people. I spoke on this matter when the legislation was first introduced into the Parliament by Hon. John Tonkin. I was in the Legislative Assembly then and I led for the Opposition and I said, "You know, Mr Speaker, the big problem with all this is that they are going to multiply this department into a huge department, and the people who deserve to get the money will not get it." It seems that has come about. To give Hon. John Tonkin his due, he said, "While I am Premier, they won't do that." The late Tom Hartrey interjected and said, "I'll make damn sure they don't." We had had the example of the Australia Council and the filing officers and other people who were employed. The situation with the Department of The Arts is getting right out of hand.

The other evening Hon. Beryl Jones mentioned the standing of members of Parliament. Her comments reminded me of a radio broadcast made in 1942, and the speaker was one Robert G. Menzies. The broadcast was headed "The sickness of democracy" and was as follows—

I went into politics for the first time fourteen years ago. Many of my friends shrugged their shoulders at what they obviously thought a harmless eccentricity. The

most generous unspoken comment was, "Another good man gone wrong!" It was plainly not thought by many that the government of the country was as important as the practice of the law.

During those fourteen years I have, times without number, heard the loud complaint of the business man about the politician. I have, as you have, repeatedly heard the statement that "What the country needs is a Government of business men". On scores of occasions I have made the obvious rejoinder, "All right, what's preventing you? Why not go into Parliament yourself?" And then, as in the old story, "they all, with one accord, began to make excuse." One was too busy—as if only the leisured or the unemployed were needed in Parliament. One would lose too much money—as if serving the people in Parliament ought to be a profitable job. One could not face the bitter criticism and misrepresentation through which the parliamentary candidate so often has to wade—as if only the thick-skinned are fit to devise the laws of the land. And so on. All excuses, masking the fundamental fact that the business of politics was disregarded as fit only for loud-mouthed careerists. It was, and is, very depressing. What should be, if we understood democracy, the noblest and highest of civil vocations, degraded into something of less importance than the higgling of the market and the acquisition of wealth!

I think it is interesting to consider Menzies' remarks of some 35 years ago.

Hon. Robert Hetherington: It goes to show he was not always wrong.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He had his good points and his bad points.

Speaking of bad points, we have a senator in Western Australia called Cook. I loved his letter to Bob Ansett telling him to keep his Budget credit card. Part of his letter read as follows—

You have made plenty of money in this country and it is an outrage that you should consider that you and your company should not have to pay taxes.

Ansett replied and, among other things, spoke about the in excess of \$40 million total tax per annum paid by his company while retaining an after-tax operating profit of about \$1 million. I wonder whether Senator Cook would have got the message. It seems that this Government will never get the message.

Let us consider the Government's last stab at private enterprise, and I refer now to the fringe benefits tax. Even some of the most moribund Labor Party city members would have driven through the country once or twice and probably have stopped at a roadhouse. The manageress of one roadhouse in Williams showed me her account the other day for fringe benefits tax. Do members know what it was for one quarter for this little country roadhouse? It was \$1 700. The people live on the premises of the roadhouse and they are not allowed to charge their meals at a reasonable figure but must charge the full retail value. And the Government wonders why people get upset about the fringe benefits tax. It is a disgusting tax which will eventually sap the resources of small business. It is not too late for the Government to take steps to get rid of it.

Hon. T. G. Butler interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Again, like many Labor Party politicians, Hon. Tom Butler is suffering from jetlag. The woman who runs this business left a well-paid job with an oil company in the city to take over this country roadhouse. She lives on the premises as the manageress and because of that she has to pay the fringe benefits tax—not at a nominal figure but at the full retail figure at which she sells her meals across the counter. Things are getting crazier and crazier.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Are they charging her for three meals a day?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes. It is a charge of something near \$30 a day for the pair of them. I had the same thought as Mr McKenzie obviously had. He can see how horrible it is. Mr McKenzie is a very honest man and he understands these things. It is just unfortunate that more of his colleagues do not understand them quite as well, because he can see what this tax is doing to people in business—it is crippling them.

I wish to speak at some length on the so-called strategies and plans of the Department of Conservation and Land Management. I say "so-called" because the amount of time and effort that has gone into the department's efforts in attempting to con the public could have been better used in upgrading management in the field.

I asked a question the other day about hazard reduction burning, about which you, Mr Deputy President, will be aware having been a former Minister for Lands and Forests. You



will also be aware that Western Australia is the leader of the world in hazard reduction burning—or it was.

Mr McKenzie and Mr Ferry will remember our taking Royal Commission evidence and being told that some of the burning would stop because there would not be enough money. Our worst fears have been realised. Mr McKenzie has seen a letter that we received from Mr Zane Smith, the regional forester in San Francisco, who said that if sensible people in America had read our Royal Commission report, 300 000 acres of bushland would not have been lost that year. He said our method of hazard reduction burning was the greatest. It was, until we found that the shortfalls of burning to 9 April this year included reductions for the northern forest region and the central forest region of 36 per cent, and a reduction of 25 per cent for the southern forest region. I have been told on fairly good authority that four burns did not go ahead in the Walpole area, an area which has just experienced a near calamitous fire. It was only because some burning had been done that the fire was stopped. If this policy continues, our fire regime will fall behind by anything up to nine years so quickly that it will not matter and then what sort of disaster will occur?

We all know what the problem is. This Government promised that it would channel funds into the Department of Conservation and Land Management after it was established. It has not and it is letting the State down badly. A disaster will occur if money is not provided to carry out hazard reduction burning.

I think that Mr Stretch and the shadow Minister for Conservation and Land Management would also agree that the state of vehicle maintenance is not so hot either. However, I will not go into that because it would probably be unfair to some people.

I was in Walpole the other day and was told that \$27 000 had been granted to provide inside toilets for the staff cottages. However, the staff was so worried about its work accommodation that the money was used to extend the office block. They had to forgo the inside toilets for that to happen. I hope that that sort of initiative will be recognised and the inside toilets for the staff cottages are provided. The extensions to the Walpole district office are wonderful and were badly needed. I suggest that winter in Walpole is not conducive to officers and their families using the backyard toilets.

I am horrified by the fact that the Minister for Conservation and Land Management has refused to grant an extension of time in which people can study the strategies and plans for those forest regions. It seems to me that he has allowed only a minimum amount of time for public participation. That is a complete mockery of his claims that he encourages public participation in the strategies for the area. Five volumes of considerable thickness have to be studied and compared with past conservation and land management strategies. Does the southern forest regions draft management plan supersede the management plan for the D'Entrecasteaux National Park? If the Premier thought he attended a large meeting at the Manjimup town hall at which about 1 400 people were present, he will be surprised when he sees 14 000 people hanging through the windows of the town hall if the draft management plan supersedes the management plan for the D'Entrecasteaux National Park. The 1987 draft management plan just about throws out everything that has been in existence for that national park.

I guess the department needs to make some use of the paper it is producing from chopping down the trees, because I thought the four-page insert included in the *Sunday Times*, the *Collie Mail* and the *Warren-Blackwood Times* was ludicrous. I do not know how much it cost, but it was headed "Your chance to have a say in the future of our forests". Is that not delightful! Apparently we will not be allowed to have a say after the middle of June.

We were told that the CALM Bill and policy were based on what had happened in Ontario. All Mr McKenzie and I saw in Ontario was an ongoing public participation. People were allowed to take an interest in their forest programmes. They did not have to deal with an arrogant Minister who, for some reason, has taken a dislike to the Campaign to Save our Native Forests. He has adopted an extremely narrow view and I believe we will have to make him change his mind and see some sense. Some members of CALM have also not had time to study the plans thoroughly.

Let us look at these plans and some of the things being done. The plans assume, as do some Ministers, that the Conservation Through Reserves systems have all been agreed in detail by Cabinet. They have not. They have been agreed to in principle only and yet you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), will recall that when this House refused to let the Government put some land into

D'Entrecasteaux National Park, we were told that the red book stated it should go into the park. In fact, the red book made a suggestion which was adopted in principle.

The red book referred to tamar. Members may recall some of the questions I asked on that subject. With reference to a 1 500 acre block in MacAlinden, when I asked when tamar had last been sighted in the area—not specifically on the block—I was told that the last time it had been seen anywhere in the district was in 1897.

That holding on to land without doing thorough research is the basis of my complaint. This House also complained about that matter and, funnily enough, we were right. No geological surveys are ever included in any of these plans. The department will have to justify its actions. I was horrified to learn that *The West Australian* had swallowed the story that this would be a good thing hook, line and sinker. How the blazes could the leader writer for *The West Australian* get the knowledge from these draft management plans and arrive at that conclusion the next morning? I have a feeling that the lead came from a Press release put out by the department. Of course, the department will say that it is a good thing and, of course, it will argue about the comments I am making tonight. Let it come out front and argue these points because by that means we will get the best land management system.

The Conservation Through Reserves system reports have not been fully endorsed; they are endorsed only in principle. These reports ask for half a million more hectares of land to go into the public estate. The department cannot manage the land it has already because of lack of funds and yet it is asking for more. I do not begrudge its making that request if only it will give some reasons. It is not sufficient to say that the proposal was mentioned in the red book or that the land should be taken because it is vacant Crown land. There must be other reasons for wanting the land. I do not think it is empire building in this case because if the department continues to grab land as it has been doing, that would be like Nero fiddling while Rome burnt.

Members will have to look very carefully indeed at the comments made about this land when the Reserves Bill comes into this House.

A further point relates to the proposed timber strategy that the whole of the bush operation will be taken over by the department; that is, the felling and logging. The timber miller

will buy it from the department. That could be all right but why does the department think that it can do it better than anybody else? We have not been told why it thinks it can; it wants to grab great lumps of vacant Crown land without telling us why.

The Manjimup Shire Council is still smarting over the doublecross by this Government; it was told it would be given land in return for the land used for pine trees. It still has not been given that land four years later. We need to know why.

The Government has had a mental aberration about creating State parks. As far as I am concerned the history of State parks has not been good anywhere they have been established. The department should have another look at that question and decide where it is going with regard to State parks.

I am sure Hon. Fred McKenzie will agree that the department has been given the land tenure and how these lands should be managed on a platter by successive Select Committees and Royal Commissions. However, everybody seems frightened of taking simple steps. It worries me a great deal.

We read the answer from the department in reply to a question on notice that it would cost \$100 000 to swap a reasonably high-ranking officer in Western Australia with his counterpart in Ontario. I have asked a subsequent question about that cost because the Education Department arranged a similar swap with its officers exchanging houses, motor cars and the whole lot, and the only cost incurred was air fares. The person working in Canada received the Canadian wage and the officer working here received the Australian wage.

Would not the experience of these people from the ministry in Ontario be most useful to the State at this stage, especially with public participation? They would be able to give us an enormous amount of advice and even if the cost is \$100 000, we should jump at the opportunity. How much money has already been wasted on inserts and fancy brochures? The department could have had an experienced person residing here and helping it but it has not taken the opportunity.

I refer now to Lake Jasper. I see that KOCO, Keep Our Coast Open, is on the move again. Some five or six years ago we had a battle involving Lake Jasper. The old-timers call it a dead lake, but the National Parks Authority said that speed boats could not be used on the lake because firstly, they would erode the sides

and secondly, they would disturb the bird life. However, we proved that there was no bird life on that magnificent sheet of water. The people from the hang-gliding club researched the area and verified what the old bushmen had said about Lake Jasper.

So we got them a permit to hang-glide on Lake Jasper. And then what happened? As with the D'Entrecasteaux management plan, the Government said, "No, you cannot do it." So we argued again, and just about had the director saying "Yes", when out came the new plan that says people cannot hang-glide at Lake Jasper.

Surely this sort of information should be passed down, and until there is a real and substantive reason that there cannot be hang-gliding on Lake Jasper, it should not be barred. If it can be proved there is damage in any shape or form, then it can be barred. But that cannot be proved. What worries me is that a group of people is talking about taking over massive pieces of land—they say in the public interest, but the public are not getting a go. Parks are for people, and this is what we forget in Western Australia. The forest is for the benefit of all of us, yet we have this sort of narrow-minded claptrap from the radical conservationists and preservationists; and the department is falling over backwards to go along with them except that it will not allow the people enough time to look at the plan because they might find too many problems with it. We must have some rational debate and thought about the management of our parks and forests.

When the Bills concerning this land come before this House I hope my colleagues will support me in not allowing the Government to put the land in reserves unless there is a good and sufficient reason. We will not be whitewashed so far as that land is concerned. We want to know the scientific details of the flora and fauna, and the geological details; we want to know when the department reckons it is going to burn it and whether it has the maintenance money, equipment, and manpower to manage it. We want to know what it is to be managed as. I believe the department has done a magnificent job with public relations, but it is a little light on fact. It worries me because if we allow it to go on, the land will be absorbed into the department. Nobody will really know why it has been absorbed into the department because there has been no real reason to absorb it in the first place. It has been only for departmental convenience, and departmental con-

venience is not one of the things that ranks particularly highly in reserving land. The people's convenience ranks far higher.

In closing on that subject I implore the department and the Minister to allow submissions to be put in for another three months from the middle of June, because I believe that unless we have proper public participation there will be confrontation in no uncertain measure, as we had with the draft plan for D'Entrecasteaux. I do not believe that should happen.

I know the arrogance of the Minister—he is still smarting from being sacked as Minister for Health—and I know he will not easily make a decision to allow the public to make submissions for a further period. However, for the sake of this State he should do it, and I urge the Labor members of Parliament to talk to him—especially somebody like Mr McKenzie with great knowledge of this subject—and in a fair-minded way put to him the fact that proper public participation would demand that submissions be accepted for a further three months. What will three months mean for a plan that is going to have effect for 15 or 20 years and see us into the next century?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I will put it to him.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I make a plea to Mr McKenzie and to his colleagues on the frontbench to go to Mr Hodge and ask him to allow those submissions for another three months.

I will leave the subject of conservation and land management at that point. There are many other things I could say about the plans, but I will not. However—and you would expect it of me, Sir—there are two or three small matters around my electorate that are concerning me and the House would never forgive me if I did not talk about some of the things happening in my electorate.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: Definitely not.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Pandal. The Dumbleyung school—

Hon. Robert Hetherington: How is the Dumbleyung Police Station?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is marvellous. Members heard how I had to get a new police station built because when the policeman's wife started the spin dryer on the washing machine in the old building she had to put her children outside. We also have the Donnybrook Hospi-

tal, but that was from a previous Government and we expected those sorts of things then. But I am talking about the Dumbleyung school.

The Dumbleyung Parents and Citizens' Association bought a couple of computers. What did this Government do at the beginning of this year? It denied that school the funds to employ an aide to teach the children how to use the computers. Now the Government is throwing computers into schools. Dumbleyung will not need them because it has already purchased some, yet the Government will not provide an aide for one day a week to teach computers at the Dumbleyung District High School.

There is a similar situation in Kukerin, where we have one of the bigger junior rooms with 33 or 34 children. An aide is needed because there are a couple of slow-learning children in that group, but we have had no response from the Minister about that. I think the Minister is doing quite a good job in various things. He tends to be a little arrogant and abrupt, and wants to push things fast, but I do not think some of the things he is doing are bad. However, little things like this create an extremely bad image for any department and I believe people in the bush ought to have these opportunities.

There are little things, such as moving the Darkan school from the control of Narrogin, where it has been traditionally, to the control of Bunbury, which is totally foreign. People in Darkan drift towards Narrogin, not towards Bunbury. Why not leave it there and use the sensible measures that have been built up in the past?

Finally, for discourtesy to members of Parliament, this Government and its Ministers take the cake.

The number of Ministers who go into electorates without notifying members is horrific.

Hon. Neil Oliver interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Well, the Premier is wrong.

Hon. Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is a courtesy for Ministers to notify members when they visit the members' electorates. The Tonkin Government always did it; and the Court and O'Connor Governments always did it without fail, but this Government has some arrogant Ministers

who flit in and out of members' electorates without even the courtesy of informing them that they are visiting. When one arranges a meeting with the shire for a Minister, often one is not even given the courtesy by the Minister of being told when he will arrive. Ministers will not even tell one when they are due to arrive. They cut one off from information altogether. I am sure Hon. Kay Hallahan and Hon. Graham Edwards would not be so discourteous, but perhaps they could pass my comments on to some of their colleagues.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I believe the custom of informing members of ministerial visits to their electorates should be honoured. I also think that when a department puts the name of a member of Parliament onto a guest list for a briefing, a Minister should not be so arrogant as to remove it. Members of Parliament are due a certain amount of respect and although an individual Minister may not like certain members of Parliament, he should allow his departmental heads to decide who goes to briefings and so on. Such a thing happened to myself and Hon. Bill Stretch a few weeks ago and really it did not make all that much difference except that the Minister lied when he was approached and blamed the department. That did not impress me very much, nor did it impress his departmental officers.

I do not intend to hold up the House any longer. I support the motion. I make a plea to the Minister to talk to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management and I implore him to allow the period for submissions regarding the management plans from CALM to be extended by at least three months. It is not only politically wise, I believe that in this case it is wise for the overall benefit of the State. I believe that we need as much input to those management plans as possible.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned to a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Hon. Robert Hetherington.

# **ELECTORAL ACT (COMMENCEMENT OF AMENDMENTS) BILL**

## *Standing Orders Suspension*

On motion by Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), resolved by an absolute majority—

That Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable the Electoral Act (Commencement of Amendments) Bill to be introduced and proceed through any or all stages in one sitting.

## *Receipt and First Reading.*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), read a first time.

## *Second Reading*

**HON. KAY HALLAHAN** (South East Metropolitan—Minister for Community Services) [4.55 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In 1985 the Western Australian and Commonwealth Parliaments passed complementary amendments to electoral legislation to ensure that the rights to enrol and vote, then presently enjoyed by enrolled British subjects who were not also Australian citizens, would be fully preserved.

It was intended that both pieces of legislation would come into operation simultaneously—that is, on the day that the Australian Citizenship Amendment Act 1984 was proclaimed.

That Act came into operation on 1 May 1987, but unfortunately no prior notice was given to Western Australian authorities, or, for that matter, to other interstate people, which thus prevented proclamation of our amending Act—the Electoral Amendment Act (No. 2) 1985—on the same day.

Upon receipt of advice on 5 May, arrangements were put in hand to proclaim our Act, which occurred on 8 May. By that proclamation the rights of those British subjects to enrol and vote, which were inadvertently removed by the unsynchronised commencement dates, were fully restored.

These unsynchronised commencements may have created a problem in that if there are any members of the State Parliament who are British subjects, but not Australian citizens, they may have ceased to be members on 1 May, 1987. To place the matter beyond doubt and to ensure full continuity of the membership of any such people, this short Bill provides that the

Electoral Amendment Act (No. 2) 1985 shall retrospectively come into operation on 1 May, 1987.

In view of the potential importance of this matter it is the Government's hope that the Bill may be dealt with by the entire Parliament with expedition.

I commend the Bill to the House.

**HON. JOHN WILLIAMS** (Metropolitan) [4.56 pm]: The Opposition certainly will not hold up this Bill in any way, shape or form.

I have no vested interest in the matter; since the Bill came in I have been asked six times and I repeat: I am an Australian citizen.

**Hon. H. W. Gayfer**: It said "British" but you are a Welshman.

**Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS**: There is a great deal of difference. It is an unusual set of circumstances that the House is asked to deal with all stages of a Bill in the one sitting, but the Opposition agreed to do it because of the implications it may have had. The only thing that strikes me as odd is that in the day and age of faxing machines, synchronised signals and so on, Western Australia is still somehow, along with most of the other States, forgotten as far as Canberra is concerned. It is remarkable in that respect of such an important issue as this—the disfranchisement of some people, perhaps the forfeiture of seats by members of Parliament—that someone somewhere just did not press the right button. One cannot take "someone" to task because he is anonymous, but we on the Opposition side of the House support the Bill.

**HON. H. W. GAYFER** (Central) [4.58 pm]: Likewise the National Party supports the Bill and would like to thank the Minister for sending to us last week an officer to fully explain the impact of the legislation.

Like the previous speaker, I am most concerned that the Commonwealth legislation should be promulgated without notifying WA, especially when, as far as I know, we were the only State which had complementary legislation as it applies within this State. The other States also do not know exactly where they stand in respect of this matter. I understand, indeed, that in four of the States there is no real definition of "British subject".

**Hon. G. E. Masters**: I wonder where you were born.

**Hon. H. W. GAYFER**: Nevertheless, we take it that the matter will be rectified in the other States; we are concerned only with this legislation. We certainly would not like to see any-

body disfranchised, as my honourable colleague has suggested might be the case. But certainly the National Party believes that the Commonwealth Government should be sent back a letter castigating it, in order to remind it that Western Australia does exist and we take a dim view of the fact that we have been asked to make this special introduction of a Bill to rationalise another Bill that we already passed simply in order to make up a deficiency of seven days, or one week.

The National Party supports the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

[Questions taken.]

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), and passed.

## **HUMAN TISSUE AND TRANSPLANT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**HON. KAY HALLAHAN** (South East Metropolitan—Minister for Community Services) [5.22 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for an amendment to the Human Tissue and Transplant Act 1982 to allow the Minister for Health to authorise specific persons to remove corneal tissue from dead bodies for the purpose of transplantation.

Western Australia's transplantation laws were rewritten in 1982. Part III of the legislation provides for the authorised removal of tissue from the body of a deceased person for the purpose of transplantation or for therapeutic, medical and other purposes. Section 24 of the Act envisages that a medical practitioner will carry out the removal of tissue.

In July 1986 the Lions Eye Institute and Save Sight Foundation established the Lions Eye Bank of Western Australia. The central objective of its establishment was to provide quality eye tissue for corneal grafting, research and other medical purposes.

The Lions Eye Bank is situated on the campus of the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre. Since its inception over 100 successful corneal transplants have taken place in Western Australia.

Corneal tissue may become available from the body of a person who dies in a hospital or whose body is brought into a hospital. When suitable donor tissue becomes available, the hospital's designated medical officer can authorise removal of the tissue. Prior to granting such authorisation, the designated officer must make inquiries as to the possible wishes of the deceased with regard to donation of tissue. The designated officer must be satisfied that the deceased had wished to donate tissue and had not withdrawn his wish. Alternatively, if there is no apparent indication of the deceased's wish, the designated officer must make inquiries as to whether the deceased would have objected to tissue removal. If there is no evidence of such an objection and if the senior next of kin does not object, the tissue removal may proceed. The designated officer would ascertain the information through discussions with the deceased's family or doctor or by sighting a signed donor card or donation request on the deceased's driver's licence.

If a patient is on a life support system, tissue removal can only occur after brain death has been certified.

Excision of corneal tissue is carried out in a skilled manner to achieve the best cosmetic and aesthetic result. Donor tissue is then assessed for suitability and blood grouping. Testing for the presence of antibodies to the AIDS virus is also undertaken.

Most people can donate corneas. The eye bank will accept corneas from donors aged from 12 months to 80 years.

Corneal tissue will generally be transplanted soon after it has been obtained and tested. On occasions, corneal tissue has been sent interstate for emergency surgery.

Corneal transplantation is undertaken in Western Australia by any one of the 12 ophthalmic surgeons who have been accredited by the eye bank. A person receiving a corneal

transplant will usually spend several days in hospital and could expect dramatic improvement in his eyesight soon after.

Under the present wording of section 24 of the Human Tissue and Transplant Act 1982, only medical practitioners can remove human tissue for the purposes of transplantation.

Presently medical registrars at teaching hospitals undertake the removal of corneal tissue. This occurs after consent has been given for the removal of such tissue. In an emergency or in the case of donors becoming available outside teaching hospitals, suitable donor corneal tissue may not be obtained if a medical practitioner is not available to remove it. Ideally, corneal tissue must be removed within 10 hours after death.

The South Australian Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1983 is modelled on lines similar to the Human Tissue and Transplant Act 1982. In 1984 the South Australian Act was amended to allow authorised persons to remove tissue for the purpose of corneal transplantation. The amendment before the House is very similar to the South Australian amendment.

In South Australia technicians are able to remove corneal tissue. The present eye bank technician in Western Australia has trained at the South Australian eye bank and has become highly skilled in removing corneal tissue and preparing it for transplantation. Because of the present wording of the Act that technician is only able to prepare corneal tissue. The amendment before the House would allow her or other authorised persons to use their skills in all facets of the process.

Presently two to three transplants are undertaken every week. People may need transplants because of damage or disease to their eyes or because of congenital abnormalities. The Lions Eye Bank estimates that the effect of the amendment before the House may make available corneal tissue for at least another two transplants every week. Availability of corneal tissue will also be increased if more people sign up as donors.

There are presently 40 people on the eye bank's constantly growing list. The availability of more corneal tissue will help to reduce this list and give back to those in need the precious gift of sight.

The Government is anxious to facilitate the continuation of the excellent work of the eye bank. Accordingly, an amendment is proposed

to section 24 to allow a medical practitioner or an authorised person to carry out the removal of tissue for the purpose of corneal transplantation. Members will note that it is only in relation to the removal of tissue for corneal transplantation that it is proposed to depart from the general requirement of removal of tissue by a medical practitioner.

Accordingly, I commend this very worthwhile Bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. John Williams.

### MARKETING OF EGGS AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan—Minister for Sport and Recreation) [5.28 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The marketing of eggs in this State is the responsibility of the Western Australian Egg Marketing Board which operates under the Marketing of Eggs Act 1945-1977.

Over the past five years, the board has operated at a high level of efficiency, as demonstrated by its achievement of a nil surplus of egg production over sales. During this period the board has adopted a more commercial approach to egg marketing and has the strong support of the egg-producing industry. It is significant to note that very few complaints from the egg-consuming public have been received, other than from a section of the community which demanded free-range eggs. Arrangements were made two years ago by the board to supply free-range eggs to the market.

To ensure its continued successful operation and to undertake its responsibilities more effectively, the board requested that a number of amendments be made to the Marketing of Eggs Act.

Cabinet, on 28 May and 13 August 1984, and 24 November 1986, gave approval for these amendments which are in accord with the policy of developing strong, orderly marketing structures for rural products.

The amendments consist of the following provisions—

- (a) To validate use of the name “Golden Egg Farms” by the board. The board has used the words “Golden Egg Farms” since 1977 to promote a more favourable marketing image.
- (b) The board consists of a chairman, three producer representatives, and two consumer representatives, one of whom must have mercantile and commercial experience in the marketing of eggs. The requirement for one of the consumer representatives to have experience in the marketing of eggs is restrictive and the deletion of this requirement will enable the appointment of persons with a wider range of commercial expertise.
- (c) The board is empowered to appoint a secretary, inspectors, and other officers and employees as required, but no specific reference is made to the appointment of the general manager. This omission is corrected in the amendments.
- (d) Egg collectors who transport eggs from the farm to the board are required to be licensed by the board. The licensing mechanism is inflexible and does not meet the changing needs of the industry. Provision is made for the deletion of the requirement that egg collectors be licensed.
- (e) Current egg grading and packing standards are established as codes under the Agricultural Products Act 1929. Amendments to the code are normally proposed by the board, which also has inspectors appointed under the Act. In all other States the responsibility for grade and quality requirements is with the board. Under these amendments, the relevant sections of the Agricultural Products Act are transferred to the Marketing of Eggs Act.
- (f) Under current legislation, the board is obliged to respond to an application to transfer a licence (section 32G) held in partnership even where a member of the partnership opposes the application. To overcome problems which have arisen in this regard, provision is made for the authorisation of all members of a partnership or associ-

ation of persons holding a licence to be required when making an application to transfer the licence.

- (g) In order to facilitate the board's ability to forecast levels of egg production, current legislation requires persons selling chickens or pullets to producers to notify the board. The board will be able to more effectively forecast production if provision is made to require persons selling adult fowls to notify the board.
- (h) Existing penalties for offences against the Act were established in 1975. These penalties have been devalued by inflation and are no longer considered appropriate. This amendment increases penalties to realistic levels.
- (i) The board is not involved in the marketing of duck eggs but reference to ducks and duck eggs in the Act implies that the board is marketing duck eggs. Deletion of reference to ducks and duck eggs and the replacement of “ducks” with the words “other prescribed species” clarifies the situation and provides the opportunity for the board to be involved in duck egg marketing if it is required.
- (j) The maximum number of fowls which any person may be licensed to keep is prescribed by regulation. To equate supply and demand, it has become necessary for the board to adjust licensed bird numbers at intervals each year. This requires repeated adjustment of the maximum licence number. Provision is made for variations in the maximum licence to be approved by the Minister on the recommendations of the board instead of formally prescribing and gazetting each variation.
- (k) A board charge is collected on each dozen eggs delivered to the board or sold under permit by producers to meet the costs of administration, marketing, and promotion. Under this mechanism, producers can understate the number of eggs sold under permit, or sell eggs illegally. Policing is both difficult and costly. Provision is made for the collection of this money by a charge on licensed hens, which will make evasion difficult and reduce board administration costs.



- (l) Under the provisions of the new Financial Administration and Audit Act, all statutory authorities are required to end their financial year on 30 June unless specific legislation states otherwise. The board uses an accounting period based on 52-53 weeks in line with Commonwealth legislation which operates on fortnightly returns on data supplied by the egg industry.

Accordingly, this amendment provides for a 52-53 week financial year.

- (m) Provision is made for the Minister to carry out a review of the operation and effectiveness of the Marketing of Eggs Act after five years from the coming into operation of the Marketing of Eggs Amendment Act.

In conjunction with amendments contained in this Bill, specifically in relation to the transfer of codes under the Agricultural Products Act to the Marketing of Eggs Act, it is necessary to amend the Agricultural Products Act 1929 so that this Act does not apply to eggs.

None of the provisions of this Bill is regarded as a major issue or controversial in nature, but collectively the amendments will allow the board to function more effectively.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

## CENSORSHIP OF FILMS AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

HON. KAY HALLAHAN (South East Metropolitan—Minister for Community Services) [5.36 pm]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to allow the Minister for The Arts to specify picture theatres which are considered to be unsuitable for the screening of restricted exhibition films.

The showing of certain restricted exhibition—R-rated—films at some drive-in picture theatres is causing offence to nearby residents and to passing pedestrians and motorists because the screen can be very easily observed from outside the theatre. Problems are also ex-

perienced in controlling minors and other inquisitive persons who gather around the fence line to view restricted films.

For some time, complaints have been received by the Government, the police, members of Parliament, and local authorities about some drive-in theatres which screen particular R-rated films in clear view of the public. Under the Censorship of Films Act, persons aged between two and 18 years may not be admitted to a picture theatre where a restricted film is being exhibited. There is nothing in the Act to prohibit minors or others from watching restricted films from outside the premises.

Provision does exist in the Act for the Minister to prohibit the screening of a specified film or to limit the screening of a film to certain venues; for example, "hard-top" picture theatres. However, a direction that a film could not be shown at drive-in picture theatres would have general application and the exact title of each film prohibited would need to be stated in an order. It would be highly desirable to be able to specify particular picture theatres which are considered to be unsuitable for the screening of restricted films.

The proposed amendment would enable the Minister to prohibit the exhibition of restricted films at any specified drive-in picture theatre or at any other specified picture theatre where the screen can be easily observed from outside the premises. The Minister would be able to revoke an order. An offence would be committed by an exhibitor where a restricted film was screened in contravention of an order.

The proposed amendment will assist in confining the viewing of restricted films to adults who have been admitted to a picture theatre suitable for the purpose. The proposed amendment should also assist in protecting persons from exposure to films which they may find offensive and will alleviate a situation which has caused embarrassment and concern in the community for some time.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Margaret McAleer.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

### *Motion*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

### *Point of Order*

HON. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Deputy President, could I raise a question on a point of

order on this matter? I am not quite sure or clear about this, but I refer to the new sessional orders. Under those new sessional orders, as I understand them, the Address-in-Reply takes precedence unless there is urgent Government business. We have dealt with that urgent Government business, and after that the spirit and intent of the sessional order is that we return to the Address-in-Reply debate. The Address-in-Reply takes precedence until such time as there is no speaker prepared to speak, or until the Address-in-Reply is completed.

It may be that I should have raised this point of order when Hon. Robert Hetherington moved to adjourn the Address-in-Reply debate to a later stage of the sitting. Maybe I should have insisted then that it should be adjourned only until such time as the Government's urgent business had been dealt with.

I raise this point of order because it is important that the sessional orders be retained and that the spirit and intent of them be pursued. If in fact they need tidying up as a result of my raising this question, so be it. I do not intend to complicate the debate on it. If you, Sir, need to take advice, I will accept that that must happen; but if it is easy to resolve at this time, perhaps you could inform the House.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): I believe we should return to the Address-in-Reply.

#### *Debate Resumed*

**HON. N. F. MOORE** (Lower North) [5.40 pm]: I indicate my support for this motion.

I commence my remarks by congratulating Hon. Joe Berinson on his appointment as Leader of the House. I have always held Hon. Joe Berinson in the highest regard; we do not agree politically, of course, but I think that his capacity to put an argument and to debate is unsurpassed in this House and probably in the Parliament.

I also congratulate Hon. Kay Hallahan on being appointed Deputy Leader of the House. I have already said about Hon. Kay Hallahan that she certainly takes her ministerial duties seriously and endeavours to find answers to questions asked of her; she is most diligent in her activities in the House. I also congratulate Hon. Graham Edwards on his elevation to the Ministry. I trust it will be a very short elevation—for another two years—and after that he will return to the back benches on this side of the House. I guess hope springs eternal in the human breast, but I congratulate Hon. Graham

Edwards on at least having two years in the Ministry. I am sure he will do a good job, by the way, and I have been impressed by the way he is able to handle his portfolio responsibilities in this House.

The matter I wish to speak about in the Address-in-Reply debate relates to education, a shadow portfolio which I have been pleased to hold for some 12 months. During that period the education system has been confronted by a Minister who, in my view, is seeking to establish himself in some historical context as a great education reformer. Regrettably the pace of the reform is such that he will go down in history as a great education wrecker because the system is just not capable of coping with the way in which this Minister is seeking to change it. Since Hon. Bob Pearce became the Minister he has endeavoured to place his stamp on the system in such a way that at the end of his term as the Minister for Education, the education system will be completely changed and will be a reflection of the views that he, to a large extent regrettably, holds personally. I do not think that the views he expresses on every occasion are necessarily the views of his party; they certainly are not the views of the vast majority of the population.

However I have to say that he has done some things as the Minister for Education with which I agree. Every Minister, on the law of averages, must make at least one or two good decisions in his time. Regrettably many of this Minister's decisions have not been good or have been introduced in a climate which is not conducive to change. It has always been my view, and it is the view of most people in the community, that educational change must take place very slowly, and it must take place in a climate of consultation and consensus—heaven forbid that I should use that word “consensus”. Such a climate is necessary in order to obtain change to the education system. Change must be gradual and slow; it really must follow the community's views rather than in some way trying to lead or direct the community's views.

The reason I put that argument is that the education system has a great influence on the future lives of every citizen of this State. If one makes a change to education and one makes a mess of it, one really has the future lives of young people and their future prospects hanging around one's neck. Every decision for change must be accompanied by a considerable amount of consultation, discussion, research and as much agreement as it is possible to attain across the whole community. I am talking

about major change, not the little incidental changes that can be made from time to time. We have been confronted over the last couple of years by major changes to our education system in this State, and those changes, regrettably, have not been accompanied by the sort of consultation to which I refer.

Hon. B. L. Jones: Are you referring to the Beazley report?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is part of what I am referring to.

Hon. B. L. Jones: There was great consultation across the board.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: One can have a report, such as the Beazley report, and it can make 200 or 300 recommendations, as Beazley did, but that does not mean that those recommendations, even though they may have been arrived at by a system of consultation, are necessarily acceptable to the majority of the population. One then has to take those recommendations out into the community again and see what people think of them because education is that sort of a beast. One has to get it right the first time.

Hon. B. L. Jones: That is why it takes time.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Exactly right. It takes time and I am glad Hon. Beryl Jones agrees with me. It takes more time than this Minister has been prepared to give. I want to give the House an example of the sort of change that has taken place in the education system in the past which indicates the sort of lesson this Minister ought to have learnt. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the lower secondary part of the education system was changed and the Achievement Certificate was brought in. It replaced the old Junior Certificate and the system of external examination. The Achievement Certificate was trialled in a number of schools for a number of years; it was subject to considerable debate and consultation, but I think it would be fair to say that consensus was reached across the community and that the changes associated with the Achievement Certificate were acceptable to most people. Ten years later we find that despite having gone through all of that rigmarole and consensus we are being told that that system was a total disaster.

Now we have a Minister who, without any consultation at all, brings out a document called "A Programme for Improvement", otherwise known as "The Better Schools Document", which has had no consultation whatsoever.

Hon. B. L. Jones: That is not true.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That document was brought out before the school year began this year and it was accompanied by a massive television and newspaper advertising programme. It was also accompanied by a letter from the Premier to every teacher in Western Australia, but it was not accompanied by any consultation or community acceptance of the proposals contained in that document. It was not launched, as it should have been, as a Green Paper, or a discussion paper or a document for consideration; it was launched as a fait accompli—"This is how education is going to be changed."

Hon. B. L. Jones: That is incorrect. For the next 12 months every part of that document is negotiable.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: How extraordinary that the member should say that every part of that is negotiable. I suggest that she ask some of the people in head office who are languishing in some little job somewhere about how negotiable their positions are, because changes have been made in the Education Department which are irrevocable and have been made already, and are part and parcel of the changes associated with this document and the decision to have an Education Ministry as opposed to the Education Department. I would be delighted if what the member is saying were correct.

Hon. B. L. Jones: The Minister has said over and over again that over the 12-month period people are invited to have input to it, and it will not be put into force this year. There is no suggestion of that.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Well, I wonder why the document contains a two-page, multi-coloured timeline at the back, which is titled, "Proposed timeline for implementation of changes" which commences in 1987. For the member's information, it also contains a list of the changes between 1987 and 1992. It lists what the changes will be for each year, and most of the changes commence in 1987, which is this year—not next year or the year after. The system is in the process of being changed.

I do not want to waste my time answering interjections because we now have time limits imposed on us. Had we not succumbed to the decision of the Government to have time constraints, I would be happy to argue with the member all night.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: We are all saved a great pleasure I am sure.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I agree. I can think of nothing worse than standing here arguing about this document all night.

The document was accompanied by a fanfare of advertising. It was a most extraordinary launch of change to education. There were full page advertisements in *The West Australian*, full page advertisements in the country newspapers, a television programme, a magnificent glossy document which must have cost an arm and a leg to produce. It is full of lovely colour pictures of the Minister with that grin on his face we have all become used to and lovely photographs of children in various schools. It is a document on which the Government has admitted to spending \$18 000. If I could get someone to give me a contract to produce those sorts of documents for that amount I would be delighted because I would take advantage of that cheap proposal. I am told that something like \$88 000 was spent on launching this new change.

If the document was simply a proposition, a Green Paper or a proposal for potential or possible change then I would not have thought the Minister would have gone to the lengths he did with taxpayers' dollars to try to convince the population that what he was seeking to do through the document was good for everybody, particularly children. Interestingly, when one reads that document, there is not much in it about children, in fact nothing at all. It talks about the changed system.

Tactically it was a very clever time to launch it because no-one had time at the beginning of the school year to study its implications. Most teachers were returning to school and being inundated with the type of work they are required to do at that time of the year. The launch went off without much consideration given to it by people who might have had a position to put.

It was incumbent upon me as a person, who is interested in education and who ought to provide the views of the Opposition, to sit down and study the document, discuss it with a variety of people and find out what it really meant. My study indicated it was a document written in such a way that one could draw a multitude of conclusions about what it intended to do. It is written in such vague language that it raises more questions than it answers. It is typical of opposition parties—and I am no different from any other member of the Opposition—to draw the worst scenario for anything the Government does. I read it in the worst possible context. I looked at every

potentiality and the worst way it could be applied. I did my best also to take the opposite approach and look at the best possible connotation I could put on the changes proposed. I hope, by discussing it with people who did not always agree with me, that I was able to come to some understanding of what was proposed, and was not necessarily the worst scenario. I did take into account and accept some of the proposals being put forward by the Minister. I attempted to see them in a positive light.

I might add that across the education spectrum, as people started to read that document, many different ideas started to come forward. People had their own views and made them known not only to me but to the public through letters to the editor, the Teachers Union and in one case by having a public meeting of teachers in the southern suburbs to which I was invited. Because people started to think about the matter, I decided to put together a document which included the views of the State Opposition in response to the changes to the education system outlined in the document "Better Schools in Western Australia—A Programme for Improvement".

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Would it be possible for the member to table that document?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I would be happy to give the Minister a copy.

In the document I have sought to give the views of the Opposition on the "Better Schools" programme. Unfortunately when it was launched—I do not blame the Press; I blame myself—I created an impression in the minds of the media that we were totally opposed to the "Better Schools" programme and that it should be scrapped. Regrettably, it was a response I gave to a question asked by one of the journalists at the Press conference which, in the heat of the moment, created a wrong impression, and I admit I was the one responsible for making the error. Instead of saying the Opposition has agreed to some things and opposed others there was a headline in the newspaper the next day entitled "Opposition will scrap better schools programme". While I may have given that impression it is not what I intended.

Hon. B. L. Jones: Did you actually say that?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I said that in reference to one part of it, but it was taken to mean the whole thing.

Tonight, I am seeking to indicate to the House the Opposition's views on the education programme—those parts we do agree with and

other areas we do not agree with. I wish to outline the commitments we have made in respect of the changes we will make when we are re-elected.

Hon. B. L. Jones: Do you have an education policy?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes, we do but like everything else it is subject to change. At the present time—as the new shadow Minister since the last State election—I am in the process of rewriting our education policy. When the next election comes, members opposite will see a brand spanking new education policy for the Liberal Party which will wow the voters. I believe education will be a major issue in the next election.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Have you got one at the present time?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes, but everything is subject to change. I am rewriting our policy. I expect the Government will rewrite its policy before the next election. The Government will take out all the bits it has not done and put them into the next policy like it did last time. The Government's policy will be upgraded, as will ours. Between 1983 and 1986 the Labor Party's policy said that all four-year-olds would be given a place in pre-primary centres. That won thousands of votes in the suburbs because all the mothers who have to go to work because of the economic climate needed someone to look after their children. When the Labor Party made that promise they voted for it. Of course, nothing happened in those first three years. In the policy document covering the period 1986 to 1989 what do we see? The promise is made again and the mothers in the suburbs were again rapt in this policy and voted in droves. That, combined with the promise that there would be full-day education for five-year-olds instead of half days as they have now, also won thousands of votes for the Labor Party in the mortgage belt area. These two items will go into the Labor Party's next policy. It will take out the bits it did not do and put them into the next policy. That's what I mean by policy development.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They are still voting for it despite the campaign.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

Hon. N. F. MOORE: A very serious concern is developing around the State for the way in which the education system is moving. The concern is not just at the pace of change which has been initiated by the Beazley report, the Better Schools Document and the change to the

Education Ministry, but a concern about what is actually happening with standards in our schools and the end product of that system.

Hon. B. L. Jones: That is why we are changing it.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am pleased to hear the member say that because it gives some indication of the rationale behind the changes the Government is seeking to implement. I have serious reservations about whether the Government is going down the right path.

Having read the Better Schools Document and applied my criteria and views to its details, my view is that it will not improve the education system at all and it may have the potential to seriously disrupt education in some areas.

Prior to the dinner break I was also advising the House of the Opposition's position with respect to the Better Schools Document and I want to quickly go through it to dispel any doubts about where we stand on this matter and, I hope, to clarify some of the problems some people may have with respect to our attitude to this document. As I said before, I will give members a thousand copies if they would like them.

The first commitment we have made—these commitments are by no means the only commitments we shall be making; they are in respect of this particular document and are our response to the Better Schools programme—is that voluntary school-based, decision-making groups will be retained but will lose the authority to employ principals and staff. When the document was written a very serious suggestion was put forward that school-based, decision-making groups or school councils should be given some authority with respect to the employment of principals and staff. We do not believe that should happen and, if it does, that power will be taken away from the school councils.

If that power is given to the school councils it is our view that the best schools—those located in the best geographical and climatic locations—will attract the best teachers and principals; that will then exacerbate the present problem so that the better schools will get better and the worse schools will get worse. I can envisage real difficulties for schools in country and remote areas if school-based, decision-making groups are given the power to appoint staff.

The present system, which is controlled by a central staffing arrangement, means that every school in Western Australia has roughly the same chance of getting a reasonably good principal and reasonably competent staff. Any change to that could affect the whole question of equity across the State and that is paramount in a State education system such as the one we have. It is just as important for pupils in Wiluna, Halls Creek or any other remote location to have equal opportunities with respect to education as it is for any child living in the more favourably located areas.

Although we shall retain the school councils which have been set up voluntarily—there is some doubt about whether the Minister sees them as voluntary or not—they will lose any authority given by the Minister to employ principals or staff.

To continue with our commitment, principals will be given ultimate authority in decision making in their schools subject only to the district superintendent. The principal will have ultimate power to make decisions in his school regardless of the views of the school council. It would be untenable for a principal to find that decisions made by a school council could override the decisions he makes within the school context.

The second commitment we have made is that staff appointments will be made by a centralised staffing branch to ensure that equity applies across the State. That is self-explanatory.

The third commitment is that secondary subject superintendents will be appointed and, apart from their involvement in assisting teachers in schools, they will also be involved in staffing decisions. One of the decisions made with respect to the rearrangement of the Education Department which I find virtually impossible to comprehend, is the decision to get rid of subject superintendents in secondary schools. They have been considered by most people—obviously the Minister is not one of them—to be one of those aspects of our system which have been a success. Subject superintendents have been very useful in assisting teachers and in assisting in the proper staffing of schools because they have an intimate knowledge of the various people involved in that subject area. We shall reappoint secondary subject superintendents.

The fourth commitment is that we will re-establish regional offices. They will be given real decision-making powers through regional

directors and superintendents. The Better Schools Document and the rearrangement of the education system has meant that existing regional offices have been abolished and replaced by district offices. The regional directors have been replaced by district superintendents. The powers given to district superintendents are considerably less than the powers previously exercised by regional directors. This is a weakness in the current arrangement and I will explain more of that shortly.

It is my view and the view of the Opposition that the regionalisation programme undertaken by the previous Government was slowly but surely gaining in its capacity to deliver education in a proper and competent way. There were problems with that system which needed to be sorted out and one of the problems was the lack of enthusiasm at "Silver City", or head office, for delegating authority to regional offices. It is important that we re-establish these regional offices and for them to be given real decision-making power.

The next commitment is that district or subject superintendents will be given the role of granting permanency to teachers. One of the initiatives, if I can call it that, in the Better Schools Document is to allow or require principals to grant permanency to staff. That is an unnecessary burden to place on principals, and most of them would agree with me. It is a burden which most of them would rather not have. It can create untenable situations particularly in small schools, but it can also create virtually impossible situations in big schools.

I give some examples of hypothetical situations that could arise with principals granting permanency. If one has a small school with two or three teachers and a principal, then it is necessary for its educational survival that the principal and his staff work closely together. There needs to be a close relationship between the teaching staff. If the principal is suddenly put into a situation where he has to decide whether some or all of the members of his staff are going to get permanency—that is, whether they are going to be able to be teachers in the system in the future; become permanent employees—it puts him in a very difficult position in his personal relationships with those teachers.

In a larger school, such as a senior high school, I wonder how a principal is going to grant permanency to a home economics teacher, for example, if he knows nothing about the teaching of home economics, or about the teaching of biology or some other subject which

is completely outside his range of knowledge. All principals have a particular area of expertise, and it would be very difficult for them to be good judges of the teaching competence and capacity of teachers whose subject areas are quite divorced and different from those of the principal himself.

It is the view of members on this side that this role should be returned to district superintendents in the case of primary schools and to subject superintendents in the case of secondary schools.

A key element of the Better Schools Document is the school grant. This basically means that the Education Ministry will work out in some way—and I do not know how—how much each school should get. That money will be provided to the principal, who will then, together with the advice he receives from the school-based decision-making group, expend those funds on a variety of different areas. All types of expenditure will come under the school grant: expenditure such as maintenance; the payment of relief for teachers; the purchase of books and teaching aids and other equipment. A whole variety of different areas will come under the concept of the school grant.

That is not a bad idea in principle but I really cannot see how it will work out in practice. I have no idea how the Education Ministry is going to work out how much each school should get, because there are so many imponderables attached to the expenditure of the fund. There could easily be situations where schools run out of money, or in other cases have a surplus. What will happen in the event that schools run out of money?

Hon. Tom Helm: That is for the superintendents to deal with.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Is the superintendent going to have a big fund of money that he gives to schools that need it, or is he going to say, "You have been naughty; you cannot have any more"? What happens if an epidemic of Asian flu goes through a school in the Pilbara and all the staff are away for three weeks? That could use up the whole school grant in three weeks for the payment of relief staff, and that would be something quite outside the control of the school. That is unlikely to happen in the Pilbara, I admit, but that sort of unexpected situation could arise and could send the school broke. Does that mean the school then goes back to the Ministry and says, "We have had

this problem. We want some more money"? Will the Ministry then have to give it more money?

I wonder why one needs to devolve that responsibility. Why not just say the principal is entitled to make the decision about the employment of relief staff but must send the bill to the Ministry? It would be a very simple way of doing it, without having to hand over a lump sum of money to the principal and say, "You keep the books; you look after the banking; you make sure that it is audited properly; and you spend the money as determined by your school council."

I am not opposed to the concept of schools having more money and having, therefore, more decision-making at their disposal, but I have serious reservations about how the whole thing will work in practice. I think what will happen is that the Minister for Budget Management will have a heart attack when he sees what some principals are doing with the money and will decide it had better all go back to the department again and principals will just be allowed to make decisions about money but will not actually write the cheques.

One principal has told me he will invest the money in the short-term money market and will use the school grant to make a big quid for the school. If his investment goes wrong and he loses all the money, is it up to the principal to find the money and replace it, or what?

Hon. Tom Helm: As long as the school council agrees.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Is the council then required to make up the losses? Where is it going to get the money from? That is what I would like to know.

I also have a concern, which is shared by a lot of people in the community, that the whole idea of the school grant is to provide a situation in which the school council is given X number of dollars, but if it then decides on a school programme or development plan which is going to cost more money than it has been given by the grant, a need arises for the school council to raise more money. This is the way in which I see the Minister saving himself some money, because the school council will become a fund raising outfit, whose job it is to supplement the school grant to provide those things that it deems necessary for the school.

So when one listens to the Minister's rhetoric about saving money and then looks at how he might do it, and finds there is no way he can do it apart from more fund raising at the school

level, one realises that is one of the areas about which people have justifiable concerns. The Opposition will be monitoring the way in which the school grant operates, and if it is working it will leave it in place; if it is not it will return to the old system. That is the commitment it has made.

The next commitment is as follows. Principals and teaching staff will be encouraged to stay longer in their schools by the use of an incentive system rather than mandatory time-frames. These incentives will apply particularly to service in remote and country schools. The Better Schools Document says, quite rightly, that there is a problem of teachers moving through schools too quickly; they do not stay long enough, particularly in country and remote areas. The Minister has said his answer to the problems is to have these mandatory time limits where if one goes to a remote area, one has to stay two years; if one goes to a less-advantaged country area, it is three years; if one goes to a good city school, it is five years; and so on. The problem with that is that good teachers will stay longer because of the mandatory requirement, but so will the bad teachers, and in the overall scheme of things one really is no better off. One is probably better off in a country school—and I am sure Hon. Tom Helm will agree with me—in having a good teacher for one year rather than a mug teacher for two years. To set these mandatory time-frames is likely to be counter productive.

Hon. Tom Helm: The good teachers stay longer.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: But so do the bad ones.

Hon. Tom Helm: The bad ones want to go as soon as they can.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I have spent enough time in the member's part of the world to know that some of the bad ones stay too, and it was an unfortunate state of affairs. What this side seeks to do is to introduce a positive instead of a negative. The negative is to say that one has to stay a certain number of years. It is better to have a system of positive incentives. I admit the details of these incentives have not been worked out, but what needs to be done is to look at providing either financial assistance or some other assistance or incentive to teachers who go to remote and country areas.

An example somebody gave was that two years' service in a remote locality would count for three years for long service purposes, or something of that nature. Those are the sorts of incentives that should be developed and Hon.

Tom Stephens ought to know that a large area of his electorate is populated by people who are on an incentive system. The mining area of the Pilbara was populated using a system of incentives such as cheap housing, reasonably high salaries, overtime and so on rather than the mandatory system in which one is told to go and do this or that. School teachers, like other public servants, by necessity have to go to remote parts of the world, so we should give them some encouragement to stay by making their lives easier and providing some incentives for them to be in remote areas.

I think that is a better way of doing it than to say, "You have to stay here a certain period of time."

Hon. Tom Stephens: It is very hard to do that when the Opposition is always saying the Government should cut expenditure, yet now you are advocating the opposite.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will try to be fair about this. We have not worked out the details, but the example I gave the House of, say, a long service leave credit would not cost as much as one might think it would. In a sense it is a delayed cost but one can actually do things which do not have a monetary attachment if one puts one's mind to it. While I expect it will cost money, the returns will be well worth while. Hon. Tom Stephens keeps saying that the Opposition keeps telling the Government to save money, yet it is the Government who is telling us that it must save money. I think the Government spends its money in the wrong way, and money could be spent better in some areas if the Government were to rearrange its priorities. It is all a question of priorities and I think the Government's priorities in some areas are quite wrong.

Those are the commitments the Liberal Party has made, apart from a general commitment that we will return the education system to one where certainty and lack of confusion are the hallmarks. The Liberal Party will allow the education system to evolve and allow change to take place in a feeling of certainty, without the constant worry that people have these days about what the next change will be. There will be a return to certainty and slow change, and there will be a return to some traditional values when the Liberal Party is returned to Government. I went through those aspects to advise the House of the position the Opposition has taken in respect of the Better Schools Document. That does not cover every-



thing, but it outlines the areas about which we feel constrained to make some comments and to advise the public what we will do.

Members, having listened to that, will now see that any suggestion that the Liberal Party will totally scrap the Better Schools Document is not correct; the Liberal Party will modify it so that a system is arrived at which is more in line with what we think an education system should be than the system that seems to be envisaged in the Better Schools Document.

I want to refer briefly to another aspect of the educational changes: That is, the formation of the Education Ministry as opposed to the previous departmental structure which was in place. I take members back to the pre-Ministry days and advise that the way in which the decision-making was arrived at then was somewhat different to what it is now and will be under the new Ministry arrangements.

Under the old system, at the head of the Education Department was the director general. He was a public servant who was not just an administrator but was appointed because of his educational qualities; he was an educator as well as an administrator and he had a dual role. He was at the top of the pyramid and beneath him was the assistant director general, directors and so on down through the various stages of the pyramid until one got down to the schools.

The departmental structure was essentially a pyramid structure. Decisions about what should happen in education essentially were taken by the director general and his top level staff, and were usually based upon the policy parameters set by the Government of the day. Under the old system, the Minister sat slightly to the side of the director general and his role was, in very simple terms, to advise the director general what the Government's policies were and to say to him, "Right, they are the policies. It is your job now—because you get paid twice as much as I do—to put them into practice. If you have any problems come back and tell me and if you can't do it, come back and tell me." The Minister had a watching brief; the professional administrator, who was appointed as the top education man in the State, carried out the policies and ran the department.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do we now have a Director General of Education?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Well, we have one because we have not changed the Act but I will mention that in a moment.

Under that system the Minister was not directly involved in the day-to-day business of education and that is how it should be, in my view, because Ministers are, by their very nature, highly political animals; some of them claim to be educators but their main purpose, at the time they are Ministers is to carry out a political programme. Because of the extreme sensitivity of politics and education, the Minister for Education should sit to the side and have a watching brief to ensure that the broad parameters of the Government's policy are implemented.

Hon. Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: We have a reformist Government which is seeking to introduce politics into education. The way it is doing that starts at the very structure of the Education Ministry. The Ministry consists of the Minister at the top of the wozzer, where the director general used to sit, and no doubt there will be an advisory council of some description which will represent all the diverse views of the different pressure groups around the place who will all be appointed by the Minister and will give him advice on educational matters. The Minister will then tell the Chief Executive Officer—that is who the director general used to be—who will then put the decisions into practice. They will be day-to-day decisions about all sorts of things connected with education and so the Minister will have a hands-on role in respect of what happens in every school in Western Australia. That frightens me because the politicisation of the education system is completely abhorrent to me and to the party I represent.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It is called "Ministerial responsibility".

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is not that; it is the politicisation of education. In fact there is considerable evidence coming forward now which indicates that the Minister is even bypassing the structure he set up. In fact his office is communicating directly with schools. The Minister may claim he is entitled to do that, and in some areas of Government administration, I would say that is fine; but it is not fine in education. The political Minister ought not to give directives to schools about educational matters.

Hon. Tom. Helm: What should he be giving them?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Minister's job is to see that the education system is run by professional educators within the parameters of

the Government's policy. It is not for him to say that every school will teach, for example, peace studies every Monday morning and will do so-and-so every Tuesday afternoon, or that so-and-so will be appointed to such-and-such a job while somebody else will be appointed to something else and somebody else will be sacked because he is of the wrong political persuasion. That is not what the Minister's role should be, and if members opposite think otherwise, they will come a resounding cropper at the next election because the people of Western Australia will not have a bar of the politicisation of education. They will toss the Labor Party out of Government on that basis, because that is what the Minister, who wants to go down in history as a great educational revolutionary, is seeking to do. He is seeking to stamp his own political views on every child in Western Australia, and I will not stand for it, nor will the people of Western Australia.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You should not peddle lies.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is not a lie; it is exactly what is happening.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! I remind Hon. Tom Stephens and Hon. Beryl Jones that my list shows they made their speeches on the Address-in-Reply on 29 April and 4 April respectively. Therefore, they should not be interjecting on another member's speech.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is my view, and I believe my argument is right, that this restructuring of the education system has the potential to politicise the system, and that is totally unacceptable. I supported the previous system whereby the Minister sat slightly to the side of the director general who, as an educator and professional person, ran the education system, and the Minister interfered as little as possible.

I am prepared to accept, as are most sensible thinking people, that the Education Department got too big. It was extraordinary that when the new building in East Perth was built all the different parts in the department could not be fitted into it, yet that was the intention of the building in the first place. Clearly, there were too many little outfits being set up under the umbrella of head office. Many had to go, and they have gone, and I am not opposed to that. There was a lot of room for removal of some of the projects that had developed within the head office structure. I am not opposed to a

leaner head office, but to the way it is being restructured and the way the Minister has a direct, hands-on role in the structure.

The way this arrogant Minister for Education went through the old Education Department and chopped off heads was without doubt the most brutal and insensitive act of any Minister I have heard of. There were people in the Education Department who had given 30 or 40 years of dedicated service and were told one day "Your job no longer exists; here is a piece of paper with a list of jobs you might like to have, put a tick next to the one you want and next Monday we will tell you what you are getting." Some people went from director to superintendent and the Minister said there were no demotions. How extraordinary! The people involved knew they were demoted. There were all sorts of changes, and the throats were slashed of people who had given dedicated, diligent service and deserved better, but the Minister said that was fair and reasonable.

On top of that, when they got their appointments on the Monday morning they were all temporary. They were told, "If you want that job next year you have to apply again." As Hon. Garry Kelly would know, having been in the business, people with 30 or 40 years' service and with every right to expect to be able to retire with dignity or move through the system with dignity, were told they were demoted and if next year they wanted the job to which they were demoted they had to apply again and compete to get it. There are ways and means of doing things, and that is not the way to do it. There are dozens of very competent, capable senior people in the education system who are absolutely ropeable about what has happened to them, and morale in the system is at rock bottom. It is not just in head office—it is right through the system; principals, staff and teachers—and the whole lot have all had enough.

It is time this Minister got out of his ivory tower and off his pedestal and started to realise what he is doing to the system because it is not good.

I was very pleased to hear by way of interjection the suggestion that this Better Schools Document is totally negotiable because I am sure that anyone who hears that comment will breathe a sigh of relief. They can disregard most of the nonsense in the document and settle down to slow, progressive changes at a pace we can cope with. Hon. Beryl Jones said it is totally negotiable. I expect that after the

pressure that has been applied to the Minister by various groups in the community he will say it is not cut and dried; it is negotiable and he will change his views on those issues where they need to be changed. I see Hon. John Halden is shaking his head. Is it negotiable or not?

Hon. B. L. Jones: The Minister has told the union in my hearing that it is a proposed document and each of the items is up for discussion this year if anybody chooses to come back to him.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Hon. Beryl Jones said it was negotiable, but Hon. John Halden tells me something different. I trust members opposite will get their act together and work out what it means. If it is totally negotiable it is a step in the right direction. It did not come out that way. If it is negotiable now it is because of the pressure of the Teachers Union, parents and a whole variety of community groups who had had enough.

If members want to see some problems in some schools they should look at those which are on the pilot project for the unitisation scheme. It will be total chaos next year in most secondary schools. The pilot project for unitisation is not being evaluated, but at the beginning of next year every school goes into it. It is a disaster in places and the Minister is bringing in that change at the same time as those proposed in this document.

I want members opposite to know that it is on their political heads. Every secondary school in Western Australia will be in absolute chaos. Some secondary schools cannot get their timetables working and school has been going for almost half the year. There is a fellow teaching manual arts unitisation in Meekatharra who has not been seen by anybody to determine how he is going. There is no evaluation.

Hon. Kay Hallahan interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is good news politically, but the Government is jeopardising the education of every child in our schools. That will be on the heads of members opposite, not mine. They should get out and have a look if they do not believe me. If they ruin the education of one child because the Minister has some grandiose plan for education it is the Government's problem, and members opposite will have to face the consequences.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Margaret McAleer.

## **BILLS (2): REPORT**

1. Main Roads Amendment Bill.
2. Business Franchise (Tobacco) Amendment Bill.

Reports of Committees adopted.

## **GREAT SOUTHERN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 30 April.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [8.10 pm]: It is not my intention to take members on a Cook's tour of Albany and the south. In another place the member for Albany made the Government well aware of the difficulties the region is experiencing. I congratulate him for the speech he made and the ground he covered. Indeed, the speech took several hours. He certainly showed that he had a very good grasp of the problems of the area, the development opportunities, and the difficulties being experienced with those developments. The manner in which he handled the Bill in another place illustrates why he was re-elected.

Regrettably, the creation of the Great Southern Development Authority cannot be divorced from politics, and the Government is using its establishment as an election issue. I think it highlights the public's opinion of politicians as being rotten. The Government's miserable showing at the last State election indicates what the public thinks of the Government and its members using public funds to mount their campaign.

The Government appointed a committee of leading citizens from throughout the south west to thoroughly examine the assets of the district, its potential, and, in particular, the problems inhibiting further expansion. I believe that report was a good document and summary of the great southern. I certainly admire the people who worked on it and the report they produced.

Hon. Graham Edwards: What report are you talking about?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The "Albany Tomorrow" report.

The Government produced an 87-page colour brochure which it issued to everyone who attended the launching of the Great Southern Development Authority about three weeks before the election. It was one of the most expensive brochures that I have ever seen. A video of a half-hour's duration was also

produced. Much of it was taken from a helicopter and was of the Albany port, town, and surrounding district.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: It was a travelogue, was it?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Yes, and goodness knows what it cost. About 100 people attended the launching. What happened, though, was that the material used in the launching of the Great Southern Development Authority was used also to launch the campaign for the Labor candidate for the seat of Albany. I was interested to see 10 copies of that brochure in my office the next day, and I was asked if I wanted more. I thought that was rather nice. However, the Labor candidate must have asked for 3 500 copies to deliver door-to-door to the people of Albany. I am not sure how much that would have cost, either. The video including beautiful panoramic views was also used in the promotion of that candidate. She also began appearing in some glamorous clothes as if from *Vogue*. However, I believe that, at that stage, the people of Albany began to realise what it was all about. None of the retailers could remember her buying the costumes at their shops and realised that, like the video and brochures, they came from the metropolitan area. They realised how hollow it all was and stuck to their local member, Leon Watt, to represent them. He had done a remarkable job. That campaign is indicative of exactly what Governments can do when they hop on the gravy train.

Hon. Doug Wenn: You tried to shaft him.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! I remind Hon. Doug Wenn that there are certain words and phrases that could be described as disorderly. I do not wish to interpret the remark he just made.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am trying to give the House the feeling of the atmosphere in Albany with regard to the promotion and launching of the Great Southern Development Authority. Fortunately the Government did not appoint its members immediately but allowed the whole matter to cool down. I think it is to their credit that, in spite of what happened, some of the leading citizens of the district and town made themselves available to be appointed to the authority regardless of how much it had been blown up politically. I believe they will provide an excellent service on that authority. The people appointed to it are good people who will be trying their best because

they have such tremendous faith in their region and believe the authority will be of great benefit to it.

People place a lot of trust in these sorts of authorities. I notice in this legislation that the Minister can direct the authority. However, if it gets to the stage of the Minister directing it against its wishes, it will not be very successful. I believe that, with cooperation between the members and staff of the authority and the Government and the Minister, those people will be of great benefit to the great southern, with Albany at its centre.

We have to be careful that everything is not dragged into the centre of the region. Government servants and other services should not be drained from the surrounding country towns into the centre.

The authority will have the power to acquire, hold, and dispose of real and personal estate. It will also have the power to improve, develop, and alter real estate, and to build roads and construct other works. I think that is also in the Local Government Act. Generally speaking it does not cause much difficulty. One can see a need in certain circumstances for such an authority developing an industrial park or something like that. Nevertheless, I question whether it should go in for such things. Another Government authority is set up to do that sort of development and I do not think it should be duplicated in one of these regional authorities, mainly because they do not have the experienced staff to do it. It would be a waste of resources, if they can use other Government authorities where required or, better still, private enterprise. Probably my greatest concern and the concern of others in the south is whether the authority will start to take on the responsibility of private enterprise and the activities private enterprise would normally carry out.

This is particularly so, as one of the main features of "Albany Tomorrow" is the development of Frederickstown. The idea was that the area at the end of York Street, which is currently taken up with railway and port facilities, should be developed into a tourist and recreation area. York Street should flow down to a wharf and marina at the edge of Princess Harbour. Without doubt the concept is very beautiful, but it is of concern to the businessmen of Albany, because like other country towns they can see their businesses receding. They are concerned that if Govern-

ment-induced development at that end of the town goes ahead, it could affect their turnover and real estate values.

The manner in which members of the authority can handle this sort of situation will be the testing of them. There is no doubt that it is a real problem. If private enterprise makes such a development—and the development includes a shopping centre, something like Fishermen's Wharf—then businessmen should be willing to accept the consequences. They may not like it but they will have to accept competition from another private enterprise project.

If the Government—or in this case the authority—goes ahead and develops this project, with the many advantages that it can gain by being attached to the Government, such as planning and the like, often using taxpayers' funds to carry it out, then it becomes a different story altogether. Those businesses which are affected will have something to complain about.

Because the "Albany Tomorrow" report had such a high Frederickstown content, it will be interesting to see just how the Great Southern Development Authority will take up this challenge. I am sure that the people on it are well aware of the powers they have; they will not wish to abuse them. It is always interesting that people on these boards are often successful in business and feel they can do everything as well or better than anyone else in business. Sometimes boards include people who are not businessmen but who reckon that they are just as intelligent and capable and they can do everything just as well as anyone making a living from real estate. For these reasons alone boards often end up competing with private enterprise.

There are plenty of fields in which this authority can work. I will not be going through them all. As I mentioned, the member for Albany has pointed out to the Government in another place the many problems and issues. We have all seen the difficulties which arose with Borthwick's abattoir, when it closed. That was later reopened. We have just seen Boans decide to get out of Albany and West Australian Newspapers discontinue and sack the staff. Fortunately it looks as if that store will remain open.

The town is having many problems, but I think an authority like this can help it to come to grips with many of them. Many good things are going on in Albany. Southern Processors have successfully taken over from Hunts fish

cannery. It looks as if they will be in the potato chip business in a big way in the very near future. When I bought some fish and chips in Esperance the other day I was astonished to find that the potato chips that that shop and others were using came from Canada; if not from Canada, from the Eastern States, but mainly from Canada. That shows that the opportunities are there; all is not lost.

Albany is the centre of a very strong agricultural area. The great southern is one of the oldest agricultural areas in the State. Financially it is very sound, and I am sure that this authority can help to expand many existing businesses such as tourism and can bring new ones to the district. It has my full support, and I wish it and the great southern well.

**HON. J. N. CALDWELL (South) [8.28 pm]:** The National Party has also indicated its support for the Great Southern Development Authority. It could be said that I was one of those members canvassing the streets of Albany prior to the elections.

**Hon. Graham Edwards:** You were being political.

**Hon. J. N. CALDWELL:** I had a feeling of inadequacy going up and down the streets seeing these picturesque brochures on every doorstep. I also noticed the odd one fluttering down the street in the breeze, and others in rubbish bins. This probably goes to prove that pretty pictures do not buy a winning vote, as in the case of Albany. However, it did not particularly deter me, and I continued.

**A Government member:** And won!

**Hon. J. N. CALDWELL:** That was nice, too. The target of the authority is to help Albany succeed and spread around its hinterland. One reservation about this is that I believe the five committee members who come from Albany make it slightly lopsided. If a vacancy occurs on that committee, one representative from one of the inland areas should be added to it. There are only two inland members, one from Katanning and one from Mt Barker, as I understand it. Some of the inland areas like Tambellup and Woodanilling have been neglected.

It would seem that perhaps Government-backed loans are not readily available to agriculture. I understand that RAFCOR is supposed to look after agriculture. I would particularly like to see the Great Southern Development Authority give some thought to helping businesses in the agricultural areas, because they are undoubtedly extremely important.

Tourism is the main income generator for Albany, and I only hope the authority gives this its full support.

One of the major projects the authority has put in place is the acquisition of land for the agricultural school at Gnowangerup. I understand this has been a great success. I believe Hon. David Wordsworth mentioned the acquisition of that land, and this is one area where I feel that aspect has been of virtue. I believe the agricultural school has progressed in leaps and bounds. The boys who attend the school have been ruled with a firm hand. They have recently taken a trip to Cairns, and had raised \$20 000, and I understand the school is flourishing.

I have little else to add, except to say that the authority will develop the area of Albany and surrounding regions, and with the support of the Government and the people of that area it will prosper. The National Party supports the Bill.

**HON. V. J. FERRY (South West) [8.32 pm]:** The legislation before the House is based on the experiment that occurred under the "Bunbury 2000" programme implemented by the Government. The Bill before us is modelled on the South West Development Authority experience.

It is interesting to recall that when legislation was introduced into this place to establish the South West Development Authority a few years ago, the Minister, on behalf of the Government, criticised what he described as the previous scatter-gun approach to development in the south west. I note from the Minister's second reading speech on this occasion that there is no mention of that phrase. I believe there is a jolly good reason why it is not mentioned by the Government today, because in the light of experience and in the hard light of reality, in trying to further the interests of any region it is recognised now that we cannot artificially create progress. Progress must be based soundly on the region. We cannot dress something up and say something will happen when there is not a sound basis on which to build. That is why the South West Development Authority has on some occasions run into heavy weather. The Government must bear some of the blame—

Hon. Kay Hallahan: And a lot of credit.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: —for this view held by some people in the south west. The South West Development Authority has my support.

Hon. Doug Wenn interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Government members are extremely sensitive. I have just said the South West Development Authority has my support, and it has had it all the way through. I have criticised areas and activities the authority has engaged in which I believe deserve to be criticised for good reason, but the concept has my support. However, if Labor members wish to criticise me for supporting their programme, that is on their own heads. There are areas in the concept of regional development as proposed by the Government which have weaknesses. I do not wish to see those weaknesses proliferated in the Albany area by the Bill before the House tonight; therefore I am taking the line of pointing out one or two pitfalls.

I remind honourable members that the so-called scatter-gun approach served this State extremely well in developing regions and smaller centres throughout the State for a very long time by Governments of all persuasions. A case in point is the SCM Chemicals Ltd plant at Australind, north of Bunbury, which was previously Laporte Industries Ltd. I have quoted before and will quote again that example, where that industry was established under the Brand-Nalder Government in 1962-63; and that had support from the then Opposition spokesman for industrial matters, Hon. John Tonkin. He is on public record as congratulating the Government of the day for establishing that industry and recognising the difficulties in encouraging that industry to come to the Bunbury area. Is that a scatter-gun approach? It is only one example.

The bauxite industry has stood the test of time in the south west, as have forestry, the agricultural industry, the coalmining in Colliie—all the Governments supported that—the mineral sands industry, and tourism. I could go on. It is derogatory to refer to that as a scatter-gun philosophy, I refer to the modern inland harbour at Bunbury, which is the catalyst for servicing these industries in the area—so much so that we are now seeing timber being imported into Western Australia from Malaysia. We will see more coming in in the future, so there is two-way trade, with our timber going out and theirs coming in. That is the result of our having a world-recognised deepwater harbour. That is not a scatter-gun approach.

Having said that, I will refer to the concept in the Bill to form this new authority for the great southern area based on Albany. Let me say immediately that I hope the new authority,

learning from the experience of the South West Development Authority's activities, will prosper from the vital involvement of representatives from the local authorities of that region. It is known to me and to others that some local authorities in the south west of this State are far from satisfied with their relationship with the South West Development Authority. In fact the representatives from local government on the advisory committee of the South West Development Authority are somewhat inhibited in their relationship with the shire councils of the region. I understand that they are not encouraged to relate to the local authorities much of the business being discussed at the committee levels of the advisory committee. I find that extremely disappointing.

I believe local authorities should be fully apprised of the work that the South West Development Authority has discussed with the advisory committee at all times so people are onside and working together. That is the idea of it—to coordinate the resources of the area to obtain the maximum result possible. I cannot see that happening at the present time, with representatives of the local authorities being somewhat inhibited in their discussions with shire councils in the region. I would hope that this new Bill will set the framework and the guidelines for a better result to occur in the great southern region.

I want to point out one or two unfortunate occurrences through the influence of the South West Development Authority. I refer to the proposal to put an international airport at Margaret River, which was promoted by that authority. I think that was most unfortunate. One could imagine an upgraded aircraft landing facility in the Margaret River district to take reasonably-sized aircraft. However, it is stretching the imagination to extreme lengths to suggest that at this time we should have an international airport at a place such as Margaret River. The involvement of the South West Development Authority in promoting this idea put the local authority, the Augusta-Margaret River Shire, under considerable pressure and it certainly caused grave concern to be felt by many of the residents of that shire, so much so that the South West Development Authority had to back off from that exercise, leaving the shire to straighten out the whole mess.

Another idea actively floated by the South West Development Authority was the establishment of a regional zoo in the south west. That is a good concept and I congratulate it for

thinking of it; but it is only great if it is a viable concept, which I doubt it will be in the foreseeable future. Worse than that, it was proposed to establish the zoo on land used by the Wokalup Research Station. The value of agriculture to the south west and the State generally is immense, so to think that the whole or even part of this land was proposed to be used for a regional zoo is most unfortunate, to say the least. Suffice it to say the involvement of farmer organisations, the Department of Agriculture, and various members of the public as well as myself saw to it that the idea was shelved, at least for the time being. I wish the concept of a regional zoo well in the long term, but I believe it is a project that should be undertaken by private enterprise. I cannot see such a concept being successful now, bearing in mind that the Perth Zoological Gardens are absorbing considerable sums of public money to ensure that they are properly maintained. The Perth Zoo is supported by one million souls in the metropolitan region, yet it is still not a viable proposition, as I understand it. I may stand corrected. To establish a regional zoo in the south west would be a further burden on the people of the south west particularly and the State generally.

Another kite flown fairly early on was the suggestion that there should be a chain of something like five 5-star hotels throughout the south west. That is a laudable concept, and we are very pleased to have the Lord Forrest Hotel in Bunbury. It is well managed and is meeting a need in the area. But here again, I question its location. It seems incredible that when we have such marvellous sites in and around Bunbury for resort hotels, the Lord Forrest should have been placed where it is. It is in an old residential area on the edge of the central business district, and alongside it is the Bunbury office tower. What we have then is a very modern and good hotel right against an office tower taller than the hotel itself. If I were building a resort hotel I would like it more in a situation like Observation City at Scarborough, somewhere near the beach-front or near some vantage point where people could have uninterrupted views, but certainly not next to an office tower which blocks out the view of roughly a quarter of the hotel's rooms.

The cost of the office tower itself has also been questioned. The last time I was there, which was not very long ago, there seemed to be a lot of empty space yet to be utilised by

Government departments and agencies. No doubt that will happen in the fullness of time, but that is another story.

The members of the South West Development Authority and the representatives of the various departments need to be prudent in the area of planning in Albany and the great southern generally.

The South West Development Authority did well in its redevelopment of Blair Street and the removal of the railway line in Bunbury, something which has benefited the city; but an establishment in the city which is really a blot on the landscape is the Ampol petroleum depot. This depot was left in a very central location in Bunbury City and, because of that, further planning for the city has been severely impeded. Because the depot was not removed when the railway was removed, Bunbury City cannot fully avail itself of the planning opportunities it might have had for the central business district. I lay the blame for the fact that the depot was left squarely at the feet of this Government, because it did not find sufficient money to make sure that it was removed. It would have paid off handsomely for the Government had it found the necessary money to clear away that blot on the landscape so that planning for the area could be properly maximised with respect to the beautification and utilisation of that area of Bunbury City.

The South West Development Authority can be of tremendous help to the south west, but it needs to do its job properly and not in haste. The oversights I have referred to probably stem from the fact that the Government and the South West Development Authority were too anxious to move quickly in order to get runs on the board in order to win votes in a public relations exercise and to gain political kudos. They have done that, but in so doing they have gone too fast when they should have taken their time and done these things better.

I have spoken previously about the South West Development Authority's and the Government's promotion of the "Bunbury 2000" project, and I refer to the artificially hyped-up expectations of things to happen in the region. I refer again to the very high expectations of the establishment of an alumina smelter in the area, which has not eventuated. In time it will be established there. Certainly 18 months or two years ago tremendous expectations were built up. Land values were enhanced because of that expectation. A number of private people and business firms purchased either residential land or commer-

cial land in the expectation of fairly rapid increases in population not only in Bunbury but also in places nearby, such as Australind, Eaton, Brunswick, Capel and Dardanup. This has caused a downturn in land values over the last several months, not only for residential plots but also for commercial sites. A number of people in Brunswick, for example, bought residential property with the expectation that the smelter would be built nearby. Of course it was not, and they have experienced great difficulties in selling their residences when they have been forced to do so. These expectations have caused considerable problems.

Development can be based only on the natural resources of the area. That is a classic example of the natural resources being used for development. It would be a great shame if it were not viable and people got hurt.

There is a feeling throughout the south west region that the City of Bunbury is the only place in that area to benefit from the "Bunbury 2000" programme. Rightly or wrongly, that is the overwhelming view of people in the south west region. I do not entirely agree with that, just as Hon. Doug Wenn would not agree. Because it was called "Bunbury 2000", people assumed that most of the benefits would go to the City of Bunbury. Indeed, I think most of them have. However, some benefits have also gone to other shires in the south west.

People all along the great southern line should ensure that their districts receive a slice of the cake wherever possible and that not all development is focused on Albany, although Albany deserves assistance.

Coincidentally, I was in Albany last weekend when I took the opportunity to look around and talk to a number of people including business people and private citizens. I got the feeling that Albany is moving along steadily, but that it needs assistance. I hope that, under this legislation, it will get that assistance. I have faith in the region that I have known all my life. I was impressed with the number of businesses established there and obviously doing a steady trade. They are not making a fortune, but Albany is not that sort of place.

While there, I visited Stirling Terrace, which was once the focal point of Albany shop owners and business people. It is opposite the railway station. In those days, most people travelled by train because cars were not as plentiful as they are today. Shipping was another important form of transport, but the focal point of most of these towns was the railway station. That has



all changed. It was very sad to walk along Stirling Terrace and see so many empty shops and the odd vacant block. It is very different from what was there not so long ago. I hope that the establishment of this new authority will see that area rejuvenated.

I have made these remarks in an attempt to indicate to members the changes that have occurred in the south west region. A little while ago, the Parliament passed a Bill establishing the South West Development Authority. I refer again to the Minister's comments made at that time when, from memory, he said that if the South West Development Authority were successful, it would become a model for other regions of the State. We are now seeing an extension of that legislation with the setting up of the Great Southern Development Authority. One wonders whether other regions, such as Geraldton, will see the establishment of authorities for their areas.

During that earlier debate I said that the wheel of fortune will turn the full circle, because if enough regions around the State fight for a share of the cake we will return to the situation that existed before the setting up of the South West Development Authority. I hope that each region receives the maximum benefit from its authority, and that it learns from the mistakes that happened in the south west.

I support the South West Development Authority. However, when I see weaknesses, I reserve my right to express my opinion on those weaknesses. I wish the new authority well.

**HON. W. N. STRETCH** (Lower Central) [8.55 pm]: I also support this legislation. I have known the port and the Town of Albany ever since I began farming in Western Australia in 1954. Indeed, as Hon. Vic Ferry said, in those days Albany probably had more going for it than it has now. The wool stores were just beginning to develop. We were one of the first to deliver to them and our family has delivered wool there ever since. At one stage we hoped Albany would become the Geelong of Western Australia—the fine quality wool-producing outlet for the entire State. Unfortunately, as we all know, the centralisation of wool selling has spelt the end of that dream. No-one regrets it more than we do. However, Albany is still hanging onto its wool handling facility. I believe it is very important to Albany and to this State that it continues in that role.

Albany also has a very fine harbour and port, and the faith shown in the port by CBH Ltd when it opened that marvellous new facility has added greatly to the port and the handling of grain from the very productive hinterland. If one is ever in Albany in the middle of the grain season, one can go to the port and see trucks lining up to the bullpen for a distance of half a mile, each loaded with up to 60 tonnes of grain. It is a great sight. It would not please railway fans, but the grain industry is well served by road transport. These trucks make an inspiring sight with their huge loads. It is not too good, though, if one is sitting in line at 3 o'clock in the morning, a quarter of a mile from the front of the line. However, that is an indication of the traffic handled by the port.

Albany is the outport for a very rich hinterland extending past Hon. John Caldwell's area. In the last season, trucks came down from as far away as Narembeen with huge loads of grain bound for Albany.

Those of us who love Albany know it has still to reach its full potential. We hope this new development authority, if sensibly set up and run on lean lines, will do something to help the area to attain the future that most of us believe it has.

It is very important that those of us who have known the area for a long time set out before the House the contributions that many people have made to that area over the years on a voluntary basis. I know that the same sort of people have made a huge contribution to Bunbury on a voluntary basis.

One of my first public duties or pleasures was to attend, as a delegate in 1958 or 1959, the meetings of a body called the Great Southern Regional Development Council. Is that not funny? That happened nearly 30 years ago, and this new authority sounds very similar. Yet, all that early work was done willingly on a voluntary basis with many people travelling from as far away as Gnowangerup and from even further afield. They voluntarily gave of their time and their knowledge to work for the port and the Town of Albany, and for the entire hinterland area.

When one sets up these bodies on a governmental basis it is easy to overlook the amount of work that has gone on before. To come in now and say this is the way to do it is a bit rude and rather unfeeling of the efforts put in by these people, because their achievements are great.

When we started near Albany the deep water jetty was not adequate. There were no wool stores, there was a small grain terminal; yet many things were brought about by voluntary bodies meeting together, pooling their knowledge and making representations to the Government of the day to achieve these tangible results.

I wish the authority well but we should bear in mind that it is not the only way that areas develop. The same people will be doing the same job, and the only difference is that it will be done differently. Those earlier bodies only got the odd bit of secretarial help and even that was pretty rare. I believe the danger in respect of these bodies is that everyone says "The Government can take over. Why should people bother?" They tend to step back from those organisations and we do not get the same input and feeling of achievement. That is the danger. We have seen it a little with the South West Development Authority, although not so much in Bunbury itself but in the hinterland which Hon. A. A. Lewis and myself represent. There have not been too many spin-offs down there in Boyup Brook and Manjimup. The Government can learn, when setting up the second development authority, from some of the mistakes made in the past.

It has been validly pointed out that when the "Bunbury 2000" project started there was a big switch off. It is now the South West Development Authority.

Without the goodwill of the hinterland the plan for Albany would be nothing because Albany itself is virtually a fishing and tourist centre. With the wealth of the hinterland, with its vegetables, wool, wheat, coarse grains, timber and magnetite, Albany can go a long way. The concept gives much hope for the future. It is important that the work of the developing pioneers in that region is recognised and remembered when all this comes to fruition.

I certainly wish the programme well; as previous speakers and Mr Watt in the other place have pointed out, there is a lot going on there, and with the right sort of catalytic assistance a lot more can be achieved. I support the Bill and wish the authority well.

**HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan—Minister for Sport and Recreation) [9.05 pm]: I am very pleased to hear the support offered by members opposite who have taken part in this debate. It is inevitable when talking about the Great Southern Development Authority Bill that we would draw

some criticisms from the Bunbury experience. It is also inevitable that the Government, along with the South West Development Authority, will be criticised; but the Government is prepared to proceed in the belief that ultimately we are working towards the best model that will best tap local resources and enable local experience to have a part and a say in the development of those areas.

In speaking to the Bill, Hon. W. N. Stretch made mention of the voluntary efforts of people who have been down a similar path before. No-one is criticising their efforts, but in putting forward models like this we must recognise that we have different economic circumstances and it is those economic circumstances as much as anything else that give rise to these types of community-based organisations. It is a good thing that it has happened that way because there is much experience and expertise in those regions. It is important that we give local people the opportunity to have a real input into the development of their local areas, because of their experience and knowledge of the areas in which they live, work and conduct their businesses.

The authority will enable them to accumulate a tremendous amount of knowledge and experience about the local area—far more than Governments can ever accumulate. It is equally important that Governments facilitate the bringing together of that experience, and only through the creation of such things as the Great Southern Development Authority can we give those people, about whom members opposite have spoken so highly, the vehicle that will enable them to pursue the answers to problems that lie in their own region.

I want to mention a couple of matters raised by Hon. D. J. Wordsworth. It is important to point out that this authority does not seek to compete with local businesses. It seeks to facilitate and to use its abilities to try to give a greater opportunity for business itself to progress.

It is not intended that the authority become a massive landholder or constructor in its own right. It is intended that the authority be able to facilitate development where it is possible for it to be done by local business. I believe that although upper House members work pretty hard they do not have the ability or the opportunity to get as close to the people and areas that lower House members do.

It is interesting to note that both the National Party and Liberal Party members strongly support this Bill in another place. I think that is because they recognise the potential of what the development authority sets out to do. They recognise there is a great need for the Great Southern Development Authority.

I do not think there is any need to go further into the input of members opposite. I have covered most of the points they have raised except to say again that I appreciate their support and believe the Great Southern Development Authority will have a great role to play in the development of the region.

It was rightly pointed out by Hon. Vic Ferry that perhaps we made a blunder in Bunbury by concentrating on Bunbury instead of the region. That certainly will not happen and the board is representative of the whole area. I know the area fairly well, having worked and lived in Katanning for some years.

I thank members for their contributions and look forward to a greater future for the great southern region as a result of the members' support for this Bill tonight.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon. Mark Nevill) in the Chair; Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation) in charge of the Bill.

#### **Clause 1: Short title—**

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I reinforce the remarks I made earlier in regard to the authority's dealings with local authorities in its area of activity. Leaning on the experience of the South West Development Authority, because of the activities of that authority some local authorities have been placed under undue pressure, especially financial, to meet their share of funding in certain directions for programmes that have been put in place.

The Bunbury City Council, especially, felt the pressure of the activities of the South West Development Authority, and it has fiscal problems. Most local authorities have fiscal problems, but certainly the Bunbury City Council has related to me on more than one occasion that it has been placed under additional pressure from the eagerness of the authority to put certain programmes in place without proper consultation and regard for the effect it would have on the local authority in that area.

I have already mentioned the Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council position in regard to the experience over the proposed new aerodrome in that area. That is another example.

I place on record my request to the members of the authority and the Government to have sensitive regard for the role of local authorities in their areas of responsibility. I remind members that local authorities are just that—local authorities; they have a direct responsibility in their very wide-ranging sphere of activity to their local people. They have the responsibility of raising revenue through rating and other charges, and they are accountable to the people of their areas. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to have local authorities completely outside whenever any arrangements are planned in their sphere of activity.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I take the point made by the honourable member, as does the Minister. The members of the board to be established have a great deal of experience in local government, and I believe they will be sensitive to the local needs. There is enough experience on the board for it to be aware of this possible conflict, and through that experience to achieve what it sets out to achieve, at the same time completely minimising that area of conflict.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 9 put and passed.

#### **Clause 10: Disclosure of pecuniary interests—**

Hon. W. N. STRETCH: In line 10, reference is made to "indirect pecuniary interest". It appears to be setting up an interesting legal point as to who does not have an indirect pecuniary interest in a body such as this.

I can go along with the reference to a board member with a direct pecuniary interest in a matter being considered; but I ask the Minister to outline where an indirect interest stops. It may open an enormous can of worms when establishing what a board member may sit in on and what he may not. I can visualise situations in which every member of the board has an indirect pecuniary interest.

The Minister may enlighten me as to whether this applies also to the advisory committee. I am not referring to whether a member is able to profit by having an indirect interest; but by being a member of the board, the person could be construed as having an indirect pecuniary interest.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: My experience in local government has taught me that pecuniary interest can be difficult to interpret. I think an indirect pecuniary interest could apply to a member of the board who could be influenced by something from which he may not get a direct financial gain, but perhaps a member of his family may stand to gain or he may perhaps gain in some indirect way financially.

I have set that aside from having a pecuniary interest in common with other members and a pecuniary interest in common with what they are seeking to achieve. That is my interpretation.

The member will be aware that this clause raised some interesting debate in the other place, although that particular issue was not taken up.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 11 to 21 put and passed.**

**Clause 22: Temporary investment of funds—**

Hon. W. N. STRETCH: Does this clause mean that surplus funds will be invested with the WA Development Corporation as of right, and that the interest accruing will go to the credit of the WADC and not be of assistance to the authority? This has concerned the Opposition for some time, and I wonder whether we shall get away from this rather unhealthy trend in this Bill.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: That is not considered to be the case as a matter of course. It would depend on where the funds came from in the first place, but any return that came from the investment of moneys that belonged to the authority would come back to the authority as I see it.

Hon. W. N. STRETCH: If I could follow that further with the Minister's own department, it may help if he can tell the Chamber whether the instruction, which I understand was sent out from the Treasurer, that surplus funds from all Government departments were to be invested with the WADC, still applies to his department? I am not trying to get off the subject but am trying to give a parallel as to whether there is a reasonable expectation that the same would apply to this authority, because if this has gone out as the Treasurer's directive, I really do not see how the money could go anywhere else.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I understand that while that is the case in relation to departments, it is not the case in relation to this authority.

Hon. W. N. STRETCH: If this authority operates with the blessing of the Minister, as I gather it does, and at his direction, is it not automatic that it has the same standing as a department? The Minister can enlighten me on the distinction, but I cannot see it from here.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I can advise the member that is simply not the case. There is a distinction between the authority and other Government departments, and the same direction does not apply to the authority.

Hon. W. N. STRETCH: I take that as an assurance that any moneys then raised by that authority will be remitted in full with interest for the use of the authority; and I wonder also whether the same applies with the South West Development Authority.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: The South West Development Authority Bill is not being dealt with but rather the Great Southern Development Authority Bill.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 23 put and passed.**

**Clause 24: Establishment and functions of Great Southern Development Authority Advisory Committee—**

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I take this opportunity to comment on the advisory committee, and coupled with that I will link the board of management, which was dealt with in a previous clause, where the same principle applies in regard to the comments I make. The members of the board of management and of the advisory committee will be appointed. Referring to my comments regarding the role played by local authorities in the area, the councils of local authorities are in fact elected and are directly responsible to the ratepayers and residents of their areas. The members of the board of management and the advisory committee are not elected and do not have that direct responsibility to the local residents or the residents in the region.

Therefore, these authority personnel across the board have a very grave responsibility to the people of the area inasmuch as they are not elected and cannot be removed by the residents of the area if they feel aggrieved in any way at all. There are other remedies, no doubt, but the fact is they are not elected by the residents; they are appointed. There is, therefore, a

tremendous onus upon the people appointed to have regard for their responsibilities. I am sure they will have.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I accept the point but come back to the fact that the person who takes ultimate responsibility for this is the Minister and, of course, the Government; and they are elected people and accountable, so that line of accountability is still there. Some members of the committee about which the member spoke are also nominated by local authorities who are elected people. So I do not see there is any real way in which that accountability is done away with or not in effect.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 25 to 28 put and passed.**

**Clause 29: Disclosure of pecuniary interests of Advisory Committee members—**

Hon. W. N. STRETCH: I virtually answer my own question by saying that the advisory committee members who have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the matter are covered by this clause, and I put on record my

concern about that indirect pecuniary interest definition again. I do not think it calls for comment, but I would like it on record that there is an area to be considered and watched fairly closely in the future.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I will draw that to the Minister's attention and get him to have a look at it.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 30 to 35 put and passed.**

**Schedules 1 to 3 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.29 pm*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### ARTS

#### *Symphony Orchestra: Funding*

74. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for The Arts:

- (1) What is the current State grant to the ABC's State Symphony Orchestra?
- (2) Is this grant to be reviewed in the light of the ABC's decision to seek commercial sponsorship for its State orchestras?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The State grant to the Western Australian Symphony Orchestra for the year 1986-87 is \$278 280.
- (2) The State grant is a contribution towards base funding for the orchestra. Commercial sponsorship is being sought by the ABC for special projects and not as a contribution to base funding. It is therefore not intended to review the State grant.

### EDUCATION

#### *Schools: South East Province*

123. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

In order to provide for the needs of an expanding population in the environs of Bunbury, what plans are there for the provision of sites for—

- (a) a primary school at Gelorup;
- (b) a high school at Gelorup;
- (c) a high school at Eaton?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (a) and (b) These matters are currently under consideration;
- (c) an Education Department officer is to meet with the Shire of Dardanup next month to discuss the location of a proposed high school site in an area to the east of the existing residential development in Eaton.

### STOCK

#### *Pig Compensation Fund: Collections*

131. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What moneys have been paid into the pig compensation fund during each financial year from 1982 to 1986?
- (2) What is the total amount now in the fund?
- (3) What has been paid out in compensation during the same period?
- (4) How many farmers have received compensation, and what is the total amount?
- (5) How many other organisations, other than farmers, have received compensation, and what are the amounts?
- (6) What other amounts of compensation moneys have been paid out of the fund for any other purposes?
- (7) What amounts of compensation have already been paid out for 1987?
- (8) Has any recent decision been made to pay any amount from the compensation fund?
- (9) If so, to whom, and what is the amount?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)	Grower Contributions	Interest and Incidental Revenue	Total
	\$	\$	\$
1981-82	122 523	83 630	206 153
1982-83	114 038	131 387	245 425
1983-84	114 443	129 026	243 469
1984-85	121 514	118 314	239 828
1985-86	137 498	112 213	249 811

(2) \$1 309 790.

(3) and (4)

	\$	No. of Farmers
1981-82	4 213.32	15
1982-83	4 795.17	12
1983-84	17 357.15	9
1984-85	11 539.30	10
1985-86	14 700.70	7

(5) Nil.

- (6) Atrophic rhinitis research \$ 5 897
- Pig improvement programme \$162 542
- Research and development \$463 979

(7) \$4 142 to 31 March 1987.

(8) and (9) In 1980 the Minister for Agriculture approved of an arrangement by which the interest on invested compensation funds would be made available for research and development in the pig industry and to assist

the Pig Producers' Association to represent the industry. A committee was established to consider proposals and make recommendations to the Minister, who approves expenditure. The committee meets in June each year to consider the majority of proposals, but does receive a small number of proposals on an out-of-sessions basis. Since this arrangement was established, \$463 979—referred to in (6) above—has been made available for research and development.

The most recent payment was approved on 8 April 1986 for \$3 200 to enable the Western Australian Pig Producers' Association to undertake a survey of piggeries in the Peel-Harvey area to assess their role in the phosphorous contamination of the estuary.

If further information is required, it is suggested that the member contact the chairman of the pig industry compensation fund advisory committee, Mr B. Gabbedy.

## AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES

### *Assistance*

132. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the scheme for assistance to agricultural societies still in force?
- (2) If yes, what are—
  - (a) the guidelines;
  - (b) the amounts available for distribution?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Grants are based on a Government-agriculture society ratio of \$2:\$1 with a limit of \$5 000 per annum on the subsidy payable to any one society. Funds allocated to the scheme are on a financial year basis and applications are considered until funds are fully committed. Any subsequent applications are considered the following financial year.

Applications must include a plan and estimated cost. On completion, receipts are forwarded and the approved subsidy is paid.

Assistance is intended primarily for the display of livestock and agricultural produce, and includes sheep, cattle, pig, and poultry pavilions and pens, etc. Grants are not available for general ground improvements such as toilets, fences, etc.

- (b) The annual amount allocated to the scheme for the financial year 1986-87 is \$52 200.

## HOUSING SALES

### *Minimum Occupancy Period*

133. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

With reference to Homeswest's scheme of selling its buildings to tenants—

- (1) Is there a minimum occupancy period before Homeswest tenants can apply to buy that house, or any other Homeswest house?
- (2) On what criteria does Homeswest value its houses, and who does the valuing?
- (3) Does Homeswest apply any monetary incentive to purchasing tenants who, over long periods, have maintained their homes and grounds in good condition?
- (4) If no to (3), will the Minister consider starting such an incentive scheme in an effort to encourage tenants to care for their homes?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Subject to the compliance with other normal eligibility criteria, there is generally no minimum period for application. However, recently Homeswest offered a special purchase scheme to tenants who were ineligible for Homeswest purchase assistance but who had been in residence in their current property for five years or more.
- (2) Valuations of Homeswest rental properties to be sold are provided by various private valuers located throughout the State, and the Valuer General. The criteria used in valuing houses is to assess the current market value less allowance for improvements carried out by the tenant.

The above relates to properties sold by valuation. However, the member's attention to drawn to (4) below.

- (3) Apart from the allowance described in (2) above, no monetary incentive is available.
- (4) Under the terms of the Commonwealth-State housing agreement, dwellings must be sold at value or cost, whichever is the greater.

### ROTTNEST ISLAND

#### *Businesses: Tenders*

135. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) What number of separate tenders has been received for—
  - (a) the Rottnest Restaurant;
  - (b) Rottnest Island Marine Services?
- (2) What number of tenders display interest in both businesses?
- (3) Why was Tentland not put out for tender?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) (a) One;
- (b) two.
- (2) Two.
- (3) The board was acting in accordance with the Functional Review Committee recommendation, accepted by Cabinet, to assume control of Tentland when the current lease expired.

### ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD

#### *Members*

137. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Will the Minister list all current members of the Rottnest Island Board?
- (2) Will she indicate—
  - (a) the date of each appointment;
  - (b) the date each will expire?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Member	(1)	(2)(a)	(2)(b)
	Initial Appointment	Current Appointment	Expiry Date
D. Dempster	1/7/82	1/7/85	30/6/88
A. Ednie-Brown	1/7/82	1/7/85	30/6/88
M. A. Lewis	1/7/82	1/7/85	30/6/88
P. M. Barblett	28/10/77	1/7/86	30/6/87
C. C. Sanders	30/8/85	30/8/85	30/6/88

### ENVIRONMENT

#### *Cossack: Termite Eradication Programme*

139. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Planning:

What is the current position of the termite eradication programme carried out on historic buildings at Cossack?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The building at Cossack which has been most severely affected by termites is the police barracks. Emergency termite treatment was undertaken on the building last year to arrest further damage to the structure.

A full and complete termite eradication programme on the building is to be undertaken shortly in conjunction with restoration of the roof and walls. This is to be funded from a bi-centennial allocation of \$150 000 announced recently, which is earmarked for a range of works at Cossack including stabilisation of the post and telegraph building and the Mercantile Store, restoration and adaptation of the courthouse, establishment of day-visitor facilities, and production of interpretative signage and leaflets.

The component of this amount allocated for the programme of works on the termite-affected police barracks is \$50 000. Work will proceed under the supervision of the Building Management Authority.

### ARTS

#### *Boards: Members*

140. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) Who are the current members of the boards of—
  - (a) the WA Museum;
  - (b) the Art Gallery;
  - (c) the Library Board?
- (2) Will the Minister please indicate the date of each appointment and the expiry date for each person's appointment?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2)



## WA Museum

## Current Members of Board

	Date of Appointment	Appointment Expires on
Chairman		
Hon. Mr Justice Kennedy	21/2/1984	12/12/1987
Vice Chairman		
Mr H. C. Lange	10/12/85	31/12/89
Mr D. S. Balfour	20/1/87	31/12/87
Prof S. Bowdler	10/12/85	31/12/89
Dr B. Y. Main	10/12/85	31/12/89
Mrs T. E. Owen	20/1/87	31/12/87

## Western Australian Art Gallery

## Current Members of Board

	Date of Appointment	Appointment Expires On
Chairman		
Mr Robert Holmes a Court	1/5/86	1/5/90
Vice Chairman		
Dr Tom Gibbons	April 85	1/5/89
Mr Tony Jones	1/5/86	1/5/90
Mrs J. M. Lewis	April 85	1/5/88
Dr Harold Schenberg	April 85	1/5/89
Mr Eric Heenan	30/1/87	20/1/91
Dr Saliba Sassine	30/1/87	20/1/91

## Library Board of Western Australia

## Current Members of Board

	Date of Appointment	Appointment Expires on
Chairman		
Dr P. D. Reeves	6/03/84	30/11/87
Vice Chairman		
Mrs F. W. Birman	1/12/85	30/11/89
Mr R. J. Belton	1/12/85	30/11/89
Mr J. G. Bissett	1/12/85	30/11/89
Mrs J. R. Hutchison	1/12/85	30/11/89
Mr N. E. King	1/12/85	30/11/89
Mr R. Siall	1/12/86	30/11/90
Mrs M. Sassi	6/3/84	30/11/87
Mrs M. Shearer	1/12/83	30/11/87
Mrs Elgin Von Kehler	1/12/85	30/11/89
Dr H. Pearson	1/12/86	Deputy for Director General of Education—Indefinite
Sister V. Brady	1/12/86	30/11/90

## TRANSPORT

*Bicentennial Bus Terminal: Interstate Coaches.*

141. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it correct that the proposed new bi-centennial bus terminal will not now incorporate facilities for interstate coaches?
- (2) If so, why has this change taken place?
- (3) Were coach companies consulted on the abandonment?
- (4) Was the abandonment based on economics?
- (5) If so, how much will be saved by the abandonment?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) City design guidelines for the development of the area resulted in a reduction in the size of the bus junction site. This precludes the provision of

additional bus platforms necessary to accommodate interstate coach operation.

- (3) Companies were advised at a meeting of the city bus terminal committee in February. Other alternatives are being investigated.
- (4) No.
- (5) Not applicable.

## EDUCATION: SPECIAL SCHOOL

*Carson Street: Toilet Facilities.*

142. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works and Services:

- (1) Would he be prepared to table full details of costings—including plans—relating to proposals for upgrading the toilet and associated facilities at the Carson Street Special School, East Victoria Park?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) Are the costings between \$200 000 and \$300 000?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

This question has been incorrectly directed. I have referred the matter to the Minister for Education. He will reply to the member in writing in due course.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

## TRANSPORT: BUSES

*Midland: Greyhound Australia Pty Ltd*

31. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) Is it correct that the Midland bus service is to be taken over by Greyhound buses?
- (2) If so, have conditions been set for the number of bus services per week to Geraldton and return to Perth through—
  - (a) Three Springs;
  - (b) Eneabba?
- (3) Will the present concessions to pensioners and schoolchildren still be offered?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I have not received any notice of that question. I request that it be put on notice.

### BUSINESSES

#### *National Companies and Securities Cooperative System: Abolition*

32. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General:

Subsequent to the question without notice which I addressed to him several weeks ago, has he yet studied, as he promised he would, the implications of the report that recommends the end of the current Commonwealth-State securities legislation system, and if so what is the Western Australian Government's attitude to such a centralisation of that system?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

That report has been studied and the State Government's position is that it disagrees with the recommendations of the Senate committee in almost all respects.

### BUSINESSES

#### *National Companies and Securities Cooperative System: Abolition*

33. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General:

What steps, if any, has the Government taken to convey that view to the appropriate authorities—in this case the Commonwealth?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

A meeting of the Ministerial Council on Companies and Securities is to be held tomorrow, which I am unable to attend due to our legislative programme this week. The view of the State Government will be conveyed there, but other than that any further action by this State would be premature pending an indication by the Commonwealth itself that it intends to proceed. I believe the Commonwealth Attorney General would already be aware of this State's position from earlier discussions with him; if he is not, he will be by tomorrow.

### COMMUNITY SERVICES

#### *Hillston: Portfolio Responsibility*

34. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Does the Hillston institution come under her ministerial jurisdiction?
- (2) If so, is Hillston still operative; if not, why is it not operative?
- (3) What plans does the Government have for its future use?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) to (3) Hillston is not in use as a juvenile detention centre, if that is what the member is referring to. Some parts of it are in use by community groups—I think there is a playgroup and some other local groups are using parts of the facilities. An examination of the future use of the whole centre is under way at present, and I cannot yet tell him the outcome.

### COMMUNITY SERVICES

#### *Hillston: Use*

35. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services:

In view of the fact that Hillston is apparently being used in part by some community groups, would she be prepared to receive further representations by groups not yet having access to it but which may make out a strong case for its continued use as a community centre of one kind or another?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I would be quite happy to receive such submissions. I have to say at the outset that their initial reception would depend on whether they fit in with the current examination.

### COMMUNITY SERVICES

#### *Juvenile Offenders: Accommodation*

36. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services:

Where are the inmates who would ordinarily have been incarcerated at Hillston now being housed, and why has it become necessary to find alternative uses for Hillston?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The changes in the use of Hillston took place before I became Minister. I presume it was on some basis of the institution not being suitable for the purposes for which it was used or that other institutions were meeting that need more effectively. I am happy to follow that up for the honourable member if he wants further information.

#### TAXES AND CHARGES

##### *Stamp Duty: Windfall Revenues*

37. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) Is he aware of recent Press reports about alleged windfall revenues being received by the New South Wales and Victorian Governments by way of stamp duty because of particularly vigorous stock market transactions in those States?
- (2) Has there been any similar windfall revenue increase in Western Australia for similar reasons?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I am not aware of the reports to which the honourable member refers. I must confess I am not altogether clear as to the sort of transactions he means in talking of windfall gains to stamp duty. It is common knowledge, of course, that the stock market is now operating at very high levels of activity, and in the ordinary course of events we would expect a substantial reflection of that in stamp duty receipts. I do not know whether the honourable member is looking beyond that to particular transactions. In any event, I do not have the current figures for stamp duty collections, but they are readily available.

#### WA EXIM CORPORATION

##### *Subsidiaries: Assets Transfer*

38. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Attorney General:

Have the assets and liabilities of Exim's subsidiaries been transferred to the new Exim Corporation as proposed under the Bill introduced last year?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I am not the Minister responsible for the Exim Corporation. Therefore I am not the Minister to whom this question should be addressed.

#### SPORT AND RECREATION

##### *WA Sports Centre Trust: Management*

39. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

I thank him for the opportunity to visit the Superdrome yesterday. Is it contemplated that the Western Australian Sports Centre Trust will take over any other sports facilities?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

No.

#### SPORT AND RECREATION

##### *WA Sports Centre Trust: Operating Deficit*

40. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

What is the Western Australian Sport Centre Trust's estimated operating deficit to June 1987?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I do not have that figure with me, but I am looking at the deficit for this year at the moment and seeking to find out what it will be. As soon as I have the information I will convey it to the member.

#### SPORT AND RECREATION

##### *Development Officers: Funding*

41. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

The previous Minister several months ago said there would be fewer funds available for sport, particularly for development officers within sporting organisations. Was this statement made knowing the extra cost of the deficit in relation to the sports centre trust?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The matter is currently being looked at under a review which has been established for the sports Instant Lottery fund.

The funding of the sports centre is also under consideration, and I am not in a position to give the member any further information at this stage.

## SPORT AND RECREATION

### *World Swimming Championships: Benefits*

42. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

The holding of the world swimming championships is seen as a great coup for this State. An extra 50-metre pool will be required. Would the Minister advise in today's money value and in 1990s money value the cost and what the Government expects to recoup after the event, and whether that money could have been better used for the benefit of swimming in Western Australia?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I presume the member is talking about the warm-up pool. The provision of such a pool is being considered, and at this stage I am not aware of any costing. Members need to be aware that the venues are being worked out in conjunction with the Perth City Council's pool at Beatty Park and the Superdrome. Some consideration has been given to the construction of a temporary pool to act as a warm-up pool to which the member has referred.

## SPORT AND RECREATION

### *Swimming: Warm-up Pool*

43. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

Could the Minister explain the relationship between the Superdrome and Beatty Park warm-up pools?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I understand that the availability of both pools is considered to be a necessity and that they, in conjunction with the provision of a warm-up pool, will provide the necessary requirements.

I am not sure how they will be used. The member would probably have a greater knowledge of that than I do. I understand that there is a need for a warm-up pool and that the Beatty

Park pool will be used in conjunction with the championships, but the major focus will be on the Superdrome. The fine tuning of the world championships has yet to be undertaken.

## SPORT AND RECREATION

### *World Swimming Championships: Venues*

44. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

Originally, Beatty Park was on the agenda to be used for the swimming events. Is the Minister saying that that has been reconsidered and that the swimming championships will be held at Beatty Park and the water polo, diving, and synchronised swimming will be held at the Superdrome?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

There will be a need to use both pools plus the warm-up pool. I am not an expert on how a world championship swimming event should be run. A number of considerations are yet to be put to the committee, and it is certainly premature of me to suggest how the event should be run. I certainly will not tell the committee how to run the event.

## SPORT AND RECREATION

### *World Swimming Championships: Expenditure*

45. Hon. MAX EVANS, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

The Minister has a responsibility for public money, and he should know what the millions of dollars involved will be spent on.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I am amazed at the line of questioning the member is taking. I am extremely pleased that the 1990 swimming championships will be held in this State, but I do not believe that it is up to me, as a politician, to tell the people who are supposedly experts and who have been able to convince the world swimming body that the championships be held in this State how they should run the event. The people involved have a heck of a lot more knowledge about the necessary requirements than I have.

If the member's concern is purely based on money, let me assure him that I am very tight when it comes to spending money that is not my own, and I am even tighter when it comes to spending money in the area of sport. My philosophy is to get the most out of the dollar that is available for sport. I assure the member that when I am the Minister for Sport and Recreation in 1990, I will be extremely careful and cautious about the matters to which he is referring.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Before Hon. Max Evans asks a further question, I draw his attention to Standing Order No. 154 which refers to repetition and argument when asking questions.

### EMPLOYMENT

#### *Plymouth Brethren*

46. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Attorney General:

Has the Attorney General been approached by any members of the Plymouth Brethren believers in regard to their right to work as ordinary citizens of this State? As an explanation: They feel they are somewhat leaned on by the unions because of their religious beliefs and it is very difficult for them to continue in their employment.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I have had approaches on that matter, but I believe these required the primary attention of the Minister for Labour, Productivity, and Employment. I have discussed the matter with him and have also exchanged correspondence. My memory of the latest position is that it remains under the active consideration of his portfolio.

### ATTORNEY GENERAL

#### *Overriding Authority*

47. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is there a stage where the Attorney General's portfolio overlaps that of the Minister for Labour, Productivity, and Employment when a person is actually deprived of the right to work? I thought that was a civil right of any citizen in this State.
- (2) Is there a stage where the Attorney General's duties can override the industrial considerations?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) There is an area of interaction in respect of this matter between the powers of the Attorney General on the one hand and of the Office of Industrial Relations on the other hand. The essential question is at this stage being treated as an industrial relations matter; and I think that avenue should be fully explored before further action is contemplated.