

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 7 November 1984

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ELECTORAL: REFORM

Petition

The following petition bearing the signatures of 209 persons was presented by Hon. Tom Stephens

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

WE, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia request the following electoral reforms:

1. The right of each elector to cast a vote equal in value to each other vote cast in elections of Members of State Parliament.
2. That Legislative Councillors be elected to represent regions using a system of proportional representation such is used in Senate elections.
3. The retirement of half of the Members of the Legislative Council from each region at every election. (ie: simultaneous elections).

And that the above reforms be decided by the people voting at a referendum.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 273.)

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Report

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [4.33 p.m.]: I have the honour to present a report from the Standing Orders Committee relating to the disallowance of regulations, Standing Order 170. I move—

That the report do lie upon the Table and be printed.

Question put and passed.

(See paper No. 274.)

DECORUM OF THE CHAMBER

THE PRESIDENT: Order! Members seem to be totally ignoring the fact that when the Chair calls for order it means just that. Members should not carry on conversations. Members are getting to the stage where nobody wants to obey the rules. As I have said on previous occasions, while the rules exist, whether one likes it or not, one has to comply with them. If members want them altered there is a facility to do that. When I call for order, everybody should cease conversing.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TRIPARTITE LABOUR CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Minister for Industrial Relations), and read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 6 November.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [4.38 p.m.]: It was not my intention to speak to this Bill, despite having spent some years as Minister for Forests. There are not many people left in this House who have held that position for such a length of time, and I felt that perhaps I had an opportunity to influence the forestry field and that I would take an interest in what others had to say about this Bill and the proposal put up by the Government.

However, the current Minister for Forests, the Premier (Mr Brian Burke) chose to issue today a Press release pointing out to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Hassell) that the Bill now under debate repudiated the policies of the last three Ministers for Forests because they had encouraged the multiple use of forest reserves for recreation, production, and conservation, and that the Opposition could not possibly disagree with the Government's Conservation and Land Management Bill.

There is a vast difference between managing a forest to have regard for conservation, and managing conservation to have regard for production.

Many committees have been set up at various times within the responsibility of the heads of Government departments to examine ways to

unite forestry and conservation. They have all come to the conclusion that such a policy would not work.

We have an example of the failure to unite conservation and the practical management of a resource in the soil conservation field. During the period that the Conservator of Soil and Management had to report to the head of the Department of Agriculture, we saw a frightening deterioration of our resources of agricultural land and a rapid expansion of salinity. We also saw a Government instrumentality unable to influence agriculture practically in this State or, indeed, to influence conservation generally. This proved to be the case where the head of the department and the Minister were only advising, not practising.

The Department of Agriculture was only recommending to farmers how to use their land, and yet the conservation wing of the department could not influence that advice. How much harder and how much more impossible would it have been if the Department of Agriculture had actually been the farmers?

In the case we are debating today, the proposed new megadepartment which is sought to be set up will go well beyond the activities of the Department of Agriculture which was the adviser. The new department will in fact be the manager of the forests.

One wonders what chance conservation will have in this situation. It is little wonder that the conservation groups and societies are against this legislation. Interestingly one asks where are the spokespeople who formerly spoke out for conservation? I refer here to Bartholomaeus and Schultz who appear to have gone to ground. I do not know whether they have become advisers to the Government on a salary of \$59 000 a year. I guess they have not. Perhaps they are a bit further down the ladder and they are still trying to become members of Parliament on \$39 000 a year!

There seems to be a quaint silence from those groups today. In fact one would almost call it a deadly hush.

The people who were led to believe it was wrong to cut down a tree on a road or a stream reserve now find their former leaders are saying it is all right to harvest those areas for production. The housewife who thought she was making a contribution by joining the protest about the loss of a single tree is now somewhat confused. The Government's policy is to harvest the road and stream reserves and to excise the forests for agricultural purposes, even when there is a moratorium on new land releases. This certainly does

not match up with the policies advocated by Labor when it was in Opposition.

It is little wonder that the public are suspicious about a Bill which will allow the Government to excise the forest unhindered and undefended by a responsible conservator or by the need to obtain parliamentary approval.

Previously the Conservator of Forests was given personal responsibility by the Parliament acting on behalf of the people of this State. Both Houses of Parliament had to agree regularly to changes in a forests reserve; but this Bill will change that and the Executive of the day will be able to influence the forests reserve and Parliament will be able to make little protest. Rather than either House being able to disagree with excision, it will be necessary for both Houses to protest or to prevent an excision taking place. Of course, that will be much more difficult, and it will certainly remove the chance of the House of Review being able to influence the position.

There is a vast amount of difference between the proposals in the Bill and those put forward by the previous Government. I will not read long extracts from the Liberal-National Country Party policies of the 1980s.

On 12 February 1980 it was stated that the Liberal Party felt there was a role for a major resource portfolio in the form of a Ministry for land resources with an expanded role and important function. It would include the chairman of a Cabinet committee, and the Ministers responsible for the various fields, so that they could get together practically to practise conservation. In this legislation we are dealing with only two fields; those of conservation and forestry. However, already we have a megadepartment.

The former Government's view was that, at ministerial level, there should be a collecting together not only of responsibility, but also of ideas, and that that should include agriculture and mining as well as conservation and forestry.

I will not speak any further on the Bill. However, I disagree completely with the Press release issued by the Minister for Forests and I point out to him that there is a vast amount of difference between managing the forest resource for timber production, recreation, and conservation matters, etc., outlined in this Bill.

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central)
[4.47 p.m.]: It is a matter of despair to me personally that this Bill has come before the House in the state it is in at present. It is a completely unresearched, unmanageable piece of legislation and I shall endeavour to prove that to the Minister during my speech.

It worries me that the Government is so vehement about the matter that it has reached the stage where it is attacking personalities and has its advisers and other members of the Public Service running around upsetting people and asking people to telephone members of Parliament. The stage has been reached where there is a certain amount of fear—fear of loss of jobs; fear of the consequences which will occur if the members of the department stand up against the Government. That is a shocking state of affairs.

Until now the public servants of this State, especially those I know best—that is, those in the Forests Department—have given magnificent service to this State, but now, under this Government, they are being trampled all over; they are being kicked from pillar to post; they do not know what their situations are even now, and yet this Bill was introduced some weeks ago in the other place. Those people do not know what their futures will be and how the department will be set up. I am talking about senior members of the various organisations. They just do not know what is going on.

The Government has played its cards rather badly. In his speech last night, Hon. Bill Stretch dealt at length with the way the Forests Department had been treated and the way the Government had overridden all the advice it had been given on the Shannon and the Donnybrook sunklands, and that it was being put into the position of an ogre instead of a policy-decider, making decisions based on good, sound advice.

This Government has not taken professional advice. Just have a look at the task force! I personally get on with all the members of the task force committee, or I hope I do. I disagree with them, but as people, they are quite reasonable. Who would set up a task force committee of three research officers to look at the management of something like this? Who would set up a committee comprised of people who have not managed anything? That management theory follows through to this Government—its members cannot even manage themselves well enough to have a Minister in the House for prayers.

Hon. Kay Hallahan interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Not by the look of it, Mrs Hallahan. We will deal with the economy and the subject of this Bill later on this evening. There is no hurry about it. If Hon. Kay Hallahan wishes to bring that subject up, I have a set of Budget papers to talk about so the Minister for Budget Management can see the fallacies in this Bill. He can see the words put into his mouth are untrue, and do not apply in this case.

These researchers have introduced a management plan. I liken it to the complete management muck-up of the Health Department. This Government will cost the taxpayer millions of dollars.

Let us get back to dealing with the basis of this Bill which is the task force report. I do not wish to spend any more time on it than necessary, but I would like to refer to page 30 of a report of the Western Australian Government's task force on land resource management of January 1984—not February as the Minister stated in his second reading speech. It was printed while the task force was still taking submissions on the interim report. That in itself makes people wonder. The interim report was brought out at a time when most people are thinking of holidays, and not thinking of making submissions to it. It is very interesting that when submissions were put, they were too late, because the document had been printed. This is the way the Government has gone about it. It has not wanted people to have an input. The Government was forced by the Manjimup Shire—and I will come back to it later on—

Hon. Graham Edwards: It will be interesting to hear your attitude.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Graham Edwards will find that there have been some things said by his leader that are completely untrue.

Hon. Graham Edwards: That is not the way I have heard it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is because Hon. Graham Edwards has been fed with false propaganda by this Government.

Hon. Sam Piantadosi interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Piantadosi knows all. It is an amazing thing that these Labor backbenchers, with their extensive knowledge of the forest, have not seen fit to get up and support the Minister on this subject. They have left the Minister like a shag on a rock because they know perfectly well that they have been throwing fuel, and that anything they say in this House is reported back to the ALP conservation lobby. People such as Hon. Graham Edwards and Hon. Sam Piantadosi are the people most vulnerable to pressure from this lobby. Their endorsements may have come from that lobby. They do not want to get up and make any statements. They want to leave their Minister so far out he is lonely! Mr Stretch's comment was, "up the Shannon in a canoe without a paddle". He could get out on the Shannon River and walk!

It will be very interesting to see how far out in the cold I am whenever the Government wishes to pull an election—and Warren is part of my electorate. I will back my stance against the Govern-

ment's stance every time because the people down there know where I stand and they do not know where the Labor Party or Mr Evans stands, because they have had so many views presented to them.

Mr Stretch read out last night how Mr Evans walked out of the ALP conference over the Shannon issue. We have had the funny situation of Mr Burke and Mr Evans threatening me with writs because I advertised prior to the last State election. They were not prepared to go on with their threats; they did not have the guts to go on with them.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask Hon. A. A. Lewis to be moderate in the language that he uses.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Certainly, Mr President. They do not have the intestinal fortitude to continue with that legal action because everyone knows.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: When members who are making speeches from their seats have completed them, I can continue. Every word that appeared in those advertisements has come true for the people of the Shannon River, of Warren, and of Manjimup. We had the Premier and his advisers visiting Manjimup a couple of weeks ago. In the past, when a real Premier of this State entered an area, he would go with either one Press secretary or a private secretary. Such a Premier would go down and do a job; but not this one. This one had five people hanging on his coat-tails to instruct him.

I will come back to that a little later on, because the five people gave him misleading information, or should I say one of the five did. It is fascinating how these advisers can set a Minister up, set the Premier up, with false information and half-truths. The public would say it sounds funny and that it is not quite right. Experts would say it sounds funny and it is not quite right.

[Questions taken.]

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We were discussing the lack of management contained in this Bill, and the lack of management procedures shown by the Government in pretty well everything it touches. We were dealing with Manjimup, but because the Government became upset about that, perhaps I should leave it. I think Manjimup Shire has been "calmer"! Probably all the land management practices which were talked about early during the second reading debate have been thrown out. I will try to prove later that this Government has not been prepared to take the bull by the horns.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Or by some other part of the anatomy!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: At least Hon. Peter Dowding agrees with me it is grabbing at bull.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Talking of bull—

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: There is nothing more to say. Bull is what one grabs at and bull is what one has.

Hon. Peter Dowding: —that is what we are getting.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Graham MacKinnon said the Minister had ruined question time. I agree with him. I am not going to have him ruin my speech. I will go quietly along with my speech and Mr Dowding, who is not handling the matter for the Government, can make the comments he wants. I imagine Hon. Joe Berinson will throw him out as soon as he can so that we can have a reasonable debate.

Let us go back to this task force and the three research officers who presented a report on management. Nowhere in the world would any Government give a job involving management to research officers. Some research officers have managerial skills, but one would think the first people to be approached would not be the ALP executive; one would think the Government would talk to somebody with managerial skills and say, "We have this in mind, what do you think will happen if we do it?"

A balanced task force would then be set up, but not with all members coming from one type of area, such as research. That task force would be sent out to produce not one, but three or four interim reports so that it could take evidence from the people who wanted to give it.

It is extremely interesting to me that from the time the interim report came out, people have flocked to my door asking how to have an input to the interim report because the Government had quickly published the final report. Some of these people had an opportunity to have an input, but many did not.

To go back to the Manjimup Shire, because that seems to be the favourite of the Government, until 25 October the shire was opposed to the Conservation and Land Management Bill. As late as yesterday I received a copy of a letter addressed to the Premier, dated 1 November, and saying that it agreed with the Conservation and Land Management Bill. This change of heart by the Manjimup Shire is perfectly permissible. I do not deny it that right; it is perfectly able to change its mind, but I wonder why the Government has not gone back to people like Mr Harris and Professor

Martyn Webb—back to the Conservation Council, the Tree Society—why has it not put the effort into talking with other people? Why has it not given everybody in the community the same opportunities as it gave the Manjimup Shire? Does the Government want something from the Manjimup Shire? I am not prepared to comment. One would think it did, but why has not everybody else had the same sort of treatment as has the Manjimup Shire?

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Referring to Mr Webb, you will recall Mr Ferry indicated that he had in fact received a very quick response and had come back in turn.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Is that not marvellous! I am glad the Premier's letter writing is so good. Is Professor Webb happy with the Bill?

Hon. P. G. Pental: No, he is not.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Substantially, yes.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Either we have crossed wires, or what I hear is totally different from what the Attorney is telling me.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Or you are wrong.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Wait a minute. That is the sort of conjecture made by the Attorney which is like the Bill—totally without logic.

The Attorney says that Professor Webb substantially approves of the Bill and of the answer the Government has given him. That is not the answer I received from the direct source—the co-authors of the letter.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Even the second letter didn't agree.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I wonder whether the Minister is receiving the correct information. This makes me worry more and more about this Bill. One of the co-writers of the letter spoke with me the other day, and he is still as worried as he was when he wrote the original letter. He still wants more consultation, yet the Attorney—and I do not disbelieve him—tells me that his advice is that they are happy, or substantially happier than they were when they wrote the letter. Then because we tend to disagree with what the people think, the Attorney makes the brilliant suggestion that I am wrong. The Attorney General equally could be wrong. He speaks from point A to point B through an intermediary, whereas I speak straight from point A to point B. I know whose ears I trust more, and I do not think it is right for him to say I am wrong because that comment was not based on logic: it was totally unlike the Attorney, with his fine legal and professional training, to make such a remark.

Hon. Garry Kelly: He was just saying it was a possibility.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I did not say it was a possibility. If the Attorney General said it was a possibility I probably would have accepted it.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Or he said you could be wrong.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is not a possibility. He is drumming them out. There is no possibility of that situation occurring. Mr Kelly knows I am always right and it worries him and the Attorney because the Attorney has used a lack of logic in his argument.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Sandy Lewis, Mr Righteous!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am very sorry that we are being led along this line—

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: What about the Manjimup Shire?

Hon. Garry Kelly: Not Mr Righteous, no!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Sam Piantadosi was not in his seat when I dealt with this matter. I will deal with the Manjimup Shire again later in the debate and I hope the member is in his seat at that time to hear my remarks. I will repeat my remarks especially for him because it will only take me another quarter of an hour. I will do so precisely and will wait until he is in his seat before doing so. However, I will not repeat it now because I want to return to the task force report which is the basis of this Bill.

Approximately three-quarters of an hour ago I began talking about page 30 of the report of the task force on land resource management in Western Australia to the Government of Western Australia of January 1984, and I return to that page where the components of the proposed department are discussed. The recommendation of the task force is as follows—

The Department would be formed from existing government departments or agencies. Those proposed for inclusion in the Department or administration by it are listed below:—

Component	Previous Department
Forests Department	
Wildlife Research	Fisheries and Wildlife
Nature Reserves management	" "
Wildlife management	" "
National Parks Authority	Conservation and Environment
Herbarium	Agriculture
Kings Park Board	Lands and Surveys
Bush Fires Board	" "
Waterways Commission	

The report then goes on as follows—

Some of these agencies should be incorporated at an early stage into the new Department while others could continue to act initially as autonomous bodies closely associated with and eventually staffed by the Department.

I ask the members to note the words "eventually staffed by the department", so if I was a member of the Kings Park Board, the Bush Fires Board, or the Waterways Commission I would be looking at the monster. The report continues—

The Kings Park Board, the Bush Fires Board and the Management Authorities of The Waterways Commission should be treated in this latter way.

Why should the authors of the report reach that conclusion? I suggest they did so because the heat was on. The heat came to the writers of the report, the Kings Park Board and the Bush Fires Board. The Bush Fires Board and the Kings Park Board said "no way". Of course, everybody loves Kings Park. I hope the Government realises that this year for the first time in a number of years a number of rainbow birds are in Kings Park. They are magnificent little creatures which are brilliant in colour. I do not know if the Government knows this, but the rainbow bird digs a hole about two or three feet long in which to lay its eggs. It is well worth the Attorney taking a drive through Kings Park and observing these magnificent birds.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Doing a bit of bird-watching?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Not the sort Mr Gayfer is used to, however.

Currently I think five nests have been dug. The birds are at work pretty well every day as I drive past. I do not see them at night because I do not go home that way, but the birds are magnificent. It is the first time in many years that these birds have come down and have nested in Kings Park. Some fuss should be made about this occurrence because the birds usually do not travel so far south. My other concern is about their nests. I think they are a little too close to the road and members of the public might disturb them. When I have finished my remarks on this Bill I will talk to the Director of the Kings Park Board to see if we can do something about it.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Mr Berinson would probably jump on the eggs!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Berinson would not jump on the eggs. He loves flora and fauna.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Perhaps he will sit on them!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He does not need to sit on the eggs to hatch them. There are two brilliant little white eggs that lie at the end of the tunnel. This tunnel keeps the eggs warm most of the time, so Mr Berinson does not need to sit on the eggs all the time.

Let us return to the Kings Park Board. Why did the authors of the report recommend that the Kings Park Board not be amalgamated with the department? The only reason they did so was because of political impact. If they had done so, everybody would have screamed and yelled and there would have been a great fuss. The Government does not like fuss. It thought it would pack a couple of the Board's weaker sisters off and amalgamate them with the Forests Department first. It thought that by doing this it would solve the problem.

Not many members of the public are really interested, in reality, in national parks or wildlife. This shows the stupidity of the Government in regard to the Shannon River basin decision because fewer than one per cent of tourists venture more than 200 yards away from their motor cars. So help me, Bob, even the disabled people's walking tracks are longer than that. How many people will walk down those tracks at the Shannon? Why reserve an area of degraded forest in the Shannon? However, that is another subject altogether.

I return to the Kings Park Board. The Government was scared to amalgamate it because great numbers of city people would have changed their votes, and that is why the Kings Park Board was ruled out. Once or twice there was talk about it amalgamating with small local authorities, but no discussion was had about an amalgamation with the Bush Fires Board.

The Bush Fires Board should come under the wing of the Forests Department tomorrow. That is one of the few departments, if not the only department, that should be amalgamated with the Forests Department, because under the Bush Fires Act the Forests Department has a three kilometre overriding power over the farms close by. I believe that is the natural place for the Bush Fires Board to reside.

When we consider the Waterways Commission, that is part of the "promises, promises" sort of approach of this Government. Of course, the Government would not take on that commission, because of Mandurah; and now the Government will make a cut into the estuary, maybe. The Government would not want to become involved with that at the moment.

What will happen to the Department of Lands and Surveys when all this is done? I believe this is one way of getting rid of the Department of Lands and Surveys altogether.

Poor Mr McIver! The Government has absolutely slaughtered his Public Works Department, and now it looks like the Department of Lands and Surveys will be slaughtered also, I wonder whether that is the reason for the proposed shift in portfolios.

Was it not interesting to see Mr Dowding trying to take over from Mr Dans tonight? He thinks he is the Minister for Industrial Relations already. I think Mr Dans does a better job than Mr Dowding could.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: The unions will have a nervous breakdown about that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not think so, because the skill of Mr Dans shows that he is much better equipped for the job than is Mr Dowding.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! I ask the member to return to the Bill.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have heard statements about maps and aerial photography, and that everything could be done by the Forests Department. Will the Department of Lands and Surveys have maps, photographs, etc. taken away from it? I think this is just the start of the dismembering of the Department of Lands and Surveys. Another group of public servants will be roughly treated. Where does the EPA stand when we consider this report and the Bill? It is very interesting because a couple of departments are out of the way already.

I can see the Minister for Budget Management has a grin on his face. He can see that these posts are going down the gurgler and that all that money will come back into the coffers. They need to, because the way the Budget is structured in this area is a disaster. I asked for figures but they were not provided to me. I said in my Budget speech that the Government cannot provide the figures to show me where I am wrong. Perhaps the Government does not trust me enough to let me see the figures.

When the Premier and his advisers use their eavesdroppers they should turn up their hearing aids so that they can hear properly what is being said. What the Premier thinks he heard and what his advisers think they heard shows that they are wrong. They are running like rats off a sinking ship, because the Government is attacking personalities and not policies. It seems it must attack personalities.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You were attacking the Minister when he was not here.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I just made the statement that Mr Dowding was trying to take Mr Dans' job and said that I thought Mr Dans did it properly, far better than Mr Dowding could. Now the member is supporting Mr Dowding. I will tell Mr Dans that a power struggle is going on. I think it would be better if the member went back to his water-works. The Deputy President asked me to come back to the Bill and I would like to.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Or even to get to it for the first time.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That statement is definitely out of character. Just for the Attorney General's sake, I will start at the beginning again. I will start talking about the task force.

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Kelly is making a move on your position, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth). From his performance in this place to date I do not really think he could do the job as well as you, Sir.

I was talking about the set-up of the department. Why did the Government only take the three departments? Is this good management? No. Why did the Government not bite the bullet? Because, it is not prepared to bite the bullet on the tough ones.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You'd break your teeth.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, they may break their teeth, but they can get a technician to make a plate! We could get a plate cheaper now. That is what this Government is trying to do: It is trying to create something on the cheap.

The Government tried to do that in the second reading speech. As I go through that second reading speech members will see the reason I am so worried about this legislation. Is it good policy? You sir, are a businessman. Would you take big bites to start off? Would you make small sensible amalgamations first, before you took a big bite? I am sure, Sir, with your knowledge of management and business, you would take a small bite first.

Let us move to that great second reading speech. It was interesting to see the absolute calm of the Attorney General, instead of the frenzied demented attitude of the Minister who presented the legislation in the other place. I congratulate the Attorney General on the use of his words which were not as inflammatory as the words used in the other place. I can always go back to the second reading speech and quote the differences. As we go through the second reading speech we note the comment, "developing an effective system

of public land management in Western Australia will ensure the protection of our lands".

Does this Bill do that? I do not believe it does. Over 53 per cent of the land surface in this State is public land, as stated in the second reading speech. It is interesting to look at this in another context, for example, from the point of view of Aboriginal land rights.

The Government has now admitted in the second reading speech that public land can come under the provisions of the Bill if and when it desires.

Further on in the second reading speech the Minister said—

It is also the responsibility of the Government to assist those who own private land to practise good land management and to conserve, where possible, our flora and fauna.

On Saturday of last weekend I attended a land seminar; unfortunately apart from the Minister who opened it and then disappeared, no political members of the Government had the courtesy to attend. It was an extremely interesting seminar. I was sorry to miss the first day, but Hon. Cyril Rushton went on Friday and we were able to compare notes. An ex-reader in agriculture, Mr Henry Schapper, made some comments on this Bill. In his usual style, fairly dry and to the point, he said that he believed the Forests Department was doing a pretty good job as it stood. He implied that he did not think the department should be interfered with, but when it came to this private land management idea, he said it was his feeling that the people, down on the farms and in localised areas should be the people making the decision and not Big Brother up here.

A brawl then ensued between my friend Mr Maurice Mulcahy and Henry Schapper, a brawl of such proportions that one had never seen the like! They battered backwards and forwards. I quite enjoyed it, not being one of those people privileged to be a researcher or lecturer. Both speakers missed each other's point, and I did tend to think it was because they did not want to listen to each other. It was extremely interesting to note that everything that came out of that conference from then on, even when Bruce Beggs—an ex-conservator and a man whom I admire greatly and whom I know the President admires also—spoke, the entire atmosphere changed and people began to query the Conservation and Land Management Bill as it stands now. I am afraid I do not know the outcome of Friday. I tend to think it was more related to Aboriginal land rights from what Mr Rushton has told me.

That argument between Mr Schapper and Mr Mulcahy attracted comments. Mr Schapper made the point that local people should have an input. I will read a critique I have written on the Bungle Bungle report, because I believe the EPA has missed the very essence of what national parks are about. I do not believe there is such a thing as joint management. I believe that we have a National Parks Authority and all action should be taken through that authority. It did not have joint management. It should have local advisory committees with a bit of bite.

Hon. Fred McKenzie will remember that this forms part of the recommendations made by the Select Committee of this House. It was an extremely good report and one which would have done the task force a great deal of good to read and understand. There was probably more management in that report than there is in this Bill. I am not saying that unkindly. I do not doubt for one moment that the Government really wants to do something like that and make its name in this field. I do doubt the methods by which it is going about it. I doubt whether it is going to be successful. I will leave the subject of private land at that.

On page five the Minister's speech reads—

As significant as this achievement is, the whole exercise will be academic if we do not provide the legislation, administrative arrangement and resource . . .

I do not believe the Government has outlined any administrative arrangements; not by answer to a question, not by a Press release, nor by anything else. Most of the Government's Press releases are statements damning the Opposition for having the hide to occasionally agree with the conservationists with whom I now believe the Labor Party disagrees. The Premier is making a point of insulting the conservation groups of this State. I do not believe that as yet the Government has shown us where the administrative arrangements for this Bill are.

I move on to page six of the second reading speech where it states—

Much of our land, including many of our national parks, will rapidly deteriorate if we do not upgrade our management.

Have we got to the stage where the Government is big enough to say that in some national parks—and I will name Warren national park to begin with—timber has to be felled or else it will be a danger to the people visiting that park? Is this upgrading the management? Hon. Fred McKenzie will remember that our Select Committee made recommendations about this. The Shannon basin needs a lot of trees knocked down.

Trees, like people, have a life span. Does this upgrading of our management in national parks include felling timber? Does it include getting rid of degraded timber? I believe it should. Many of my friends would say it is a ghastly thing. We heard Hon. David Wordsworth comment last night or today on the lady who got onto him about the trees.

I now move to page seven of the second reading speech which reads—

The whole question of public land management was controversial. Large amounts of resources were consumed in emotional confrontation between Government agencies . . .

What Government agencies had confrontations? Okay, some Government agencies and the community groups did; some Government agencies and industry did; Government agencies in the guise of the Forests Department and the timber industry had been fighting for a number of years, but it has always been a fair fight. The Forests Department has always tried to manage the forest in the best interests of the community.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I suppose I agree with many things in the Minister's second reading speech, but there are many with which I do not. I am only drawing attention to those that I do not agree with so that the Attorney can give me answers.

When we rose I was dealing with the consuming and emotional confrontations between Government agencies. I wanted to know which Government agencies had these emotional confrontations. I know that politicians, Ministers, and departments had some, very few, emotional confrontations with community groups and with industry. I wonder why the Minister did not explain where these things were and why this Bill could change that situation in any way.

It is worrying that the previous Government had departments fighting with each other, and confrontation. Hon. Fred McKenzie and I found none of this. We found a certain amount of duplication which could be straightened out, and we made recommendations, but not as far-reaching as these.

The terms in which the second reading speech is couched—emotional confrontations between departments—indicates it is written by somebody who has been opposed at some stage and does not like it. That is a little like this Government; it does not like being opposed. We saw the Leader of the House putting on a tantrum and saying nothing could be done unless it was done through the Government.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have two Little Sir Echoes, one male and one female.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I thought you were controlling this House, Sir, not anybody else.

The PRESIDENT: I have control of it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Going on to page 8, review of resource management, the proposal was supposed to be the best undertaking in the history of the State, and it involved local government, Government agencies, and so on. This is the problem. The consultation has not been undertaken. As I explained earlier to the Attorney, numerous people still want to make inputs to this debate. Numerous people, when they understand what is in the Bill, want to change their minds.

I dealt with the Manjimup Shire Council: I discussed its attitude originally, and I do not blame the shire for changing it. There was a highly specialised service direct from the Premier. Was this given to the conservation interests, the Tree Society, or anyone else? Of course it was not. Nor was it given to Professor Martyn Webb or Allan Harris, the ex-Conservator of Forests. There is a tendency for the Government to laugh off the contributions of people like Webb and Harris, but the laughing is a very embarrassed laugh; it is a bit guilty. The Government decides to laugh these people off because it has no answers. It decides to go on with the deal because more people may read and understand it, and that would be confrontation. That is something this Government is not used to—standing up for a point of view.

I was rather amused to see the change at the bottom of page 8, and the provision for further consultation, particularly with local authorities, which Mr Blaikie (the member for Vasse) had inserted into the Bill. It was not the Government which put it there; it was Mr Blaikie who put it there, and, of course, the Manjimup shire, which wanted consultation.

Of course they want consultation. Whether we have gone far enough I do not know. As I deal with the Bill and management plans further on in my speech we will discuss this matter.

On page 9 the task force concluded that the only way Western Australia could have an effective land management system was by the formation of a land management department. We have seen that the Government does not have that. It has left out half the departments suggested in the report.

Why? For political reasons, obviously. Cabinet accepted only part of it. Cabinet was not prepared to bite the bullet. It is called the initial phase of implementation.

You, Sir, are a very good manager; you manage this House and you managed a business before you came to this place. Where are the following stages? When will we hear from the Government what it intends to do in the future?

We cannot hear from the Government because the Government does not know what it is doing with this Bill. It does not know what its future steps will be.

Turning to page 10, security of tenure; I will deal with that later, because successive pages of this second reading speech, which was supposed to be explained to us, have given contradictory statements of what it is meant to do.

The Bill then goes on to say, beautifully, "to provide a mechanism for public participation in land management policy formulation". How long are the public to be able to comment? If the public are to be able to comment only for as long as they were allowed to comment on the interim task force report and the final task force report, the public will not know what has hit them because the Government will go ahead and make its decisions before the public even hear about it. I suppose it is a good policy to go ahead and blame everyone else and not be prepared to come out and say, "Our policy is such and such, and we will go to the nth degree to support that policy". This Government will not do that. It has said it would throw everything, including the forestry working plans, out for public comment. I wonder who the experts are.

I see that confidentiality has been provided for in the timber industry, again because of Mr Blaikie. So some things will not go to the public. The Government has not admitted this yet. We will have what the Government wants thrown out to the public for comment—little scraps thrown here, there, and everywhere. However, anything that might be of a confidential nature will be decided on by the Minister or the executive director.

Let us not fool ourselves: This is a highly political Bill. It alters the whole concept of forestry planning and throws it out to the public. But the final decision will be made by the Minister. The final decision will be made by the ALP executive, and we have seen how accurate the ALP is in the area of land management; we have seen the trouble in which it has put the member for Warren.

The Government has been trying to get out of this mess which was started by two things: The

closing of the Shannon and the non-planting of timber in the Donnybrook sunlands.

The problem has been caused because people outside the Parliament and outside the Public Service have made these decisions.

I can recall the Premier's performance at a meeting in Manjimup of 400-plus people when he was asked, "Why did you make that silly decision about the Shannon?" The Premier in true style said, "Mr Hare will answer that question". The Premier did not answer the question himself; he did not know why the ALP had made the decision; he simply handed the question over to Mr Hare.

Does anyone in this House believe that that is the way a Minister should run his department? The Premier did not say, "Because we believe in it and because we believe it is the right thing to do for this or that reason". The Premier simply turned the question over to the president of the sectional group. I wonder how Mr Hare feels today now that the Premier has totally divorced himself from the conservation movement. I will deal with that later and with the Premier's comments to foresters in Manjimup just a week or so ago.

This Government shifts ground so quickly one would think it was in the middle of an earthquake. It does not know which way it is going; its advisers do not know which way they are going. I have always said that the best public servant the State has had is Mr Bruce Beggs, the present Director of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The Government also has a first-class researcher in its forestry adviser to the Minister. Does the Government expect us to believe that these men are giving the Government advice on scientific and managerial grounds to go ahead with this sort of thing? These people are good public servants, and they will do exactly as they are told. The people who have told them what to do are the Labor Party advisers, and they are not the informed people in forestry, national parks, and conservation matters. They are people from outside the Public Service; they are people who really have no responsibility to this State in the long term.

Mr President, you have been to party conferences I guess for nearly as long as I have, and perhaps I will not comment on what we think about party conferences except to say that there is a complete difference between the conservative side of politics and the revolutionaries in the ALP.

The reason for this is that members of the ALP have to sign a pledge to follow what their conferences dictate. They cannot come to this place and take a fair look at legislation; they cannot come into Government and say, "No, we will

not do that". I will not debate tonight whether they have the strength of character required. I doubt very much whether this Government does because all it seems to do is vacillate. I really do not know whether Government members have the required strength of character as men—I should not say "men" but "persons"—and Ministers. I doubt it, especially when we consider the actions of the leader of the State.

Mr President, could you imagine Ray O'Connor, Charles Court, John Tonkin, or David Brand getting up at a public meeting and saying, "I don't know the answer to that question. I will refer this to Mr Hare"? Could you imagine any one of those four great leaders shifting the responsibility to a person outside Parliament and outside the Public Service? You could not have expected that ever to happen with the leaders I have mentioned. They were men; they could stick up for what they believed in; they knew what their policies were; they could continue through thick and thin to support their policies because they understood them. When the gentleman on the floor asked the Premier why he had taken that action, the Premier could not answer.

The basis of the whole Bill is the Shannon basin—the river that does not run; the series of ponds. Here we are with the Labor Government conned by an outside conference which has forced it to go into something that in the long term will only be to the detriment of this State.

I am only half-way through the Minister's second reading speech. When I have finished, I will start dealing with the Bill.

Hon. Robert Hetherington interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Hetherington I understood, as a Deputy Chairman of Committees in this place could probably tell me whether I am wrong. The second reading speech is meant to explain what is in the Bill. Silence! That indicates Mr Hetherington agrees with me.

We could not get that information out of this Government, because it is an extremely slack Government. I pointed out several days ago that the Government is not telling us what the Bill is about; it is only telling us what it expects people to accept.

On page 12 of the second reading speech it states, "This Bill does not change the security of purpose or tenure on any public land". The following sentence says, "The Bill has been amended, however, to give all future national parks the equivalent of an "A"-class security". This is in direct confrontation with the report of the Select Committee of this House. There are certain areas of national parks that surely should be given "A"-

class security status, but the Government is not interested in committees of this House and the work that the Hon. Fred McKenzie did. It is only interested in following outside interests.

On page 13 reference is made to the Lands and Forest Commission which is to consist of "two members from the community who will represent conservation and production interest respectively, and the executive director of the department". Lands reserved for production will be vested in this commission.

On the following page appears "This authority has vested in it all lands that have been reserved for conservation or as national parks". It is the intention of the Government to vest in this authority those areas of State forests which have been set aside for conservation or as national parks.

Let us consider that statement. As I understand it, management priority areas in a forestry working plan are flexible. At the time of writing the working plans, the department believes that some areas should be conserved for some reason or other. After the life of the plan, that reason may alter and the management priority areas may alter. However, under this Bill, which does not change the tenure—ha ha!—of management priority areas, that authority will go straight into the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority, so denying the foresters the opportunity to manage their forests, as they have in the past.

There is no need for people to dive for books and things like that; they have only to read pages 12 to 14 of the Minister's second reading speech which outlines that situation.

No areas of State forests were set aside as national parks until this Government came into power. To the best of my knowledge, to this moment there has been only one set aside; that is, the Shannon. It is interesting that the Shannon is to be managed as if it were a national park.

Many things have happened to the Shannon already. I am not blaming the Forests Department; I am blaming the political masters of the Forests Department, the political masters who have insisted on barbecues with wooden shingles covering them and no chimneys, so that the whole place can burn down! A sum of \$4 000 had to be expended to put in chimneys afterwards.

This was done using Mr Dowding's CEP funds, as at Manjimup, and that sum was overrun by 100 per cent at the Manjimup primary school. No wonder we doubt the sincerity of the Government.

Let us continue with the farcical document which is called a second reading speech. Page 15 states that the Department of Conservation and Land Management has three main functions:

Firstly the department is responsible for managing public land vested in either the commission or the authority. We must remember the Government has taken the land away from the commission to place it under the responsibility of the authority. The responsibility of the MPAs and forestry will be taken away and that fact was denied in answer to a question asked in this House. Where does the Government stand on this? It denied that the MPAs would be affected, but the interesting fact is, according to the policy determined by those two bodies and the Minister, they are set up to advise the Minister. This was stated in pages 12 and 13, but on page 15 it is stated that the two bodies and the Minister will decide the policy. Who do we believe will decide the policy?

On our side of politics it is simple, because outside people cannot advise the Minister or instruct him. However, with a socialist Government in power who will advise the Minister?

Hon. Tom Knight: Caucus.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, the ALP conference. We know the Attorney General has to do as he is told by the conference. He signed a pledge to that effect: he pledged his life away, before he was even elected to this place.

We can have chuckles from the ALP members, but we do see their long faces when their endorsements are coming up and they have to face that body. They look at and search their souls.

Hon. Robert Hetherington can laugh. He went through three months of soul-searching and of not being prepared to say a thing in this House in case his selection committee picked it up. We have heard his comments on unions and we have heard--

Hon. Robert Hetherington interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member will relate his comments to this Bill and Hon. Robert Hetherington has nothing to do with it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am glad to hear that, Mr President. I will take your advice. I thought that he had something to do with it because the ALP introduced the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member knows what I am talking about and I suggest that he talk about what is in the Bill.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Certainly, Sir, I am doing that all the time at your instruction.

On page 16 of the Minister's second reading speech, the Government, again because of pressures put on it by Mr Blaikie, the member for Vasse in the other place, and the Opposition spokesman on this matter, inserted a condition relating to the executive director's having appro-

prate tertiary qualifications. I wonder why the Director of Forests does not have to have those qualifications. I hate to disagree with my colleague, Mr Blaikie, but I wonder why the executive director should have to have them because, after all, his will be a political appointment. He will not have to know much about anything because, after all, he will be a lackey of the Minister and will run backwards and forwards between authorities, directors, and general managers. There is really no need for his being included in this legislation at all. I believe that the general manager should have tertiary qualifications.

Now we come to the most hilarious part of the second reading speech. The Bill clearly sets out the objectives for management of each category of land vested in the commission and places constraints on the activities for which this land can be used. How ludicrous is that statement. It is nonsense. It is not clear from the second reading speech or from the answers to questions whether MPAs are, or are not, going to the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority or whatever the authority is. The second reading speech says that they are. However, in answer to questions, the Minister says they are not. This Government's double standards are again evident.

The second reading speech states that the Bill sets out the objectives. There are no objectives in this Bill except political ones. There is not a management objective in sight. The Government has not said what it wants to do. I will deal later with an EPA report relating to Bungle Bungle to give an example of how this Government "bungle-bungles" its way through these matters.

The second reading speech states further that the legislation significantly improves the security of tenure and the purpose of public lands that have been reserved for special purposes. The Bill, like the Minister's second reading speech, changes its mind on every page.

Now we come to an interesting part of the second reading speech. It states that no commercial exploitation of forest produce or flora is permitted on national parks or nature reserves. I made the point before the suspension of the sitting about what happens to degraded trees in national parks. Will the Government not grasp the nettle and make the right management decision? Of course it will not because it will throw the plans open for public inspection and say that it wants to cut down two karri trees in the Warren national park. Will it be exactly the opposite? Is all this hocus-pocus so that the Minister can make all the decisions and not take any notice of the professionals?

The Government is very smart on the confrontation issues. I ask members to cast their minds back to the candidates which the ALP put up when in Opposition on conservation issues. The ALP is even running a candidate now in the Federal seat of Curtin. The Government hugged those people to its bosom and said at that time, "Come with us, we will lead you through the minefields of this bureaucratic and horribly overbearing Forests Department". It said, "When we are in Government we will help you". What has it done? Absolutely nothing. It has turned its back on the conservation movement.

I will quote from no less an authority than the Premier of this State. He put out a Press release on 6 November—Melbourne Cup day. It was his 381st Press release for the year. He said that Mr Hassell's comments mirror those of the conservation movement. It seems that the conservation movement was of use to the Premier when he was in Opposition, but he scorns it when he is Premier. This man expects the public to trust him, and then he does that sort of thing. He turns his back on those people.

Hon. Tom Stephens: What nonsense!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: "Nonsense" says Hon. Tom Stephens! We will deal with Bungle Bungle later. I see that the Attorney has turned around to tell the member to keep quiet.

Hon. Robert Hetherington interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: There are even more interjections, Sir, which are completely unruly. I would deal with them, but I know you, Mr President, would prefer that I talk to the Bill. Does it not hurt when Government members see their own leader turn upon the people who elected them? That is not utter nonsense. The interjections prove that it does hurt them and it makes them squirm in their seats.

We proceed to page 19 of the Minister's speech where he said—

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

Let us take that through the hoops. Would we not love to do that with Medicare? Would not the public like an input to tell the Government what it thinks about Medicare? Of course, we shall not be allowed to do that. The public would like to have an input on all this belting of the Police Department by the Labor Government.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: We would like one on one—vote-one-value.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, we would endorse it thoroughly. The last poll said that 75 per cent of the people in this State favour an upper House whatever the conditions of election. However, that is a different Bill and I can see the President looking at me very severely.

The public has a right to participate in formulating policies which determine management procedures! I once heard a senior public servant in the Health Department say that he admired Australians because they swam in shark infested waters and were prepared to be cut up by anybody. This is the sort of attitude that perhaps prevails in this Bill. What does the public know about park and forest management? There is a noisy minority that can always do everything better than the Government. The interesting part about this is that the Government has not gone as far as to say that any individual who is aggrieved by parts of the legislation or by management plans can bring a court action against the Government, the sort of class action that had to be taken in the United States because it could not be done in Australia. The Government has not gone that far.

It was interesting to note that the Director of the Department of Premier and Cabinet fielded that question from a university student on Saturday morning at a land management seminar. There is no way that the Government wants to be put under that sort of scrutiny. It does not want to go before law courts and in a way I do not blame it. However, why include this section about public participation? In another part of the second reading speech it is stated that the public has participation through the two authorities. How ludicrous. You and I know, Mr Deputy President (Hon. John Williams), that time after time organisations elected to represent all classes of people—perhaps businesses, farmers, or other professions—miss out on what the individuals in that organisation really want to do. The Government thinks that these two bodies will know what the public wants and I do not believe that is right.

The Premier makes a habit of saying that the Opposition opposes the Forests Department. I refer to the second reading speech, page 20, where it was stated—

I do not want to dwell on the inadequacies of the current system of public land management . . .

Of course, he does not want to dwell on it because he knows the Government has slated every public servant in the State. There may be, I grant, one or two per cent of people in those three departments

which the Government is attempting to amalgamate, who wish that amalgamation to go through. However, I represent the biggest forestry area in the State and the majority of the people for whom I speak do not want it to go through. Once more, the Government is hoist on its own petard.

We go further and reach the ridiculous; the National Parks Authority of WA purchased vehicles from another department. How many vehicles were purchased? What type of vehicles were they? Of course, the Government is not prepared to tell us that sort of information. I expect it was heavy firefighting equipment and the forestry, through its usual, well-managed, upgrading of equipment, had surplus equipment. But any person thinking that a firefighting truck coming from the Forests Department was not in first class condition when it was sold is doubting the professionalism of the department. All its equipment is in first class condition.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: They are maintained in their own workshop.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Their own workshops keep them that way. The only problem in the Forests Department is the morale of its troops; this low morale has been caused by a Government which utterly and totally lacks concern for the foresters and the people who work in the Forests Department.

Let us consider this step by step. The Government did not take the department's advice on Shannon or on the Donnybrook sunklands and it did not even appoint a new conservator. From memory, I think that Mr Beggs was appointed to his new position on 25 March 1983 and we have had an acting conservator since that time. One of the department's senior and most brilliant research officers, Dr Shea, was pulled out to become an adviser to the Premier. Mr Williamson and Mr Underwood were pulled out and put into this lovely little department in Elders building, putting together all this nonsense. Mr Campbell has been pulled out and put onto the Public Service Board. Is it any wonder that every time one travels on an aeroplane between Bunbury and Perth, one sees senior forestry officers from Bunbury travelling to spend two or three days in Perth because there are no permanent officers. Is it any wonder that they are concerned about what is going on? They certainly are concerned. Eighteen months of neglect of the Forests Department by the Government has led to this situation.

Question after question has been fielded and the Forests Department has been left out in the cold. It is a disgrace to this Government and to the Premier. To say that the Opposition does not like

the Forests Department or foresters is even worse—it is playing with the truth very carelessly.

I know I am not allowed to use the other word, but I repeat that it is playing with the truth very carelessly.

Let us deal further with the second reading speech. We have dealt with the purchasing of second-hand vehicles by the National Parks Authority. Let us consider the bushfires situation. Nobody in his right mind, who knew anything about the bushfire situation, would have commented on sending a unit from Perth to the lower south-west simply because it did not have units available. If it did not have local units available, obviously the units were out fighting fires. The previous Government gave the National Parks Authority—I guess at the instigation of me and people like Hon. Fred McKenzie—extra firefighting equipment for the lower south-west; but it happens that at times the Forests Department or the National Parks Authority, like a general, can commit only so much of its resources to a particular fire. It was noticeable that no date and no time were attached to that comment. When was it? Is that sort of thing a regular occurrence, or is it a one-off situation? These are the sorts of things that the Government should consider. The problem could be overcome by adopting the suggestion I made earlier, of putting the Bush Fires Board under the control—loosely, I admit—of the Forests Department.

On page 22 of the second reading speech, the Leader of the House said—

The new system of public land management which will be possible when this Bill is proclaimed—

If I have anything to do with it, the Bill will never be proclaimed. The second reading speech continued—

—in summary, involves the formation of an integrated agency which will implement the policy formulated by bodies which have broad community representation.

In other words, everybody's responsibility is nobody's responsibility. One cannot have that sort of management.

Then we go on and see nonsensical comments such as the following—

...all of the administrative overheads associated with any Government department can be minimised by incorporating them into one system. Financial systems, clerical services, computer systems, publications, communications systems, drafting facilities...

Will we reach the stage that one Minister controls the State? Surely one computer would be cheaper than six or seven, and one set of clerical services would be cheaper than the numerous Ministers and advisers. One set of publications would be better than the numerous ones we have in every department.

The Leader of the House spoke about one communications system. This is the communications system for which the Government has doubled the budget.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Even though some of the Ministers do not have a telex.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes. The Minister for Industrial Relations and Administrative Services does not have one, and the administration is so bad that it takes two days for a telex to reach Mr Dans from the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! The member should address himself to the Bill.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am doing so. The second reading speech deals with financial systems, clerical services, computer systems, and publications. I had reached "communications" and that is when the debate started on telexes. Then we happened to mention that Mr Dans did not have one.

Surely it would be far easier to have just one Minister! Would not that mean a saving for the Minister for Budget Management? He would not have a job, of course, because only the Premier would run the State; but we would have one computer, one set of communications, and one set of financial systems. The Premier could run the lot. It is absolutely frightening that the Leader of the House could have those words put in his mouth.

On page 24 of the second reading speech, we read that the proposed Department of Conservation and Land Management is not large by any standards, but it has been designed to ensure that it does not suffer from bureaucratic inertia. What about the setting up time? How many people have been involved? How many high-class officers have been involved so far, over the last three months? How far back would the department go if the scheme was implemented? How long would it take to set it into place?

We go on, and we find talk about regions, but there is no talk of voluntary regional organisations and local advisory groups with input, as Hon. Fred McKenzie and I suggested in the national parks report. The second reading speech continues—

Regional administration will be controlled by a regional manager ensuring that public

land management in the region is sensitive to the local environment and local people.

It will still be under the control of city-based bureaucrats. Governments of whatever colour talk about regional administration, but let us have a look at the South West Development Authority to see what chance it has of making regional decisions. Absolutely none at all. The people in that organisation are racing to Perth to see Ministers day by day because they are not allowed to make decisions. Can we believe that this organisation will be any different?

The following appears in the second reading speech made by the Leader of the House—

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

The conservation movement does not agree with that. It does not say where the resources are, and that is extremely worrying because the movement was promised all sorts of things when the Government was in Opposition.

On page 27 the following appears—

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

I believe that applies to only some of the public servants, and probably they would come from the Forests Department because it will be a Forests Department-controlled organisation—I am not knocking that—if it comes into being.

Now we get into the little stirry part about what the Opposition has had to say. Once again it is clear the hearing aids of the Premier and his advisers need to be turned up when they are eavesdropping. The Minister's second reading speech has this to say—

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

I did not believe that until the Premier went to Manjimup just over a week ago and told the foresters not once, but twice, in my hearing that the Forests Department will be running this new department. Up until then I thought the Government was genuine, but, in his statement at the opening of the Forests Department building, and at a din-

ner afterwards, the Premier said that the Forests Department would be running the new department.

I find that rather scary, because some people who have trusted the Government have been deceived. It is also scary because previously the foresters were worried that the conservation movement might be taking over the Forests Department.

The great problem with the whole of this Bill is one of distrust. People do not know where they are going or what the end result of the legislation will be.

I believe that the Forests Department does a pretty good job, but I also do not discount the conservation movement, because it is doing a good job also. It has made the public aware of what is going on. I do not always agree with the conservation movement, nor do I always agree with the Forests Department, but at the moment nobody knows where this Bill will end.

There has been no leadership as such. The Premier has made statements that the Forests Department will run this department and that horrified me. The foresters were fairly happy about it, but they were worried as to how the amalgamation would take place. The Minister said—

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

He went on to say—

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

That is a decision based on the wrong premise. Both can be right and both probably are right. In a politically motivated Bill like this, the conservation movement has been deceived and those in the Forests Department who are not loved by the hierarchy will be superseded by political appointees.

It is interesting that the Minister should even mention that aspect after the hiding the Premier has had in respect of those sorts of comments. It is extremely worrying that the Minister or his advisers should try to draw this line between the conservation movement and the Forests Department. It is particularly surprising when one bears in mind the ALP's so-called adherence to conciliation and consensus.

Earlier we talked of the emotional confrontation between Government agencies and community groups, a confrontation which I did not believe had occurred. What is this Government doing? It is promoting those confrontations for purely political purposes. It is shameful.

The Forests Department's record in multi-use of forests is second to none. On page 29 of the Minister's second reading speech he had this to say—

If the argument that foresters are unsympathetic to non-productive uses of forest lands is accepted—

I am not quoting the Government's view, but rather what the Minister said. He started the argument two paragraphs previously. To continue—

—then logically, it can be argued that the inclusion of wildlife and national parks personnel with forests in an integrated agency will substantially improve the conservation and recreation values of those forest lands which have been reserved for forest production.

Is it not fascinating that here we are, with the national parks and wildlife people moving in with the Forests Department, when the report of the task force indicated that the resources of the Forests Department were so great that we could help national parks and wildlife. There is another set of double standards; but, of course, what does one expect from this Government? I am only using the Minister's words in his introduction of the Bill. I have not even started on the Bill yet.

Is it not fascinating that the Government should be so narrow, and that it should be deceiving all the people involved, including the conservationists and the foresters. The Minister goes on to say—

stringent provisions in this Bill ensure that there is no conflict between the production function and conservation and recreation functions of the new department.

Of course, that is absolute rot, because I pointed out earlier the conflict involved and the tenures which are not tenures at all to the Forests Department. The Forests Department will lose them. All the MPAs are going to the new authority and yet, for page after page in the second reading speech, the Minister goes on with all this nonsense. On page 30 he says—

In effect, the staff and resources which must be employed for production forestry and for which there is a revenue return for the Government, can be utilised for conservation and recreation activities.

Does the Forests Department need more people in those areas? On the previous page it is said that it

does. However, the report of the task force indicated that we should take people out of the Forests Department and put them into the other department. As is said on page 30, all this can be done without detracting from the resources devoted to the production of forestry.

On page 31 it is said that all public servants will carry out the policies of the Government, provided that they have an appropriate organisation and the resources required. This Bill will give them neither. The organisation is slipshod and resources are just not in the Budget.

I now pass to the diagram attached to the Minister's second reading speech notes. We are talking about management. Can the Government explain to me, apart from the idea of preserving jobs or creating new jobs, why we want a director of both nature conservation and national parks and recreation?

There is absolutely no precedent for that. Why can there not be more than one director? Can the Minister explain why the directors cannot go straight to the Minister? Why do they have to go through the executive director? I am using the Minister's diagram. In other words, the positions of the Director of National Parks, the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Conservator of Forests have all been downgraded in this Bill, if we follow the diagram, because each of those people can go to his respective Minister.

The Director of Forests has to go through the executive director to get to the general manager down through an assistant general manager to get to the harvesting and utilisation branch. Is that good management? I very much doubt it. I hope the Attorney is following the diagram and that he begins at the left and goes right over to the right, down a little bit of a curve. The Attorney never would have run a business like that.

Look at the next one. The directors are only for policy planning and research; not one director is involved with implementation, except perhaps the director of research and planning. Not one director has direct access to the operations in that field. It all must come back through the executive director. Does the Government call that good management?

It is an absolute utter shambles yet this Government continues to press ahead with this Bill. The Forest Production Council has the Director of Forests, but it has nothing to do with harvesting and utilisation except when going through the executive director, the general manager, the assistant general manager, and so on. Even the Minister goes through the executive director, the general manager, the assistant general manager, etc. when

he makes a decision. The whole of that diagram or chart looks as though it was drawn by a child who had the hiccups. In managerial terms it is a disaster. Incidentally, this is the third crack the Government has had at getting this legislation right. The attempt it made in the other place omitted the line between "the Minister" and "the executive director" so the executive director was safe—high and dry. I think it left out the lines between "the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority" and also the various directors. The Government has only had two or three goes at this legislation! We are told the Government has done its research and that it knows what it is doing. It says, "Trust us". It sounds like that bloke in Canberra, saying "Trust me". The only trust I would put him in would be one associated with an asylum. Really that sort of diagram horrifies us all because we understand what management is all about.

I intended to deal quietly with the second reading debate in the other place because of the variations in the second reading speeches, but I will not do so because I have many more matters to tell the House and I do not want the House to become pressed for time.

I have here a very interesting Press release from Caroline Hooper representing the conservation movement. Caroline Hooper is the secretary of the coalition of nine conservation groups and the Press release indicates her concern. These people are not against the Bill. The Press release reads as follows—

Caroline Hooper, the secretary of a coalition of nine conservation groups who oppose the controversial Conservation and Land Management Bill, currently before Parliament, today called on the Legislative Council to act as a genuine House of Review and to reject the legislation.

It further reads as follows—

Rejecting the Bill would be responsible and politically courageous, Mrs Hooper said. The government will call the Council a House of Obstruction but this claim should not divert people's attention from the real issues.

These are the minority. We have heard so far from only about eight groups which are worried about the Bill. I have dealt with security of tenure and with the differences which appear on pages 12, 13, 14, and 17, and which show the conflict in the Government's arguments.

I now turn to the sort of thing that is fairly worrying and about which the Premier goes around the place making announcements. The last announcement he flew—as the cuckoo flies out of

its nest—was about 30-year jarrah instead of 100-year jarrah. I made it my business to check up on the matter, and I spoke with a very fine forester who said, "It is a pie in the sky. You can cut logs, but they have to be sawn, then kiln dried and made ready." Hon. Colin Bell's and Hon. Ian Pratts' electorates would get a bit of work from this measure, but if the logs are kiln dried there will be greater difficulty in holding the logs together and they are likely to split. This forester said that it was possible to obtain similar logs either through coppices or seedlings.

It is very interesting that Dr Syd Shea had these ideas some years ago, but they were not considered to be of great importance until this Government came into power and then the department was instructed to put more resources into looking at the subject.

Is that not interesting? I wonder if that Dr Syd Shea is the same Dr Shea who wrote the management report and probably wrote the Premier's Press release. I ask members to remember my opening words, "Pie in the sky".

I do not blame people for pushing their own barrows, but it worries me that the Premier alludes to matters which are not correct. It is worrying that a Premier with all the advice he had at Manjimup—the five or six advisers and departmental people who were travelling with him, not like the real Premiers who only had one person with them, and whose accommodation and everything else was at the taxpayers' expense I presume—could not make a true and honest statement on the subject. He did not say anything about kilns or splitting, and yet people to whom I talked and I believe their word, say there are problems and that it is something on which more work could be done in the future.

I am not denying it is the right of the Premier and Minister for Forests to push one of his own barrows. It is probably good that a change takes place now and again and that emphasises change. All I worry about is that the Premier is being given information to put out to the public, information which is not quite accurate. I am not knocking anybody; I believe it is unfortunate that those sorts of Press releases should be put out when the proper research has not been done.

While I am referring to not knocking anybody, I advise that Mr Stretch said before I started he would like me to correct something which may or may not have been in his speech. He felt it was not there according to the way he read it, but some people may think it was. He was referring to morale in the Forests Department and someone said he was rather hard on the acting conservator. Mr

Stretch asked me to make the point in my speech that he had no intention of being hard on the acting conservator because he realised it was Government policy and that the Government was giving the instructions. The acting conservator virtually had to obey instructions because of this Government's overpowering wish, directed by the ALP conference, to go ahead with this nonsense.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I was giving somebody else's point of view, as I did for Hon. Kay Hallahan, and I did it fairly and squarely. It is a reflection on the member's mentality that he will not listen to something like that without interjecting.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You are a bore, Mr Lewis.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I may be.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not mind whether I have or not. There are things to be said and I have one lot to repeat for Mr Piantadosi because he was not in the House when it was said.

I want to ask the Minister about clause 41(1)(a) which relates to the executive director. The Forests Act provides that the conservator may be suspended from office by the Governor for incompetence or misbehaviour. Under this Bill, the executive director can be suspended for incompetence or misbehaviour impairing the performance of his duties. I wonder why that was added.

I ask why, in clause 41(2), it refers to suspension within 20 sitting days when the Forests Act refers to four sitting days. In this House suspension within 20 sitting days could mean that, if the executive director were suspended next week and there were four or five sitting days before Christmas and the House did not come back until March or April, he would be sitting on his thumb for months. I wonder why the Government has allowed this.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: If I may interrupt, my copy of the Bill actually reads "four sitting days".

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mine does not. Mine says that the executive director when suspended shall not be restored to office unless each House of Parliament, within 20 sitting days of that House from the time when such statement has been laid before it, declares by resolution that he ought to be restored to office. Maybe I have a copy of the lower House Bill.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I think so.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am glad that has been cleared up.

In relation to seniority I ask the Minister who is next in line when the executive director goes? Where is the seniority in the department; who takes over if the executive director is away? There seems to be no line of succession there at all.

I will hurry through the rest of my comments. I mentioned earlier that this Bill *de facto* abolishes the EPAs responsibility, and I refer to part of the Bill which says that it shall co-ordinate all activities whether governmental or otherwise as are necessary to protect, restore, or improve the environment of the State. The proposals will subsume professional and technical quality under organisational expediency. The conglomerate bureaucracy proposed will reduce the professional pride, performance, and standing of the existing constituent organisations.

The Forest Production Council will have little influence and at best it can be seen only as a sop to the producers. I have written comments in my notes about a committee producing a camel, but I do not think I need refer to that. I have dealt with security of tenure; it does not bear scrutiny.

We were talking about putting plans out to the public. However, if one reads the Bill one sees that neither the Minister nor the controlling statutory authorities need take any notice of the submissions.

In the final analysis, the Minister will decide the nature of the plan to be adopted. There is no real public input into it; and the concentration of the decision-making powers will be in the Minister's hands, especially in key areas which have been deliberately kept away from political influence under the existing legislation.

I promised to refer to a couple of points, one of which is Bungle Bungle. It is interesting to compare national parks, because one compares what should happen. A report has been published by the EPA suggesting a joint management scheme involving the traditional landowners and the National Parks Authority. Are we going to have a national parks service? Will the national parks service run the national parks all over the State or will we have joint management schemes? The Government does not mention anything about that in this Bill.

I would be horrified if the national parks management was taken over by joint management schemes. I am keen on local advisory committees if they are listened to, but unfortunately in my area much of the local information has not been listened to and it has created many difficulties. I noticed in the latest report of the National Parks Authority that reference was made to the accessibility to D'Entrecasteaux National Park and to

the Shannon, which was done as a sop to the people in that area.

The National Parks Authority prohibited the use of power boats on Lake Jasper, but that has been solved and the necessary research has been carried out. However, we are going back over old ground because the National Parks Authority has been beaten over this matter. It is my tip that it has been thrown in again because hang gliders have been permitted to use the lake. The National Parks Authority said that the power boats were prohibited from using the lake because they had destroyed the birdlife. The Select Committee on national parks proved to the Minister and to the director that there were no breeding grounds at the lake originally. Now the department wants to allow hang gliders on the lake. It seems that we go round and round in circles.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I like your graphic exhibition of hang gliding.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It goes well.

I have dealt already with the Shire of Manjimup, and I only hope that the Government honours its promise to that shire because if it does not the Government can kiss goodbye to the seat of Warren. It probably has already, but I should not have to worry about that.

Hon. Kay Hallahan interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: For some reason I keep getting increased majorities; and it is funny that I have two Lower House Labor seats. When we come to the unfair representation Bill I will deal with this matter further.

The Tree Society Review refers to the special meeting held by the Conservation Council to discuss the new department. It was stated at that meeting that this Bill was better than the present state of affairs so far as the national parks were concerned.

The Budget that has just been brought down gave a less than five per cent increase to the National Parks Authority. Despite the comments in the Minister's second reading speech when he said that resources will be available—I am sure Hon. Fred McKenzie is interested in this, both as an ex-member of the Select Committee on national parks and as a union secretary—each of the 81 rangers will receive an increment this year of \$250! That is what they can expect this year.

Hon. C. J. Bell: It is less than \$5 a week.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is right and even the most—

Hon. J. M. Brown: Astute Rhodes Scholar!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, because we have already got one of those who is leading the country and making a mess of it.

Even the most conservative estimates of inflation are two or three per cent, but the rangers employed by the National Parks Authority will receive an increment of less than half the CPI increase.

It is interesting to learn from the Budget that Government advisers—I guess they wrote this Bill—will each receive an increment of \$10 000. The rangers have to work in the field and they will only receive \$250. I am using the Government's figures which were presented to this House in the Budget. The rangers will receive \$250 and the Government advisers, who sit back and write Bills like this nonsense, will each receive \$10 000.

I would like to comment on who will represent the Government at COMCON and other similar conferences. Will it be the executive director or will the Minister have time to attend such conferences? I refer to the departments which have been divided in other States of Australia. Queensland was the last State to divide the National Parks Authority from the Forests Department. Why did the Queensland Government do that? Is it silly? That is not the case according to the Victorian Government. The Victorian Government wanted to separate its conservation section and this Government is hell-bent on an amalgamation. The management programmes of these two departments are different. There is a preponderance of forestry staff who will be involved, and, therefore, the forestry doctrines will take over.

At the meeting which was held in Manjimup, the Premier said that the Forests Department will run the proposed authority. Either he is wrong or he is ill-advised because a number of foresters will take over the implementation of the scheme.

Let us look at what happened to the Public Library, the Museum, and the Art Gallery before they were made separate departments. These questions need to be answered. Why did the Government pick on the Western Australian National Parks Authority? Why were not positions made available to certain people in that authority?

Those three organisations may have seen the WA Conservation Council as a politically orientated group. Perhaps they have changed their opinions since this Bill was introduced.

Staff morale has been severely undermined. This Government has never learnt to deal with people. There is something about the Labor Party—it cannot deal with people. It may be the

training, but its members have a confrontationalist attitude to everything they do.

I will not quote the number of letters I have from shires opposing this Bill. It is obvious the Government has not done its job in talking to shires and to people about the Bill.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: What about the Manjimup Shire?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Would the member like me to read the letters?

Hon. Lyla Elliott: No.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Then the member should not ask a silly question.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: It is not a silly question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members interjecting to stop it because they can see that the honourable member is trying to draw his remarks to a close, and they are only hindering him. I ask the honourable member to get on with it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am sorry to disappoint you, but I had no wish to close at this stage.

The PRESIDENT: It sounded as though the member was coming to a close.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have numerous authorities.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: You have not answered the question. Is it "yes" or "no"?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have letters from the Manjimup Shire. I hate to delay the House, but Hon. Lyla Elliott wants them. Hon. Joe Berinsoen should talk to her.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: Just give me a straight answer, "yes" or "no".

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Lyla Elliott has no authority to be asking questions, and the member has no authority to answer them.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Are you banning me from reading these letters from the Manjimup Shire?

The PRESIDENT: Talk about this Bill.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: This is a four-page letter which Hon. Lyla Elliott wants me to read.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: Let us not be ridiculous.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is what she wanted to find out.

Hon. J. M. Berinsoen: She just wants you to summarise its conclusions.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Let me summarise both letters. I will summarise the four pages in the first letter. The council had a great number of worries about the Bill. I will summarise the second letter, which is dated 1 November, in this way: The Shire has accepted the Bill. It wants to know in due

course the number of new positions created in that region, and the increased resources allocated for this area. It is not talking about the 7 000 hectares of land which may be swamped; it is talking about extra wardens, extra vehicles, and everything else.

Some ministerial advisers went to talk to the shire representatives the day before the Premier got there, and they changed their minds. If one reads the Premier's answer to the member for Mandurah in the other place, he proves that he is an cavesdropper, or that his staff are cavesdroppers. I am not really into that sort of thing—repeating corridor gossip—but obviously the Premier is because that is the sort of construction one must put on his answer to the member for Mandurah.

I disagree with the Manjimup Shire. I do not trust the Government. Members of the Manjimup Shire, being nice people, are very trusting. The runaround this Government has given them is hideous, both in regard to the planting of pine trees and the provisions of this Conservation and Land Management Bill.

I believe—one usually does if one is fairly sound of thought—that the Manjimup Shire may have been too trusting in this situation. The backlash—if things do not go the way the Government has promised to the Manjimup Shire—will be horrific for this Government. The Manjimup Shire has changed its mind, but the Mandurah Shire has not. The Dumbleyung Shire is against the Bill. One could go through all the shires, but I do not want to do that.

I am horrified at this Bill. The Government should have done far more research before introducing it. The Government tried to bypass the House by setting up the task force in Elder House for the Public Service Board to get this department started. It is set out in the "in-house" magazine that is already being sent round.

This Bill cannot be passed. I do not believe this House, with the information in front of it, can pass this Bill.

Amendment to Motion

I move an amendment—

That all words after the word "that" be deleted, with a view to substituting the following passage—

the Conservation and Land Management Bill be referred to a select committee of 3 members having power to call for persons papers and records; to adjourn from place to place; to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and that a message be transmitted to the Legislat-

ive Assembly acquainting it that this House has referred the said Bill to a select committee and requesting the Assembly to appoint a like select committee with power to confer with the said committee of the Council, and that the committee report to this House not later than May 31, 1985.

HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [9.20 p.m.]: I support the move by Hon. A. A. Lewis. It is not my intention to deal with the Bill or the second reading speech in the same sort of detail, but I will indicate to the House why I am concerned about the immediate passage of the legislation. I do have some concern about the necessity for a Select Committee, but I see no other viable alternative and I will give reasons for that in a little while. I congratulate Hon. A. A. Lewis, Hon. Bill Stretch, and Hon. Vic Ferry for their contributions and for the tremendous amount of work they put into their speeches.

I wish to speak mainly because of the positions I held as Minister for Fisheries, as the first Minister for Conservation in Australia—really a matter of being in the right place at the right time, I suppose—and subsequently as Minister for the Environment, for National Parks, for Wildlife and again for Fisheries and for Conservation. I intend to express my views about the report that has been presented.

I was very disappointed with the initial inquiry conducted by three quite eminent gentlemen; namely, Mr Norm Halse, Dr Sid Shea and Mr Morris Mulcahy. I worked with Mr Mulcahy in my capacity as Minister for Conservation. I have great respect for him as a scientist. I met Dr Shea in my capacity as Minister for Works and Water Supplies when we had taken a group of farmers and other interested people on a trip into the forest area to study reafforestation, the use of trees as water pumps to take water from the soil in an evapotranspiration exercise and to study soil salinity. Dr Shea escorted us on one of those trips. I had never met Mr Halse, to the best of my knowledge.

As I said, I found the report I read to be extremely disappointing. I got the impression that we had three eminent scientists who had been dragooned into conducting an exercise under Government instructions and who had had the application of their scientific knowledge misused.

A tremendous amount of material seems to be a matter of opinion, not of scientific fact, and to my mind, scientists such as these men ought to be exercised in the application of their knowledge in sorting out facts. Indeed, one exercise they con-

ducted was to point out that they believed the new organisation would be better because it would have more staff and more money. I took the opportunity of pointing out to Mr Mulcahy that that was an absolute absurdity, because any organisation could be improved by the application of more staff and more money.

Later the Minister might spend some time allaying my suspicions, but I have gained the impression from listening to people and reading this report that the Government's attitude is that, if it gets this legislation through, there will indeed be adequate money and an increase in staff, but that if it does not get it through, everyone can go to hell—it is almost as blunt as that. If that undercover threat is real, it is quite a disgraceful situation. One gets the impression it is real because right through the report, entitled "Task Force on Land Resource Management in South Western Australia" one finds references which give the impression that if the plan is adopted, a lot more money and resources will be available. I will come back to some of the resources in a little while.

The following is from page 25 of the report—

There are obvious mutual benefits from interagency co-operation and co-ordination which have not been fully exploited. For example, at present the distinction between nature reserves and National Parks is that the former are for nature conservation and the latter are for conservation and recreation in natural surroundings. This distinction is artificial in respect to many reserves.

I am not a scientist, as everyone will know; I am a politician. However, over a period of time as a Minister I had to deal with a lot of scientific reports and I believe that for a scientist to submit a report of this nature is quite odd indeed, because surely people who go out to study the difference between a national park or a nature reserve ought to know that the intrusion of human beings into some of them presents a real and distinct problem.

Some of the older members—sorry, there are none here old enough to remember—but if there had been they would have remembered trips to the reserve at Pingelly, which is a very good but small reserve with a lot of mallee fowls. In that reserve it was found necessary literally to change the trap lines every week because even simply walking along them would create permanent marks. It was therefore necessary to change the lines if they were followed more than twice. If anyone doubts that, he should go out to look at the trails left by the sandalwood pullers. Those trails have not been used for 50 years, but they are still clear. The

same applies with the tundra in Canada, and I think the original idea for this plan followed a visit to Canada by Dr Sid Shea; but whether that is right I do not know, although I have heard rumours around the traps. If it were true, it would be the height of absurdity. I have visited Canada in my capacity as a Minister and I studied the conditions there. Canada's growing season and general conditions are quite dissimilar to ours. One would imagine that things that are successful there would not be as successful here.

But it is no good saying that this distinction between national parks and reserves is artificial. For these three scientists to have put their names to that comment is a total absurdity. This is a matter of opinion. It is a matter of such wild generality as to completely undermine their credibility, in my view. Much of this report is a matter of opinion and belief, and they actually used the word "belief". It goes on like this time and time again, and I quote as follows—

We believe the new Land Management Department would have the expertise, and would be the appropriate body, to undertake the management of public lands in natural condition throughout the State.

Why? No real reasons are given. No effort is made to show that the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife has treated the islands off Geraldton badly. The only reason that goats were still there until recently was that the department did not have the money to undertake an eradication programme. Perhaps this was lucky, because people were able to capture the goats and use them commercially. It is purely supposition to say that the islands were badly used.

This report has all the hallmarks of the speech in support of the proposal to change the Health Department regulations. One would have thought that all wisdom in the Health Department commenced with the appointment of Minister Hodge.

That idea simply is not true because Ministers come and go and the Health Department has gone on since the inception of this State. It has been an extremely good department and so have the land management organisations in this State.

It is of no use talking about the loss of species, as was mentioned in the second reading speech. We simply had to have food so the land was put to the plough. I found not one mention in this statement of the scientific fact that a change of environment leads to the loss of species more than does any other activity, as does the intrusion of human beings into an environment. The numbers to which white man proliferates must change the

environment. It is of no use talking about fault and blame, or about the degradation of the soil. It is a matter of people. Indeed, much of the degradation is not even a matter of people. There are indications that this country was at one time lush and fertile and it was entirely covered by rain forests. If there were human beings here at that time they were in small numbers only, yet the environment changed. Why did it change? It changed because the climate changed, and we went through a long, dry period.

When the first human beings came here, the Aborigines—I have heard them described by scientists as peripatetic pyromaniacs—walked from waterhole to waterhole and each time they left an area, they burnt the country and changed the environment. The biggest change to the environment has been that sort of thing.

I have read reports of the drought in the early 1920s in the Exmouth area where 18 inches of soil was taken off the land. It was not stock that took it off, it was the wind. Pure climatic conditions caused that. Yet, we have read the scientific comments of Mr Shea and Mr Mulcahy, bearing in mind that Mr Mulcahy is a geographer, who knows about the soil, as is Mr Halse, yet there is not one mention of that fact. We are told that if we get management all our problems will be solved.

Any one of those scientists knows that that is not true. Not one, when speaking man to man, would not say that is true, so why do they say it is so? Is it because there was an instruction to say it? Is that the reason? Was it that they might not do well out of it if they did not say that? I think they are men of greater honour than that. Why ever did they say it? When we go through this report page by page—

Hon. Mark Nevill: Is that an interim report?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It does not matter which report it is. It is the interim report.

Hon. Mark Nevill: How about quoting the final report.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This is a report they signed and this is the one I find extremely interesting, because it was written as they thought, without any interference.

Hon. Mark Nevill: There has been public comment on that.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Oh sure, they had to change their tune a bit.

Hon. Mark Nevill: What is wrong with that?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Three scientists set this thing on this path, and I am just pointing out that they left a lot to be desired. For instance, I

mentioned the allocation of money. Members should not forget that I have been on the end of trying to work out budgets for each of those departments, with the exception of the Forests Department. I know how difficult it is. We are not talking about piddly little departments on inter-state or international scale. I am talking about the Forests Department. The task force was advised that where parks and wildlife reserves elsewhere have been managed by the same department, the result has been a diversion of resources to larger management, because of size. Page 41 of the report states—

If our proposals are accepted the staff allocated to wildlife research should be immediately increased. This will be needed to offset the demands of the few existing research staff for inputs to management programmes, and it will also be a measure of the Government's commitment to maintain nature conservation priorities in the new Department.

When I was Minister responsible for national parks, the amount of land held by that department doubled and doubled again. I do not have the figures before me because I did not bother to take them out, but the increase was from a few thousand hectares to a million hectares. We could not get the men to run it, however, because money simply was not there.

The main statement in this second reading speech was that if we accept this proposition, we will get the men and the money. If Mr Gayfer's farming property needs extra men, he has two ways of providing them. He can either go to the banker and get money to employ men or sell to someone who has enough money to put the property on the mend. What the Government is suggesting is that if we sell these land control people on a new organisation, the Government will set it up and will provide the money. That seems to me to be threatening "You either take the money or knock it back." That is what will happen.

One of the worst aspects is that so many of these things have taken place already. My colleagues who have spoken previously have said that the departments are in a state of turmoil. Morale is down and some people know that they will be looking for jobs. One of the difficulties of course is if we put this Bill to a Select Committee, those people will be left in limbo and that is very sad.

If we defeat the Bill, they will be left in turmoil, and if we carry it, they will have a time of confusion. We have a sad choice to make.

I am suggesting the Government should have some heart and consideration for human beings

and less consideration for its didactic theories, then it might organise things a little better.

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife has been chalked off, and we have been told we might lose wildlife. We are not dealing with some little Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. Western Australian fisheries constitute two-thirds of Australia's seafood exports and we are dealing with an industry which is one of the best in the world, although not one of the richest. Indeed, according to a professor from Canada, our fisheries industry is one of the best in the world.

There are more difficulties that these scientists did not tell us about. I think it was terribly remiss of them not to say so, because so many departments depend on the views of scientists. Hon. Mark Nevill would appreciate this, because he worked in an organisation of geologists and people with scientific expertise in rocks, soils, and minerals. Whatever field of mining one is in, whether coal or gold, there are people with a similar scientific background and they get together because they have a lot in common.

The same thing applies to people engaged in the field of fisheries and wildlife conservation. What are we talking about? Basically, we are talking about the conservation of a species, its reproduction, and its life cycle. When I was associated with those organisations, they seemed to be talking interminably about sex for the simple reason that they were dealing with population dynamics. If we have to control the population of kangaroos, we have to work out how many there would be in an accessible area, what the annual replacement is going to be under normal conditions, how it will vary with different weather conditions, drought, flood, and the like, and what percentage one can afford to crop.

Exactly the same thing applies if one is dealing with pilchards, rock lobster, or shrimp. The same fundamental and basic principle applies. We are dealing with the demography of the species. We are talking about the sex life of the creature and its reproductive cycle. The same scientific background is used for all these problems. I submit that that is not the background of a forester—his background is more into silviculture. I suggest that that group of scientists is distinct from the fisheries and wildlife scientists. That is where they ought to be, so they can get together and talk with one another and with the director—a fellow by the name of Bowen; most would know him I have no doubt. The principal scientist is a fellow by the name of Hancock and others are Morrissey, Burbidge, Bob Prince, and other top scientists associated with these aspects of fisheries.

These fellows are dealing with different species and different aspects, but they have the same background in scientific expertise.

I now refer to management. Mr Lewis has previously touched on this subject. The best managed fishery in Australia is without doubt the rock lobster fishery on the west coast of Western Australia. I think it was Professor Cole who classed it as the best managed fishery in the world. I would think that the Canadian salmon fishery is probably very well-managed as well. There has been some political influence and interference with that, similar to what this Bill will bring about.

What is this management based on? It is not based on political ideas as to whether we should have a big show or not. It is not based on directorates. It is simply and succinctly based on the life cycle of the creature we are trying to protect. It is based on a careful scientific survey of the rock lobster—I think its scientific name is *panulirus cygnus*. It is based on the fact that the eggs become viable at a certain stage. They are unhatched. I have almost forgotten the phraseology. At a viable stage they drift out to sea and come back and lodge on the reefs. At three years of age when they are ready to start breeding again, one can start taking the stock.

Everything about the operation of the department is subject to that cycle. The management programme is subject to that. All the flow charts are based on the fact that there is a living creature which has to be protected. So good is the management that it is estimated the industry crops something like 60 per cent of the resource, and that is running terribly close to the knife edge of destruction. So good is it, that in 1965 I was told the industry would be finished by 1970. It is now the 1980s and the industry is still going strong.

Good management is based on the life cycle of the creature, not on an airy-fairy political theory brought in because the Premier got caught up at a conference by a fellow called Bartholomaeus. That is a scientific fact and if one wrote it into that report it would be about the only scientific fact in it. I hate to say it, because the gentlemen involved are probably very nice fellows, but there has to be a reason why they produced such an unscientific report.

In my opinion and I spent the first six years of my career as a Minister, reading nothing but scientific reports and listening to nobody but scientists, Kesteven of the CSIRO to the newest recruit at the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, and from all the top brass in the Eastern States in the health departments down to our own

directors and commissioners in Western Australia. I lived, ate, and drank nothing but scientific reports for the first six years of my ministerial career. I learnt a bit of an understanding—

Hon. Mark Nevill: You cannot equate that with a scientific report.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Then why are research officers assigned to do it, and then it is turned around to say that we have got three good scientists.

Hon. Mark Nevill: If you restructure the Health Department, you do not have scientific facts in it. It is the same with that sort of report.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: One restructures the Health Department around the necessities to maintain the health of the community. Again, the Commissioner of Health is the most powerful man in the country. There is no-one with the power of the Commissioner of Health. He is the only man who can come and burn one's house down. Very few people know that of course, but he can do it.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Don't advertise it too much.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That dates from the days when there were some pretty dreadful diseases around, and such action might have been necessary, and the structuring of the Health Act is based on a need to look after and care for people and, of course, to do that, one needs scientific expertise. The first thing to obtain, when looking at the health of the community, is a proper demographic study. We need a scientist to tell us the demography of the community. We need a scientist to tell us the likely movement of the community. Again, we are dealing with a species. We are dealing with a living, breeding species—"man". That information determines the fundamental basis of one's organisation. There are many things such as the fisheries laws and the health laws which are almost the same in the Soviet Union as they are in capitalist America. Why? Because they are based on the lifestyle of the creature they are meant to look after, whether it is fisheries or health. That is where the management procedures start. It is the basis of them.

I notice Mr Lewis paid quite a lot of attention to the staff of national parks. We had to invent a procedure of mobile rangers to try to cope with the lack of funds. It was not because no-one cared about national parks. There was a lot of pressure from the public. We are talking about the national parks where holiday-makers can go, whether it be up north to Yardi Creek, Exmouth, and the like, and when the caravan parks were full, people were allowed to camp in all manner of spots. We had to have rangers to see that they were behaving. The rangers were really to ensure that people knew

where the water was. Most people under those circumstances behaved pretty well.

We arranged for rangers who would provide their own vehicles and caravans to travel up there. They would take their wives and do the job. They were equipped with radios and contacted base daily. That was a perfectly excellent arrangement.

A fellow told me the other day that wonderful management programmes were included in this Bill. Part V of the Bill relates to the management of land. I do not know whether this part is a copy from another Act; I have not bothered to look it up. However, I know it is a straight copy of what national parks and wildlife authorities have been doing in practice ever since I have had anything to do with them. They work out those management plans. The management plan mentioned in the Bill certainly dates back to 1965 when I started to have anything to do with these matters. That part is just plain common-sense. If one had just left high school, one would do it that way.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the member that the question before the chair is that the Bill be now read a second time, to which we have an amendment that all words after "That" be deleted and some other words be substituted. The question now is that the words proposed to be deleted be deleted. I take it that the member is relating his comments to the motion that the words proposed to be deleted be deleted.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr President, thank you for reminding me because I have been remiss in pointing out that the reason I am supporting Mr Lewis is because of the very grave doubts that I am expressing to the House. In short, I am not convinced that the fundamental idea, as espoused by the Government on the advice of the three gentlemen mentioned, that this is a worthwhile programme which should proceed, is correct. On the other hand, I stress that I am not absolutely convinced either that it is bad enough that I ought to disrupt all the work that has gone on and put my voice towards defeating it. I hope I make that clear.

I am taking the middle course which is, perhaps, a little cowardly because I have no intention of going on the committee. However, I am suggesting that we ought to send this matter to a committee for consideration. I know that will be difficult. I thought I mentioned my belief that, in a quite unwarranted fashion, if the rumours I hear are correct, the Government has operated on the basis of a *fait accompli* and has moved ahead with a number of plans which will lead to this Bill's becoming law. I thought that I had suggested there is an underlying threat that, unless that happens,

the various departments involved in the management of national parks, wildlife, forests, land management, and conservation, will be cut off without a penny, like the proverbial wanton daughter, and will be cast adrift in the snowy wilderness, but that, if we adopt the Bill, they will be welcomed back like the prodigal daughter, the Government will kill the fatted calf, Mr Shea will be put in charge of these matters, and everyone will be happy for ever after and will go forth and multiply. That is the basis of my reasoning and the reason for my explanation on and confusion about so many of the matters that have been put before us over the last month or two. Again, Mr President, I appreciate your bringing to my attention the fact that I had not mentioned that quite as often perhaps as I should have.

I wonder whether I could point out another problem relating to practical matters in relation to clause 49. As I said, I have no intention of going through the Bill in detail as Mr Lewis went through it. It has been put to me, because of this clause, that all sorts of people will now occupy the position of inspectors. Clause 49 states—

A person shall *ex officio* be a wildlife officer and a ranger for the whole of the State if, and so long as, he holds, or acts in, any of the following offices—

- (a) a member of the Commission or the Authority;
- (b) a police officer;
- (c) the Director of Fisheries under the Fisheries Act 1905; and
- (d) an inspector under that Act.

Those ideas are found in other places in the Bill.

I relinquished my position relating to these matters as Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife back in 1976, if my memory serves me correctly. I held that position for a short time. In those days policemen were *ex officio* inspectors. I cannot recall a case which was instigated by the police and which was actually prosecuted. That could be wrong, but I doubt it. In short, I am suggesting that, in my experience with departments such as this that require specialised inspectorial activities, the people solely and totally charged with the responsibility to inspect should inspect and nobody else should be involved. The Minister says that, generally, anybody can look after these matters. I think it is a fact of life that everybody's business is nobody's business and jobs do not get done.

The Bill tends to suggest that more people could be involved in these matters. It points to a lack of fundamental and basic experience. I cannot understand why that has been allowed to creep into the

legislation. Maybe my view is not the view of the people in authority. It has been suggested to me that this is the point of view of those in authority. They could have asked Mr Sonder or Mr Bowen, or any of those sorts of people, and they would have learnt the facts of life.

Many years ago, Mr Murray, Mr Willmott, and I got into serious trouble with the then Premier, Sir David Brand, because we refused him a wildlife Bill for two reasons. The first was that every second person in this country would be involved in inspecting and the second was that nobody would work at it. Theoretically, there would have been a whole host of inspectors, but in actual fact there would not have been one.

It is not my intention to go through the Bill in detail. However, I wanted to place on record some of my serious thoughts. Mr Lewis went through the second reading speech in detail and, although I have a number of notes on that speech, I will not mention them. However, I do mention that the Minister's notes at page 4 of the second reading speech hint at the point that where possible, flora and fauna, with the benefits of good management, will be able to survive.

I do not believe that this Bill will lead to any great changes because so many of our species now live in conditions that really do not suit them. For example, the mallee fowl at Pingelly have an extremely interesting sex life. They build a hummock of debris which they allow to rot. The male bird then gauges the temperature with a little "thermometer" in his wattle. The eggs are put into that nest and are hatched. The moment the chicks hatch they are on their own: if any other bird sees them they are chased, and they must move to the limits of the range where there are no other birds to chase them. Once there they pair off, thrive, and in the fullness of time may nest. The reserve at Pingelly has a fence around it and there are paddocks outside that. Once a given number of fowl are in that reserve, the other birds go into the wheatfields and die. There is no possibility of good management of that land leading to an increase in the number of mallee fowl.

At Two People Bay there is a limited number of noisy scrub birds. This is probably one of the rarest birds in the world. I will not go into its life history because it seems to annoy Mr Nevill. The noisy scrub birds live in a very peculiar way, and the reserve can only support a given number. It is my understanding that since my time some of these birds have been moved to a new location. That sort of creature management might be effected by a more efficient department, but not by a restructuring of the whole department of land management into one great megadepartment.

These are down to earth illustrations and I do not see how the change in the land management programme will help them. If this committee can be formed, operate, and perhaps come back with some answers, I will be extremely interested. I am concerned that so many things have happened to upset the morale, planning, and general welfare of the department. There has been a tremendous amount of concern and worry, and there is nothing we can do to turn the clock back and make the situation happier.

This is a department in which the members have worked happily and amicably; the directors and those in charge have maintained extremely happy relations for a number of years; and the workers have been loyal to the cause and have pursued their jobs with enthusiasm and dedication beyond the call of duty. They feel very let down because after a number of years in a career structure their whole system seems suddenly to be turned upside down. That has happened in a number of departments mentioned in this report and this Bill, and we should look at the situation very carefully. I express my heartfelt concern to those who have made plans and whose plans will be upset if there is a delay. I know that some members of the department have accepted positions in other places because their current positions were expected to disappear. With an inquiry being conducted, they will not know what to do; and I am sorry for them in that regard.

For the reasons I have enumerated, it is my intention to support the proposition by Hon. A. A. Lewis.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [10.04 p.m.]: The Government strenuously opposes this amendment as a bid for delay for its own sake.

This Bill culminates a lengthy and intensive consultation process. The task force worked from March 1983 to January 1984; and the implementation group worked from January of this year virtually until the time the Bill was presented to the Parliament. In the course of this process, the widest possible consultation has been engaged in, and the widespread agreement of interested groups has been secured. That support certainly is not universal, but there is now clear majority acceptance; and I will go into some detail of that matter in a few moments. Before doing so, I believe I should make this preliminary point: This Bill represents a major and very important part of the Government's legislative programme. To frustrate it, as the carriage of the amendment will do, will raise serious wider questions as well as constitute a drastic blow to the prospects of better land management in this State.

I hope that members will not accept that the accuracy, relevance, or persuasiveness of an argument is necessarily in proportion to its length. I believe this debate illustrates the opposite. The speeches by Opposition members have been very long, but their accuracy and relevance have been very light on. It may well be that members opposite have now closed their minds to the issues and will perceive this amendment as a way to put off the day of actually making a decision. I say that to carry the amendment is to make a decision—a decision not only on this Bill but on the extent to which this House will now go in frustrating the programme of the elected Government.

In the hope that at least some members opposite have not closed their minds to the merits of the Bill, I propose to deal in some detail with the reservations and the arguments that have been raised in the course of debate.

I refer in the first place to the claim that there has not been effective community consultation on this Bill and that there is major opposition to it. Of course, the Government accepts that there has been opposition to the Bill and to the report of the task force. That is hardly surprising. When any change is proposed, let alone a major change of this nature, there is nearly always some section of the community which will see a reason that the change should not occur. However, the Government completely rejects the proposition that there has not been widespread consultation through the period which has led to the presentation of the Bill to the Parliament.

We say, with confidence based on the facts, that criticisms of the Bill have been adequately explained and that there is not, in fact, any significant group with a cogent argument against the Bill. The Opposition's claim that there has been inadequate public consultation is simply wrong. The truth is that the task force carried out the most comprehensive review of land resource management ever undertaken in this State. It involved extensive and intensive consultation with members of the community, industry, local authorities, and Government agencies. For example, the task force met more than 80 different groups and individuals during the time the report was being developed. Three major workshops were held in country areas to discuss land resource management. An interim report was produced so that the public could respond to the general concepts being developed before final recommendations were made to the Government. The task force received and considered more than 200 written submissions. Copies of the task force report were sent to all local authorities throughout the State and to every individual and organisation that had made a sub-

mission or attended a workshop. Copies have been made freely available to all interested members of the public.

Following the adoption by the Government of the recommendations of the task force, all local authorities were sent two letters by the Premier outlining the general principles that the Government adopted and inviting submissions to the implementation group which was formed to carry forward the Government's decision. During the period in which the implementation group has been working, opportunity has been given for any individual agency, local authority, community group, or person to make submissions to the implementation group; and many have. The implementation group consisted of four senior public servants, and in addition there was extensive consultation with a large number of public servants in each of the component agencies. The consultation was on aspects of the legislation and on the future administrative requirements of the proposed department. For example, the implementation group had reporting to it 14 different working groups composed of representatives from the component agencies, each dealing with specific aspects of land management.

It has been suggested by some people that the response to the interim report of the task force is indicative of opposition to the final recommendations as accepted by the Government. This fails to acknowledge that the idea of producing an interim report was to seek an input from the public and, where possible, to incorporate their responses into the final report. In fact, a large number of the recommendations and suggestions which were made in response to the interim report have been incorporated into the final report and into the Bill which is now before us.

Following the adoption in principle of the final report by the Government, there has been ample opportunity for further consultation and submissions to the Government. Contrary to what has been suggested, relatively few further objections have been lodged. I refer firstly to the response of local authorities. An overwhelming majority of the responses received have been supportive of the Bill. It would be well for me to quote from a copy of a letter which the Premier received, and which constituted a response from the Local Government Association to a letter from the member for Vasse. The letter reads as follows—

I note your point about the "marriage" of forest resource and conservation being difficult to achieve and administratively unwieldy. This observation has been made on a broader scale but I must admit that currently we have a very adhoc and fragmented approach to the

aspect of (public) land management in WA. Various Government departments are convinced that they have more control than the other over public land and often when it comes to local government, we find ourselves to be the poor relation of them all. The co-ordinated approach which the legislation hopes to achieve does seem to be a step in the right direction. The conflict that may exist between the forest and conservation aspects is something that I am not qualified to make detailed comment on, however, my dealings with the Forests Department in the past have left me with the view that they seem to be a fairly responsible and professional group of people. Conversely my impressions of the conservation fraternity is somewhat opposite.

I refer as well, and more specifically, to the position of the Manjimup Shire Council. Hon. Sandy Lewis suggested that, in some way, the Government has not fulfilled its undertaking to that council to incorporate amendments to the Bill that the council had proposed. That is simply not so.

For the information of members, I propose to give a short history of the Government's negotiations with the shire. This will indicate the factual position. In such a case, detail is required because Manjimup will be a key area of responsibility for the proposed new department. Obviously the Government would have been concerned if the council had maintained its earlier objections to the Conservation and Land Management Bill.

In fact, even the council's early reservations were limited. The truth is that ever since the concept of an integrated land management department was proposed, the council has indicated to the Premier that it supports the concept in principle. Reasonably, however, the council raised a number of questions about the Bill, questions which it believed required further explanation before the council could be expected to support the Bill.

In a letter to the Premier dated 8 October, the Manjimup Shire Council again expressed general support for the concept of an integrated land management department; the council indicated a number of areas of concern and asked the Government for clarification. The Government responded to that letter on 9 October, and it agreed to accept a number of amendments relating primarily to improving liaison with local authorities. On 16 October, the Premier received a reply from the president of the shire, a letter which indicated that although the president could not speak for the whole council, he anticipated that the council would have no objections to the Bill because the

Premier's letter of explanation had been very comprehensive and satisfactory.

On Thursday, 25 October, at a special meeting of the Manjimup Shire Council, the council formally gave its support to the Conservation and Land Management Bill. On 1 November, the Clerk of the Shire of Manjimup wrote to the Premier confirming the council's support for the Bill, with the qualification that the Government should honour its commitment to allocate additional resources for effective land management, and to incorporate in the Bill amendments that were agreed to in the Premier's letter of 9 October.

If members examine the amendments that were agreed to by the Government, and if they compare them with the Bill as amended, they will see that all of the amendments which the Government agreed to incorporate have been incorporated. Further, with respect to the council's reference to the Government's commitment to allocate additional resources for effective land management, I can assure members that this undertaking has been honoured as well.

Considering the significance of the Manjimup region and the implications of this Bill for the region, it will also interest members to know that not only did the council as such formally endorse the Government's proposed legislation, but also, during the Premier's meeting with the shire on Saturday, 27 October, the Bill was supported by Mr Ross Young, a previous Liberal candidate for the seat of Warren, and Mr Dave Baylonne, a senior staff member of the major milling company in the Manjimup region. Members will surely accept that it is very significant that the local authority in the heart of the area which Hon. Sandy Lewis represents has given its support for the legislation in this way.

For the further information of honourable members, I seek leave to table the letters of 8 and 9 October and 1 November, to which I previously referred.

Leave granted.

The letters were tabled (see paper No. 275).

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: It is freely acknowledged that the Government has received a number of objections to this Bill. Hon. Vic Ferry read a letter from Professor Webb and Mr Harris. Their main objection to the Government's proposal was not to the Conservation and Land Management Bill, but it arose from their understanding that the proposals to form a land resource policy council had not been acted upon. When the Premier responded to the two gentlemen, explaining that the Government was in fact setting

up the land resource policy council, the main reason for their concern was removed.

In effect, in their most recent letter to the Premier their only complaint was that the land resource policy council should be a statutory authority. The Premier responded to explain why this would not be desirable. It is also true to say that at various stages over the past several months the Conservation Council, which represents a large body of conservation interests in this State—41 groups in all—has objected to various aspects of the Bill. The Premier's latest advice from the Conservation Council, however, is that it has withdrawn its objection to the Bill because, although it still has some concern with it, it accepts that there are a number of very positive initiatives in the Bill which would be of considerable benefit to conservation. It has chosen to adopt a positive approach and has submitted a number of suggested amendments to the Government for incorporation into the Bill. A number of these amendments were accepted by the Government and were incorporated in the Bill during the Committee stage in the Legislative Assembly.

True enough, some sections of the conservation movement remain opposed to the Bill. They have summarised their reasons in a letter which Hon. Vic Ferry read last night during his contribution to the second reading debate. In a few moments I will deal with those reasons, but I think I should mention here that it is quite evident from the letter signed by Caroline Hooper, on behalf of seven of those 41 groups in the Conservation Council, that their principal objections to the Bill are that the incorporation of the Forests Department in the new department would be undesirable for conservation. She gives the following reason—

Foresters, with their specific training in production forestry, are inadequately prepared to manage national parks and wildlife reserves.

I merely make the observation at this point, and I will elaborate on it in a moment, that this proposition is quite contrary to the views expressed by a number of Opposition speakers who have strongly supported the Forests Department, particularly with respect to its success in working in wildlife management and research.

Coincidentally, there appeared in this morning's *The West Australian* an article which explains some of the excellent research which has been carried out by the Forests Department in the Manjimup area. This work was also referred to by Hon. Bill Stretch during last night's debate.

In summary, I do not believe that the Opposition's claim of ineffective consultation or hasty

or inadequate review can be substantiated by any reasonable judgment. No justification exists for delaying the Bill on that score; and the Government cannot accept that proposal.

Finally, in this respect it might be recalled that as recently as last night Hon. Vic Ferry, in leading for the Opposition, acknowledged that the task force work was very comprehensively and professionally carried out. In addition, there have been at least 13 reports on land use planning or land use management over the last nine or 10 years, and although some of the recommendations of these reports have been implemented, a large proportion of them have simply been put on the shelf and forgotten. It is reasonable in the Government's view that we start to act on them now.

I move to the need for extra resources in management and the Government's response to it. On one issue at least there is certainly no disagreement. All members acknowledge that there is a pressing need to increase and improve the resources which are available for public land management. This problem was certainly identified in the report of the Select Committee on National Parks, chaired by Hon. A. A. Lewis. Particularly those members who represent country electorates will know that unless we specifically increase our commitment to public lands, those lands will be subject to severe degradation. Those members will also know that lack of management of public lands has very deleterious effects on adjacent privately-owned land.

At an early stage of the review by the task force on land resource management, the Premier made a commitment that a substantial increase in resources would be made available to public land management agencies. His only qualification was that before the Government could commit these additional resources it was essential that the extra taxpayers' money involved should be spent in the most efficient way. That, Mr MacKinnon, is not a threat. It represents the view of the Government that if substantial additional commitments are to be made they should only be applied in the most efficient way. In any event, the commitment to additional resources has already been met. Provision has been made in the current Budget for an additional 73 staff positions for the proposed Department of Conservation and Land Management at a part-year cost of \$638 000. An additional \$530 000 has been allocated for the part-year component of operating costs which is over and above the increased allocations which have been made to component agencies. A large number of the additional staff positions are proposed to be allocated to country areas to enable the staff to be familiar with the regional system of management,

which is an important feature of the new department.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I suggested that two years ago when you were debating long and hard, trying to convince us it was a threat.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I am labouring neither hard nor long to convince Mr MacKinnon it is not a threat. I am simply giving him the facts. The facts are that State finances are sufficiently constrained to require us, in moving to extra commitments, to make sure that they are spent in the best way possible. That is the extent of our commitment which we have already moved to meet by the proposed allocation in the current Budget.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You would accept my interjection as being factual?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I do not have a memory as long as Mr MacKinnon's. My main interest is in looking to the future. In addition to the commitment for additional staff and operating costs amounting to something of the order of \$1.2 million to which I have already referred, an additional \$2.6 million of the capital vote is proposed to be made available to the new department for vehicle purchases, accommodation, and nature reserve and park management programmes. The Budget provides \$1 219 000 for national park management, which is an increase of 29 per cent on the 1983-84 allocation. It provides \$367 000 for nature reserve management, an increase of 145 per cent. The capital works Budget allocation for the Forests Department has been increased by 39 per cent over the 1983-84 level.

In summary, the Government has clearly fulfilled its commitment to increased funding for public land management. It remains committed, however, to ensuring that the most effective use is made of the extra resources that these funds should provide.

I turn now to the question of the relative efficiency of the existing and proposed new departments. A number of Opposition members have questioned whether the new department will in fact be more efficient and suggested that the current situation was not as bad as has sometimes been suggested. I emphasise the point that was made during the second reading stage that the Government is not criticising the Public Service and the existing agencies for the inefficiency and duplication which now occur.

The problems with the existing arrangements are not with the individuals who make up the organisations but with the system within which they are required to function.

I repeat what has been said by the Premier and the task force on land resource management, that

although inefficiencies and duplications exist currently, the problem in many situations is that resources are so inadequate that duplication is not possible. The Government is really concerned about the fact that additional resources, if committed to land management under the existing system, have a serious potential for excessive duplication and, consequently, a waste of taxpayers' funds. It is pointless for me to repeat the examples cited during the second reading debate to illustrate the inadequacies of the current situation.

I would like to indicate instead how the new department will be able to make more efficient use of its resources and undertake a number of exciting initiatives which would be difficult to mount if the status quo were to be maintained. One important feature of the Bill is its provision for land management planning, a concept which I believe is supported by Hon. Sandy Lewis. It would be almost impossible to form an effective land management planning unit without amalgamating the three agencies. The reason is that such a unit must have access to a number of scientists and managers of land management disciplines. To be effective, the unit must have access to services such as a strong information division to ensure effective public participation in public land management planning and an inventory and land mapping service. At the very minimum, to provide a functional land management planning unit, at least five professional staff are required and an equal number of support staff. To provide such a unit for each of the component agencies proposed for the new department would be extremely expensive, yet with the provisions in the Budget for additional staff, together with the existing staff of component agencies, it would be possible to establish such a unit early in the new year.

An important initiative the Government will be able to implement is the setting up of a regional system for public land management throughout the State. Currently, the situation at Karratha, for example, is that there is one representative of each of the three component agencies of the new department. Each one does an excellent job but is constrained by interdepartmental barriers. For example, they operate three different radio systems which are incompatible. In the allocation of staff to the new department, 19 will be allocated to regions throughout the State. The system involves the establishment of 10 regions with a regional manager responsible for public land management in each region.

Each region will have considerable autonomy but, in the amalgamated department, will have access to all the services that are essential for land

management. Under the existing arrangement, to take another example, the national parks service has one officer to provide information brochures for all national parks throughout the State. In the proposed department there will be an information division of 20 which means that each of the regions will have access to a professional information service. Similarly, the regions will have access to a range of other services which can only be provided by a larger organisation. An integrated department will permit the exchange of resources between regions in accordance with demands for a particular service.

Currently the Forests Department has nine aircraft which are used for fire detection in the south-west during the summer months, but are basically grounded during the winter months. Under the proposed new arrangements, it would be possible to relocate some of those aircraft to northern regions of the State where the fire season is different.

Hon. Bill Stretch and Hon. Sandy Lewis obviously have a special interest in the lower south-west, and I believe it is appropriate that I should give a specific example of how the system of regional development proposed for the new department will be much more efficient than the existing arrangements. The existing arrangements for the national parks service is that a superintendent of national parks based at Albany has responsibility extending from Bunbury to the South Australian border. Clearly, that is a ridiculous situation. No matter how dedicated, no person can possibly adequately provide supervision for national parks staff over that region. Provision has been made in the Budget for the appointment of national parks superintendents at Bunbury and Manjimup, who will form part of the two regional management groups. A separate region will be based at Albany to service national parks on the south coast to the east of Albany.

Another initiative the Government will be undertaking if the new department is formed is to substantially upgrade training opportunities for field staff. Currently there is only one training officer in the national parks service. Although she does an excellent job, clearly she faces an impossible task because she is responsible for the training of more than 70 national parks rangers. The Government proposes to upgrade national parks ranger training and establish an Aboriginal national parks ranger training scheme. It would be possible to allocate a large number of additional staff to the National Parks Authority to upgrade the training facility in that organisation. That, however would be very wasteful because the Forests Department already has a first-class training

system which, with a small addition of resources, can accommodate a vastly improved national parks ranger training system.

Another simple example will illustrate the cost advantages which will result from the proposed amalgamation. Currently no facility exists for mapping and inventory in the wildlife section of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife and the national parks service. To provide an efficient service to either of those agencies or an amalgamation of the two would involve an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars. By incorporating the Forests Department in the new department, it will be possible to provide a first-class inventory and mapping service throughout the State with relatively small additions of resources to the inventory and mapping unit which already exists in the Forests Department.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why not use existing mapping services?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: A range of services can be provided from the integrated department which it would not be possible to provide from the single existing agencies without large expenditure. Aerial photographic detection services, computing services, mechanical service divisions, training systems, and accounting and auditing systems are all services which can only be provided efficiently if the organisation is of sufficient size to justify their formation.

There are many other examples of how the Government's proposals will ensure more efficient use of taxpayers' funds, but I believe I have provided sufficient to answer the Opposition's demand that the Government should demonstrate that its proposals are cost effective. It has been proposed that better co-ordination could be achieved simply by interagency agreements between agencies. If I heard Hon. Graham MacKinnon's interjection a moment ago, it was somewhat to that effect. I am aware such agreements exist and that some do work, but one would have to ask this question: If it is practicable to achieve better co-ordination by interagency agreements, why has this not been achieved in the past?

The simple fact is, and members such as Hon. Graham MacKinnon who have had ministerial responsibility will understand, that interdepartmental barriers are quite strong. In practice it is very difficult to achieve the degree of integration that is necessary while there are separate agencies. That remains true even where they have similar functions.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon interjected.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: In those areas of land management the problems to which the Govern-

ment is now addressing itself have been recognised for years, and they have never been overcome.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Everything you have said could be chopped off like that with a change of Treasurer; make no mistake about that. A change in the Ministry and the Treasury and all the things you are talking about will go like that—the whole lot with one stroke of the pen. You know that.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I guess it is always simpler, and I have shared this experience, to find easy solutions when in Opposition. The honourable member has been in Government, the honourable member has been a Minister, and the honourable member was a member of Cabinets which received most of the 13 earlier reports to which I referred and none of which addressed themselves to providing the same easy solution which he now says is available to us.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There were other urgencies. It is a simple as that.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Concern has been expressed by some speakers as to the size and structure of the proposed Department of Conservation and Land Management. These concerns have been encapsulated in the use of the term by some members of "megadepartment".

The facts are that the new department will have a Public Service staff of 635 and a wages staff of 736; that is, a total staff of approximately 1 400. By any standards it is not a large organisation if it is compared with similar organisations, whether in the public or private sector, which have comparable functions and responsibilities.

There has been some suggestion that the structure and organisation of the new department as proposed is unwieldy and, in fact, unworkable. The structure which has been proposed and which is outlined in the circulated explanatory notes has been devised by a number of senior public servants and has been approved by the Public Service Board which specialises in questions of organisational structure within the Government service.

I do not intend to discuss the structure and organisation in detail, but I do make the following points which may allay members' concerns. The structure provides a real opportunity for public input into public land management via the council, the authority, the commission, and the land management planning process. The Government is committed to this and believes it is an important means by which public controversy over public land management can be reduced.

I stress, however, that the Bill clearly identifies the roles of the policy-forming bodies as policy

formulation so that management is strictly the preserve of the department. This avoids a situation whereby the department becomes unworkable because its day-to-day operations are, in effect, controlled by committees.

Another important feature of the new department is the corporate system of management. This is a system which is gradually being introduced by the Public Service Board to a number of departments and agencies. It is analogous in many respects to a board of directors concept in private industry. In the department the executive director, general manager, the three policy directors, and the director of research form the department's policy body. In effect this system of management has been practised for some time in the Forests Department which, although it does not have a formal corporate group, does have a senior policy formulation group.

Another feature of the department is the clear separation of the implementation and the policy formulation wings. This does not mean that there is close interaction between the two. What it does do is ensure that there is a clear line of command, once the policy has been formulated, to the field staff.

I have already mentioned the regional system of management which will be incorporated into the department. The Government believes that this system of management is absolutely essential in a State the size of Western Australia and is particularly appropriate to a land management agency.

Finally, one of the important advantages of the organisation that is proposed for the new department is that it will result in minimal disruption to existing arrangements. The regional system of management can be easily established because there are already staff from each of the agencies in the proposed regions.

The services and administrative divisions of the department can be formed with minimal disruption, thus the only major change to existing arrangements is the creation of the policy formulation bodies and the corporate system of management.

As I have already indicated, this corporate system already exists in the Forests Department and is a system which is being introduced into a number of other Government agencies.

I now turn to what might be regarded as the schizophrenic attitude of the Opposition towards the role of the Forests Department. The Opposition collectively, to summarise this problem, has been unable to decide whether this is a measure which will lead to the aggrandisement of the Forests Department or to its decimation.

One of the major causes of concern expressed by the Opposition and also by some sections of the conservation movement is the Government's proposal to include the Forests Department in the new organisation. On the one hand, it is suggested that the Bill will decimate the Forests Department. On the other hand it is claimed also, particularly by some conservationist groups, that inclusion of the Forests Department in the new department will enhance the position of foresters by giving them control over national parks and wildlife conservation.

The Government rejects any suggestion that its proposals will have an adverse effect on the members of the Forests Department or on the security of tenure and purpose of State forests.

It is not surprising that the legislation and administrative arrangements that have been developed for the new department pay particular attention to both forest management and the Forests Department's staff, because the previous Deputy Conservator of Forests, Mr Frank Campbell, and the current President of the Institute of Foresters, Mr Underwood, played a key role in developing the legislation and the administrative structure.

In addition, Mr Bruce Beggs, the previous Conservator of Forests, has been in close consultation with the public servants who drafted the Bill and he has indicated his support for it. As well, the Forests Department played a major role in drafting the legislation and closely examined the final draft of the Bill and has indicated its satisfaction with it.

The legislation incorporates large sections of the Forests Act unchanged, and the structure of the new department has been modelled on that of the Forests Department.

Some mention has been made of the removal of the position carrying the title of "Conservator of Forests" from the new department. Obviously it would be inappropriate to retain that title in the new organisation which has a much broader land management responsibility than forests. The existing legislative provisions for the appointment and conditions of appointment of the executive director are precisely those which were in the Forests Act for the appointment of the Conservator of Forests. Every other single clause in the Forests Act, which was designed to protect State forests, has been incorporated in the legislation. I believe the point made by Hon. Vic Ferry was that the new director of forests will not have the same authority as the conservator does now. The true comparison is not between the director of forests and the conservator, but between the executive director of the department and the conservator.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: I think that if you look at my speech you will find that is what I said.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I am subject to correction. I understood Hon. Vic Ferry to refer only to the director of forests.

In fact, one could argue that the security and tenure of State forests is improved because of the creation of two bodies which have specific responsibility to ensure that State forests are protected; that is, the Lands and Forest Commission and the executive director of the department.

In addition, the legislation under the management plan section lays down clearly the objectives of management for the forests—objectives which have been constructed to ensure that State forests are managed in perpetuity for the benefit of all Western Australians.

It is impossible to reconcile the Opposition's strong support for the Forests Department with its statements that the incorporation of the Forests Department and the amalgamated agencies will have an adverse effect on conservation and national park management.

It is also very difficult to accept the Opposition's argument that it is unwise and impracticable to link in the same department a production function and a conservation function. It was to the credit of the previous Government that it endorsed the Forests Department's policy of multiple use in State forests some eight years ago. As a result of the endorsement of that policy and the support of the previous Government for it, the Forests Department has successfully undertaken a full range of land management functions including conservation, recreation, and production with, as I would expect the Opposition to agree, substantial success.

One specific example to which I have already referred is how the department has successfully combined its production and conservation functions in its wildlife research unit based at Manjimup. This has an international reputation. Members who visit State forest areas will also be aware of the excellent work that the department has done in providing recreation facilities in State forests. How then do we reconcile the proposition that marrying the interests of production and conservation is unsound, when there would be general agreement from all members that the Forests Department has successfully done this for a number of years?

There has been some suggestion that while the Forests Department has succeeded with its multiple-use policy in the south-west, it is inappropriate to extend that policy to the rest of the State.

Again, the facts are that the Forests Department already has staff in Kununurra, Broome, Karratha, Narrogin, Kalgoorlie, and Esperance. In effect, the embryo of the proposed department of conservation and land management is already in existence.

Some concern has been expressed regarding fire management in the new agency if the Forests Department were included. The truth is that fire is a most important factor affecting land management in Western Australia. In the absence of fire management, as is the case, for example, in some national parks, the fire regime which results is highly undesirable for the parks. For example, it is not unusual for the Stirling Range National Park to have half of its area burned every two or three years. By linking up what all members would agree is the superb system of fire detection and management of the Forests Department with that of national parks and wildlife services, it should be possible to ensure that the fire management regime of national parks and nature reserves is compatible with the objectives of management for those areas. The advantages to adjoining landowners as well will be rather obvious.

In summary, there is simply no rational argument against including the Forests Department in the amalgamated agency. It does not represent an attack on the forests or the Forests Department. If we accept the Opposition's proposition that one cannot include production and conservation functions in the same agency, then we would have to conclude that we should also support proposals put forward by the conservation movement to remove from the control of the Forests Department areas of State forests set aside for conservation.

I move now to the question of the effect on local government. Contrary to what has been suggested, this Bill is of considerable benefit to local authorities, and this is reflected in the support which the Government has received from such bodies as the Shire of Manjimup.

For the first time local government bodies will be able to participate in land management policy formulation on public land in their shires. This will be possible because of the Bill's provision for statutory input into the land management planning process. A shire like Manjimup, which has only 17 per cent of its land in private ownership, will be able to influence land management practices in the large proportion of the shire held in public ownership. Improved co-ordination of public land management and the management of public lands because of greater efficiency and increased resources will be of marked benefit to local government.

The regional system of management of this department will also be of considerable benefit to local authorities because it will mean that the department will be very responsive to local issues.

This Bill also offers significant advantages to the timber industry. For the first time that industry will have a formal mechanism to contribute to forest land management policy by way of the Forest Production Council. There will be minimal disruption to existing arrangements which operate in the department and which affect the timber industry.

The regional system of management and specialised conservation divisions proposed for the new department are identical to those which operate in the Forests Department. One very significant benefit of this Bill for the timber industry is in the clauses relating to the issue of permits and licences to the industry. Under current arrangements the industry is inhibited from making long-term investments in timber mills and utilisation research simply because it does not have long-term tenure over forest areas. For the first time this Bill will permit contracts with a term of 20 years to be drawn up between the industry and the new department. This will remove a major disincentive to invest in the processing and marketing of timber products.

The Premier has also indicated to the timber industry that the Government intends to establish a timber bureau in the Department of Premier and Cabinet, which will primarily be concerned with developing commercial aspects of the timber industry and will provide that industry with a direct line to the Premier and Cabinet.

I conclude with some brief answers to specific queries raised by Opposition speakers. In the first place the Bill does not change the tenure or vesting of any public land in Western Australia. The Bill does not have any impact or effect on owners or operators of private land. The Bill simply provides for private owners or local authorities to use the services of the department if they are required. The Bill does not in any way affect land-use planning on any other area of land outside the public sector.

Some members have confused the recommendations of the task force on land use planning with those relating to public land management. The task force recommended that its suggestions on land use planning be referred to the committee of statutory inquiry. That inquiry has been proceeding.

It has been suggested by a number of members that the Government has pre-empted the Parliament by proceeding with plans for the new depart-

ment. The Government would be culpable if it did not take steps to ensure that if the Bill were passed the new department could be formed without further delay. That is all that has been done.

The Opposition has suggested that the Government's proposals have created uncertainty in the Public Service. It is precisely because the Government wishes to minimise the uncertainty that public servants undoubtedly feel that it has established an implementation group to plan the formation of the new department.

I can say quite specifically, and I do this for the benefit of Hon. Graham MacKinnon in particular, that no appointments have been made to the new department, simply because it does not exist. Although it is true that a number of public servants have been working on administrative arrangements for the new department, no action has been taken which is irrevocable.

Given the length of the debate on this matter, it will be understandable if, in spite of the unusual lengths to which I have gone on this occasion, I have not been able to cover every single matter raised by honourable members. Nonetheless, I believe that the facts which I have presented speak for themselves. They point to the extent to which the Bill is based on thorough research, on extensive consultation, and on a very precise understanding both of the weaknesses of the current system and the advantages which the Bill has to offer.

I conclude on the same point as that on which I started. The amendment seeks to delay this Bill for no purpose other than in the interests of delay itself.

The delay is not necessary; it is not justified; and it would constitute a most serious frustration and obstruction of the Government's legislative programme. The delay is totally unacceptable to the Government, and I urge the House to reject it.

HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [11.00 p.m.]: I support the motion before the Chair, and I assure the Attorney that I certainly have not closed my mind to the proposition of the subject matter before the House. As I said in the second reading debate, it is one thing for the task force's report to be published, for many to be in favour of it, and for most to agree that it was a reasonable report. However, subsequent to that report we have had the presentation of a Bill to the Parliament. It is always the case that the Bill and the words it contains are what matters, and that is what concerns the members of this House. It is the effect of the Bill and the law, if it is passed as a Statute, that really matter.

Despite what the Attorney has just told the House, many local authorities, organisations, and individuals in this State—I will not go through them, although I have a number of them on file—are extremely concerned at the way in which the proposal will operate and they want the opportunity to be provided for the proposition to be examined further.

We have not been told in the Attorney's contribution, to my satisfaction at least—he has not been able to tell us, because the Government has not yet formalised its ideas—what further changes will be made to other Government agencies. As I mentioned last night, this Bill is a platform from which other things will be launched, and we have not yet been satisfied as to what those changes might be.

There is no indication as to exactly what is in the mind of the Government in this area of uncertainty. In view of the importance of the matters relevant to the Bill, as acknowledged by the Attorney, it is fair and reasonable that it should be subject to further scrutiny in the public arena before it is returned to Parliament for consideration.

One point which stands out very clearly is that the Bill provides a greater risk and greater opportunity for political interference in the good management of resources in this State. Under the present system, there are checks and balances which are not perfect, but they have certainly worked in the past and they are still working. There is no surety that the Bill in its present form will continue to provide those checks and balances, and I support the proposal put forward by Hon. A. A. Lewis.

HON. W. N. STRETCH (Lower Central) [11.04 p.m.]: I also support the amendment moved by Hon. A. A. Lewis to delete the words after the word "That". I take great exception to the Attorney General's facile dismissal of my contribution to this debate as being obstructive and too long. I assure him on that point that I only used about half the available material that was very relevant to the future of the forest industries. That is why I rise to defend the situation we have and support this amendment.

I took that stance, and I take this stance on the amendment, because I sincerely believe that the forest industries will not be best served by this amalgamation. I believe the forest industries are most important and fragile, and they should not be buried as they will be under this proposal.

In his summing up, the Attorney General put forward a very good argument for the status quo. He pointed out, as I pointed out in my second reading speech—and I thank him for repeating

much of it—that the Forests Department is already doing the things that he outlined. In fact the article in *The West Australian* on the Perup fauna reserve could have been an expansion of the remarks I made last night. The recreation reserves are being looked after very well under the revolving MPA system and, as the Attorney General pointed out, they are working extremely well.

The Attorney General highlighted the shortage of funds to the national parks management. That is something which all members of this House mentioned in speaking to this debate. We know there is a crying need for more people in national parks. We know there are difficulties with fire control in areas such as the Stirling Range National Park. We have seen it, and I mentioned it last night in respect of Cape Arid and the big reserve in the Encabba area where bad fires were experienced. We know these things. We pointed them out, but they do not represent a problem which will be solved by this amalgamation. As the Attorney so rightly said, it will be solved by allocations of money and staff. Therefore, these words should be deleted, because the Bill in its present form will do nothing for the long-term future of this industry.

I also urge the Attorney to read a small book by a gentleman called Robert Townshend, which goes by the enigmatic title of *Up the Organisation*. If the Attorney looks at that, he will see how fallacious the management structure set out for this department will be.

I will not attempt to paraphrase that excellent article except to say that the more little boxes we have, the more confusing and the less efficient our operation becomes. Anyone who has run his own business knows that the more boxes we have, the less effect and effort one gets out of the last little box. It just does not work like that. It might look great on paper, but I assure the Attorney that, in an emergency situation such as fire control, it does not matter how many boxes we have: we will not get the fire out any quicker. In fact we will get overlapping of authority and bigger problems.

I purposely did not refer to the Manjimup Shire, although, as its local member, I have been closely involved with its negotiations. I accept that the Manjimup Shire now supports this Bill. In doing so, I believe that, in its negotiations with the Premier, it has achieved great benefits for the Manjimup district. As the Attorney General pointed out, the Manjimup district's great difficulty was the shortage of rateable agricultural land in the shire, which amounted to 17 per cent. I did not know the figure was as high as that. I thought it was between 14 and 16 per cent.

However, as a result of the shire's negotiations with the Burke Government, it has forced a concession of 7 500 hectares of land to be released for agricultural purposes. In return the shire is prepared to support the surrender of 750 hectares of land for the planting of pine. That is a good deal. I congratulate the shire on it and the Premier has stood by his commitment to meet his side of the bargain in getting the shire's support for the Bill.

I believe we have a long-term duty to the Forests Department and our electorate. I am not doing this for political reasons or to be obstructive, as I said earlier. The very thinly veiled threats made by the Attorney General were out of character and probably out of place. We are aware of the difficulties that this may hold for the future. I for one do not shirk from that duty; our duty is to the forests in the area and their long-term future. The difficulties outlined by the Attorney General will be handled admirably by a Select Committee.

If the chosen people show the faith in their selection that Hon. A. A. Lewis will exercise, they can come up with excellent results and recommendations; and with the greatest deference to the gentlemen who formed the task force, I believe we can improve this Bill enormously. There are lots of simple things that need attention, and the structures are there now and are working well now. The Attorney General has given evidence of that in his summing up, in outlining the shortages in regard to national parks and the ability of the Forests Department to manage the many facets of its operations as it is now.

Therefore, I fully support the deletion of the words and the formation of a Select Committee.

Amendment (deletion of words) put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 14

Hon. C. J. Bell	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. Neil Oliver
Hon. Tom Knight	Hon. W. N. Stretch
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. P. H. Wells
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. John Williams
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. Margaret McAleer

(Teller)

Noes 9

Hon. J. M. Berinson	Hon. Mark Nevill
Hon. J. M. Brown	Hon. S. M. Piantadosi
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Tom Stephens
Hon. Kay Hallahan	Hon. Fred McKenzie
Hon. Robert Hetherington	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. D. J. Wordsworth	Hon. Peter Dowding
Hon. P. G. Pandal	Hon. D. K. Dans
Hon. P. H. Lockyer	Hon. Graham Edwards
Hon. I. G. Pratt	Hon. Garry Kelly

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I move an amendment—

Substitute the following for the words deleted—

the Conservation and Land Management Bill be referred to a select committee of 3 members having power to call for persons papers and records; to adjourn from place to place; to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and that a message be transmitted to the Legislative Assembly acquainting it that this House has referred the said Bill to a select committee and requesting the Assembly to appoint a like select committee with power to confer with the said committee of the Council, and that the committee report to this House not later than May 31 1985.

Amendment (substitution of words) put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 14

Hon. C. J. Bell	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. Neil Oliver
Hon. Tom Knight	Hon. W. N. Stretch
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. P. H. Wells
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. John Williams
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. Margaret McAleer

(Teller)

Noes 9

Hon. J. M. Berinson	Hon. Mark Nevill
Hon. J. M. Brown	Hon. S. M. Piantadosi
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Tom Stephens
Hon. Kay Hallahan	Hon. Fred McKenzie
Hon. Robert Hetherington	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. D. J. Wordsworth	Hon. Peter Dowding
Hon. P. G. Pandal	Hon. D. K. Dans
Hon. P. H. Lockyer	Hon. Graham Edwards
Hon. I. G. Pratt	Hon. Garry Kelly

Motion, as Amended

Question (motion, as amended) put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 14

Hon. C. J. Bell	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. Neil Oliver
Hon. Tom Knight	Hon. W. N. Stretch
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. P. H. Wells
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. John Williams
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. Margaret McAleer

(Teller)

Noes 9

Hon. J. M. Berinson	Hon. Mark Nevill
Hon. J. M. Brown	Hon. S. M. Piantadosi
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Tom Stephens
Hon. Kay Hallahan	Hon. Fred McKenzie
Hon. Robert Hetherington	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. D. J. Wordsworth	Hon. Peter Dowding
Hon. P. G. Pandal	Hon. D. K. Dans
Hon. P. H. Lockyer	Hon. Graham Edwards
Hon. I. G. Pratt	Hon. Garry Kelly

Question (motion, as amended) thus passed.

CREDIT UNIONS AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Message

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

BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Machinery Safety Amendment Bill.
 2. Construction Safety Amendment Bill.
- Bills returned from the Assembly without amendment.

STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), read a first time.

House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ENVIRONMENT: BUNGLE BUNGLE

Warmun Aboriginal Community

376. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Mr A. Tegg, an adviser to the Warmun Community at Turkey Creek and a member of the Bungle Bungle working group, together with Mr Raymond Wallaby, are in the process of moving building materials into the Bungle Bungle area?
- (2) If so, what is the purpose of this activity and does it have the Government's support?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I am advised that some sheets of iron will provide the people in the out-station with temporary shelter during the imminent wet season. Their intention is to remain in the area during the wet when the area is isolated. No permission was sought or given by the Government.

LAND: CROWN

Vacant

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

- (1) Will the Minister provide a map of Western Australia showing the vacant Crown land for which no public purpose has been allocated?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) For the reason similar to that set out in my response to question 363 of 30 October 1984; namely, that such a plan would require a manual assessment of some 3 904 public plans and related drafting and the task could not be cost justified.
- (b) The information is available at the public counter at the Lands and Surveys Department, where the public plans may be examined.

LAND: CROWN

Vacant

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

Further to my question 363 of Wednesday, 24 October 1984, will the Minister advise if there is a difference between vacant Crown land ("unallocated" Crown land) and vacant Crown land for which no public purpose has been allocated, and if so—

- (a) what is the difference; and
- (b) which land on the map he provided in response to my question 919 of 11 April 1984 is vacant Crown land for which no public purpose has been allocated?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (a) There is no difference;
- (b) all of it.

LAND: RESERVES

Abydos and Woodstock

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

What is the current status of the Woodstock and Abydos pastoral leases?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Abydos and Woodstock are not pastoral leases but are the subject of reserves 22626 and 22627 respectively, set aside for the purpose of "Preservation of Aboriginal Cultural Materials and Historic Buildings and Grazing" and vested in the control of the Western Australian Museum, with power to lease.

Both are protected areas under the Aboriginal Heritage Act.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Leonora

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

- (1) What is the current status of special grazing lease 332/1771 at Leonora?
- (2) Does Esso have permission to use this lease for the erection of buildings and plant associated with its harbour lights project at Leonora?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) It is a lease of reserve 23926 (Public Utility) comprising Malcolm Location 13 of 323.748 5 hectares granted to Keith Biggs of Leonora (Butcher) under section 32 of the Land Act, 1933-1972 for the purpose of "Grazing" for the term of one year at a rental of \$20 from 1 October 1975 and is subject to the following conditions—

- (a) The land shall not be used for any purpose other than Grazing without the prior approval in writing of the Minister for Lands and Surveys;
- (b) the lease shall be renewable at the will of the Minister for Lands and Surveys and subject to determination at three months' notice by either party after the initial term of one year. Should the lease be so renewed, the rental fixed may be reappraised at such amount as the Minister for Lands and Surveys may at any time and from time to time determine;
- (c) the lessee shall not cut down, fell, or destroy any living timber or scrub upon the demised land except for the purpose of destroying poisonous growth or by the agistment of stock in reasonable number;
- (d) compensation shall not be payable to the lessee in respect of any improvements effected by him on the demised land and remaining thereon at the expiration or earlier determination of the lease;
- (e) any person holding a miner's right shall have the right of entry at all times for the purpose of prospecting and pegging mining tenements on the land;
- (f) power is reserved to the Minister for Lands and Surveys to direct that the number of stock depasturing on the demised land shall be reduced if the Minister is of the opinion that the demised land is overstocked to an extent sufficient or likely to cause permanent damage to the land; failure to comply with any such direction will result in the forfeiture of the lease.

In accordance with condition (b), the lease term has been renewed to

30 September 1985 and the rental reappraised to \$50 per annum.

- (2) Yes, provided the company holds a mining tenement under provisions of the Mining Act over the land concerned.

EDUCATION: TERTIARY

WAIT: Geology Course

381. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of the expressions of concern from Western Australian Institute of Technology students and others over the status of the geology course on the WAIT campus?
- (2) Is it correct that the course is either to be discontinued or extensively restructured as a means of increasing student numbers at the School of Mines?
- (3) Would he comment on student claims to the effect that—
 - (a) the two courses are dissimilar; the School of Mines teaches "mining geology" whereas the Bentley campus is concerned with "exploration and applied geology";
 - (b) a highly successful course at Bentley should not be curtailed to prop up an undersubscribed one at Kalgoorlie;
 - (c) students at present are free to choose between the School of Mines and the Bentley course; this freedom should remain and there should be no compulsory transfer; and
 - (d) transfer of part of the course to Kalgoorlie would be educationally disruptive?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No decision has been taken to discontinue or extensively restructure the course.

In areas like geology which are subject to significant and rapid changes in the demand for graduates, it is important that ongoing efforts be directed at protecting the position of enrolled students and meeting the needs of Western Australia through high quality resource efficient courses, whether they be offered in Perth or country locations. In this context, I understand there have been some dis-

cussions within the Western Australian Institute of Technology. Should any specific proposals eventuate, the Government will examine them carefully.

- (3) (a) to (d) See (2) above

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION

Annual Report of Government

382. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Has the Premier ordered the printing and publication of 10 000 copies of an annual report either for the Department of Premier and Cabinet or the Government as a whole?
- (2) If so, why has this number of reports been requested?
- (3) What is the cost?
- (4) How many colours is the printing to involve?
- (5) Did he not instruct or request his Ministers last year to produce only black and white reports as a means of containing costs?
- (6) If so, what has prompted the publication of this glossy, multi-coloured report?
- (7) When was the printing order placed?
- (8) Is it to be done by the Government Printer or a private printer?
- (9) What is the requested completion date for the order?
- (10) Will overtime be involved in its publication?
- (11) If so, why?
- (12) Who is to receive the report—
 - (a) by mail; or
 - (b) by other means?
- (13) What is to be the total distribution cost?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (13) The Government is considering the production of an annual report for the Government as a whole.

While primarily decisions have been made in respect of a report, no final decision to proceed with the publication has been made.

If any decision to proceed is made, a copy of the publication will be provided to the member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: CANNING CITY COUNCIL

Deposit Legislation for Beverage Containers

383. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the Canning City Council's support for the introduction of deposit legislation for beverage containers in Western Australia?
- (2) Has the Government considered this matter yet?
- (3) If so, with what result?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) I understand the City of Canning has written to local members of Parliament supporting the introduction of deposit legislation following representations from the Marine Collectors Association.
- (2) and (3) The Government is presently considering the recent Victorian Government report which examined recycling alternatives related to beverage containers.

The adoption of a deposit scheme is one of the options being considered in the development of an effective waste recycling and management programme.

POLICE: HOUSEBREAKING

Victoria Park

384. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What statistics, if any, are available regarding the level of house breaking in the Victoria Park area in the past three years?
- (2) Will the Minister inform the House of any available statistics and particularly those which may indicate a dramatic increase in house breaking in this area?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Statistics are not available over this complete period.
- (2) Available statistics for the fiscal year 1982-83 record 491 instances. The fiscal year 1-7-83 to 30-6-84 records 702 instances. The period 1-7-84 to 31-10-84 reveals that 220 instances have occurred to date.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: HEIRISSON

ISLAND

Status

385. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Youth and Community Services with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Has any claim been made for Heirisson Island by people currently residing there?
- (2) If so, what is the nature of the claim?
- (3) What is the current status of the land which forms the island?
- (4) Does its category make it claimable by Aboriginal people under the terms of the legislation for land rights to be introduced by the State Government?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) As above.
- (3) It is a class-"A" public parks reserve.
- (4) No.

HEALTH: NURSING HOMES

Giles Report

386. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does the Minister support the conclusions contained in the Giles report on nursing homes?
- (2) If so, why?
- (3) Will he obtain from the Federal authorities a list of those nursing homes referred to in the report?
- (4) How many private nursing homes are there in Western Australia?
- (5) How many of these does his department believe provide the allegedly "appalling" conditions?
- (6) How many complaints has his department received in—
 - (a) 1980;
 - (b) 1981;
 - (c) 1982;
 - (d) 1983; and
 - (e) the first 10 months of 1984;
 regarding allegedly "appalling" conditions?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The report was only received by the Minister last Friday and the numerous recommendations are still being studied.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.
- (4) 107.
- (5) Nil.
- (6) (a) to (e) Complaints are received from time to time but not of a nature which could be described as "appalling", except for some recent allegations about the Hillview Nursing Home.

A number of complaints of this nature were made about Hillview, which is the subject of an inquiry by State and Commonwealth officers.

AGRICULTURE: PESTS

Wingless Grasshoppers

387. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What funds have been made available for research into wingless grasshoppers in this financial year?
- (2) What projects will benefit?
- (3) What funds have been allocated for the control of locusts in this year's Budget, and how will they be distributed?
- (4) Has an efficient bait been formulated for the control of wingless grasshoppers and, if so, will it be made available to farmers for use on their properties this season?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), what will be the cost to apply such baits and what plans for distribution have been made?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) \$18 800.
- (2) Further development of chemical baits for broad acre control and investigation of biological control using nematodes and a fly parasite.
- (3) The APB has allocated \$50 000 for locust control. Funds will be used to purchase chemicals for sale to farmers at a 50 per cent subsidy where locusts become a problem.
- (4) Yes.

The bait formula has been available to farmers for several years and has been widely used as a farmer-formulated product. The bait is not available commercially. A pilot plant suitable for com-

mercial bait formulation has been developed by the Department of Agriculture and will be used in 1984-85.

- (5) The bait is not yet available commercially.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING: UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Students

388. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) If a student fails to gain enough passes to retain TEAS allowances, yet still wishes to continue studying while on the dole, what conditions as regards hours of study are placed on him by the Department of Social Services?
- (2) Is it possible that eight hours a week would be considered as excessive and liable to interfere with a student's chances of seeking and applying for job vacancies?
- (3) If not, what hours of study at a tertiary institution are allowed?
- (4) Is a similar restriction placed upon hours spent surfing and on similar sports?
- (5) Do those on the dole have to account for their activities while enjoying unemployment benefits?
- (6) What encouragement is given to those lacking the necessary skills to gain employment so that they shall continue to study and improve their chances of employment?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (5) The matters raised by the member would appear to be more appropriately addressed to the Commonwealth Minister with responsibility for social security. I would suggest that the member direct these inquiries accordingly.
- (6) The member should perhaps note that this Government has never accepted that supply-side measures are substitutes for actual demand-generating policies. While acknowledging the prime responsibility of the Commonwealth for key aspects of economic policy, the recent State Budget is a clear illustration of this Government's commitment to a greater entrepreneurial role to secure economic and financial independence. That undertaking was set firmly within the Budget's principal themes of encouraging a higher level of economic activity

and stimulating employment. In this regard, I refer the member to the Premier's financial statement and in particular to my own statements, provided in this House, outlining significant proposals to increase employment opportunities for young West Australians.

To respond more directly to the issue raised, I would remind the member that the themes of increased school retention rates and tertiary education participation rates, and the relevance of schooling were the major focus of both the Beazley and MacGaw reports and I would refer the member to them and to subsequent Government actions.

If the member wishes to obtain a more detailed and comprehensive response to this question, then he may care to address his question to my colleague in another place, the Minister for Education.

SPORT AND RECREATION: CAMPS

Revenue

389. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) What income was derived from Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation camps for the financial year ended 30 June 1984?
- (2) Were these funds paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund?
- (3) If not, where were the funds disbursed?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Revenue derived from the Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation was \$481 061.91.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.

SUPERANNUATION

State Superannuation Fund

390. Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

If a contributor to the State Superannuation Fund with more than 30 years service elects to retire when his age is between 55 and 60 years, is the amount of his pension greater than it would be if he had only 30 years service?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

No. Service in excess of 30 years does not increase the pension.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Bunbury Study

391. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the survey conducted by the Transport Commission of WA into the bus services in the Bunbury area been completed?
- (2) If so, when will the report be available to the public?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The "Bunbury 2000" bus study—interim report has been completed.
- (2) Until such time as the Government has considered the findings of this report, I am unable to advise a date for release to the public.

HEALTH: HOSPITAL

Wooroloo: Closure

392. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

With reference to my question 300 of 17 October and parts (1) and (2) of question 349 of 24 October 1984—

- (1) Can the Minister explain why another member was given a detailed response to a question without notice on Thursday, 25 October, in the Legislative Assembly, to enable him to make public comment when I had been advised that the matter will take some months to negotiate?
- (2) Can the Minister explain why the information given to another member was not also advised to me, in view of my question 349 which was postponed until 30 October, yet the public comment referred to above was contained in a publication titled *Hills Gazette*, the deadline for Press releases being noon on Friday, 26 October?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The questions asked by the members sought different information. The information supplied is not conflicting.
- (2) The member is incorrect—the answer to his question was given on Thursday, 25 October 1984.

ROAD: MITCHELL FREEWAY

Land Fill

393. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What landfill was used for the Mitchell Freeway from blocks in the vicinity of Balcatta Road?
- (2) From what block was this land fill taken?
- (3) What type of fill was used and what was it used for?
- (4) What quantities of soil were taken from each block?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Other than some minor quantities, all landfill taken from the vicinity of Balcatta Road for the Mitchell Freeway was from property acquired for the freeway.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Material used included a mixture of sand and limestone which was used to form embankments and paving materials.
- (4) Separate quantities taken from each block have not been measured.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: ETU

Standover Tactics: F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty Ltd.

156. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Has he received a telex from F. R. Tulk and Co. Pty. Ltd. complaining of gross threats and coercion by the Electrical Trades Union and, in particular, by Mr Ken Richards representing the ETU?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Up until the time I left my office at 3.45 p.m., no.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: ETU

Standover Tactics: F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty Ltd.

157. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Was Mr Dans aware of the threats of standover tactics to the company prior to today, and what steps has he taken to protect that company and its employees?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I have no knowledge of the company Mr Masters is talking about. Certainly no reports have been received in my office, and no telex.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: ETU

Standover Tactics: F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty Ltd.

158. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

(1) Is it not true that on 19 July 1984 he met representatives of F. R. Tulk and Co. in his office with two of his staff, and that the standover tactics were discussed at that time?

(2) Is it a fact that this occurred, or has the Minister forgotten that meeting?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) and (2) Mr Masters constantly uses obscure words like "standover" and "threats". Yes, at that particular time we met with representatives of that company and a number of other companies' representatives and, as a result of some actions we took the problems they raised with us dissipated because we never heard of them again. Mr Masters asks me a question today, but it is now November. No, I have not heard from the company since that particular meeting in July.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: ETU

Standover Tactics: Mr Ken Richards

159. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

(1) Can the Minister remember whether he was advised at that meeting in his office on 19 July that Mr Ken Richards of the ETU addressed a meeting of employees at Tulk and Co. Pty. Ltd., in which he stated to a full meeting of the employees on that site: "Boys, you have a simple decision to make—union membership or no work"?

(2) Was he advised that that comment was made?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) and (2) No, I cannot recall that statement being made, but I will give the Leader of the Opposition a fuller answer tomorrow because a transcript of that meeting was kept, and no doubt it is still in my office. I have a very good memory, but I have probably had meetings with a couple of hundred people since July and I would not be able to give an honest answer to that particular question. There has been no further communication from that particular company or from any other company because the actions pursued by the ETU at that time were discontinued.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: ETU

Standover Tactics: Mr Gandini

160. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

The Minister said the action was discontinued. I wonder whether the Minister has been advised at some stage over recent days that Mr Gandini of the ETU is now in the north enforcing black bans on Tulk and Co., and saying that mining companies must not in any circumstances use that company's equipment or their facilities to repair that equipment?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

This is very tiring. The answer is "No".

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: ETU

Standover Tactics: Mr Gandini

161. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Bearing in mind that the Minister now recalls having met representatives of the company, is he aware that Tulk and Co. Pty. Ltd. is by far the largest company of its kind in Australia—I am sure he must have picked that up during the discussions—has the most advanced technology, and that more than 50 per cent of its business is in export from Western Australia, and that, the company must consider moving part of its business overseas if the ban is not lifted?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Let me make a short statement. If the particular firm to which Mr Masters is referring decides to go to the Minister for Industrial Relations and does not continue this conspiracy with the Opposition, a conspiracy which has been encouraged by the Opposition not to solve industrial disputes but to exacerbate them, we will do something about it.

Mr President, I have answered completely and honestly. Sure, we met representatives of this company last July. We did something about their problems. Since last July I have heard nothing from the company, and I certainly did not know Mr Gandini was in the north-west. I have no knowledge of Tulk and Co.'s moving business out of this State or any knowledge that it is the biggest company of its type—it has something to do with the wheels of trucks, I know. Let that company start using the Government and not the Opposition. If those people somehow or other think Labor should not be in office in this State, then let them use the Opposition. As long as they do, they will get no result. If they make a proper approach to the elected Government of this State, we will do something about it, as we did on 19 July.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DEPARTMENT

F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty Ltd.

162. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Will he make immediate contact with his department, his advisers, and his office to ask them why they have not drawn to his attention a telex to his office dated 5 November 1984 addressed to Mr Brian Burke, the Premier, the office of Mr D. K. Dans, Minister for Industrial Relations, from F. R. Tulk and Co. Pty. Ltd? There are two-and-a-half pages of telex which set out the full details. I find it extraordinary that the Minister does not have some knowledge of the matter.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Speech!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That company has not just come to him, it has come to the Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Speech!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I ask the Minister whether he will tan someone's backside for not bringing this to his attention, and

I am prepared to make details available to him and to the Press.

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

In answer once again, I have received no telex. I have no industrial advisers. The officers of the Department of Industrial Relations are competent, honest, and trustworthy. I will not receive the telex from Mr Masters because the Opposition—and it may as well get it into its head now—is simply not going to usurp the role of the Government. If this firm, or anyone else, wants to continue to use the Opposition as the *de facto* Government of this State, it will not get into the starter's hands.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: OPPOSITION

Role

163. Hon. I. G. PRATT, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Does he intend the Opposition to understand from his statement that members of the public should not approach properly elected members who happen to be in the Opposition with problems, and that problems will only be considered when they are directed to members of the Government?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

That is a pitiful question. I never made any such statement at all. Every member of the public can approach any member of Parliament whether he be a member of the Government or the Opposition. Mr Masters trots out this nonsense and he has been doing it repeatedly. There is no knowledge of this matter within my department and he has cast a slur on those competent officials of the department who worked for him.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: He wrote the telex!

Hon. D. K. DANS: When this telex comes to me I will act. If Mr Masters wants to discuss it with me when I get the telex, I will be only too pleased to do so and to co-operate with him or with anyone else in the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes.

That is not the purpose of his asking questions in this House. His purpose, and the majority of the business community knows it, is to exacerbate disputes because he belongs to an Opposition which is incompetent to a degree never seen

before in this State. It does not have a feather to fly with and is discredited in every corner of the State.

Government members: Hear, hear!

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DEPARTMENT

F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty Ltd.

164. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I regret that the Minister has become agitated over this matter, but I know he has the worst industrial record in Australia. I think he misunderstood my question.

I ask the Minister if he will contact the members of his department—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes, Mr Masters I will do that.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am not reflecting on the ability of the Minister's staff.

Will the Minister inquire from his staff why the telex which was sent to him and dated 5 November was not drawn to his attention?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member seems to be asking the same question. If it is the same question, he cannot ask it again irrespective of what answer he was given.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I thought that the Minister misunderstood my question because he did not answer it at all.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Minister for Planning keeps quiet when I am talking and leaves the running of this place to the proper authority, we will probably get somewhere. I am getting into enough trouble as it is without keeping track of what he is saying and what other members are saying.

The Leader of the Opposition has every right to ask questions without notice, as have other members, but there are some rules attached. As I said the other day, one of the important reasons for asking questions is to seek information, not to give it. Having sought the information once, a member cannot ask the same question again. It is clearly written in the Standing Orders.

I am not stopping the Leader of the Opposition from asking his question, and

incidentally, I do not want anyone to tell me how to interpret what is happening; but I am pointing out that if he is asking the same question it is out of order. If he is not, he is in order.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: When the Minister does receive the telex dated 5 November this year from F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty. Ltd. will he agree to meet with the company and contact it immediately about securing the jobs of the 106 employees of the company who are threatened with unemployment if the ETU proceeds with its campaign to put the company out of business?

Hon. D. K. Dans replied:

I do not think the Leader of the Opposition is with it. Obviously he has lost his script. I did answer his question before in which he gave me a clue as to why I have not received the telex. If he goes back to his script he will see that he commenced—

Hon. G. E. Masters: Would you like a copy?

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am trying to help the Leader of the Opposition and I would appreciate it if he would be silent. He said that the telex was sent to Mr Burke.

Hon. G. E. Masters: And to you.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am answering the question. The Leader of the Opposition said the telex was sent to Mr Burke and to the Minister. As the Leader of the Opposition is well aware, many telexes are sent to Mr Brian Burke with copies sent to the appropriate Minister. We have not got any such telex; and when it is referred to me I will bring the principals of the company into my office, as I did before.

I will look for the telex tomorrow, but it is probably somewhere in the Premier's department. It certainly is not in my office. I have received plenty of telexes and telegrams today and have seen many people about a whole range of things, but I have not received the telex to which the Leader of the Opposition refers.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Did you say that you cannot receive telexes in your office?

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. Dans: When I took over from Mr Masters as the Minister for Industrial Relations there was no telex ma-

chine in the office. I have not got a telex machine in my office. I have given the Leader of the Opposition a clue, which he gave to me about where the telex is. When I get hold of the telex I will get in touch with the company and talk to the principals of it and see what we can do as we did on 19 July, about the matter.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DEPARTMENT

F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty Ltd.

165. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

In view of the Minister's comment about telexes, would he advise the House the best way in which a company such as F. R. Tulk and Co. Pty. Ltd. can contact him if they cannot get a reaction by telephone or telex? This is a serious matter and in fairness to the company the Minister should advise the best way it can contact him.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

This is getting a little bit ridiculous. Mr Masters is now saying that if the company cannot contact me by telex—there is no telex in my office and there was not one there when he was in that portfolio. All it is a matter of picking up the telephone.

Mr Masters can tell the company to get in touch with my office by telephone tomorrow morning and I will arrange a meeting with them some time tomorrow.

When they come to my office I will tell them that if they want to do business with the Government, they should do it with the Government and not with the Opposition. By all means they can refer any matter they like to the Opposition, but there are always two sides to a story in regard to industrial problems.

If the Leader of the Opposition is thinking about usurping the role of Government, I suggest that he forgets about it because he will not get away with it.

This Government's record is extremely good and in the first six months of this year, industrial disputes dropped by 210 per cent to the lowest level in eight years; and the Opposition does not like that.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DEPARTMENT

F. R. Tulk & Co. Pty Ltd.

166. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) What the Minister just said is important. Am I to understand that anyone with a similar sort of problem to F. R. Tulk and Co. Pty. Ltd. should now telephone the Minister's office with such a complaint?
- (2) Does the Minister mean that people who are having problems in the work force, such as standover tactics, coercion, and the like, should ring the Minister's office without having to put the complaint in writing?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Since I have been the Minister for Industrial Relations it has been my practice to have my home telephone number suitably displayed in the telephone directory in order that people can contact me. They can also ring my electorate office or my ministerial office.

Most of the major industrial people in Western Australia have a direct line to my office, so what the Leader of the Opposition is saying would not change a thing from the way it was when I first took over the portfolio.

One of the reasons the Government is doing so well is that its Ministers are accessible to the public. The Ministers of the previous Government were inaccessible, and that is why it is on the Opposition benches. Every member of the Opposition knows that, as does the business community of this State.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: OPPOSITION

Role

167. Hon. G. C. MacKINNON, to the Leader of the House:

Am I to understand that the Minister no longer really considers that Her Majesty's Opposition is an integral, important and vital part of the parliamentary system in this State?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I think Oppositions play a very important role. We have spent a lot of time in Opposition and a lot of time on problems. We did not try to stir up a hornet's nest; we went out into the community, identified the problems, and then

produced policies which were attractive to the public. That is why we were elected.

Similar to the Hawke Government, which will be returned with an increased majority, when we pick a date for an election we will increase our majority substantially. No member on either side of the House has ever been refused access to me by telephone. I take all calls first up.

A number of people have approached me with problems from the Opposition side, and I hope I can say, without patting myself on the back, that I have always endeavoured to do something about them. In some cases I am successful, and in others I am not.

In answer to Mr MacKinnon, Her Majesty's Opposition is still alive and well in the life of the Burke Government.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: OPPOSITION Role

168. Hon. G. C. MacKINNON, to the Leader of the House:

Whilst demonstrably the Minister has a tremendously short memory and a very poor recall, I wonder whether he would agree with me that it is a proper role for the Opposition to receive complaints about the Government and to air them? Indeed, the best exponent of that was his colleague, Hon. Peter Dowding, who totally changed question time in this House.

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I think I have amply demonstrated to the House that I deal with all complaints which come to me. I recognise the Opposition as an Opposition, but not as the Government. I must make that point.

On all occasions I shall be courteous and well-mannered, but I am not going to start venturing opinions as to what might happen in the future.

I shall answer no more questions on that subject.

