

Legislative Council

Thursday, 20 September 1984

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

ELECTORAL

Reforms: Petition

On motions by Hon. S. M. Piantadosi, the following petition bearing the signatures of 91 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House.

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. 147.)

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

PORT AUTHORITIES: REGULATIONS

Disallowance: Motion

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [2.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the Regulations made pursuant to the Albany Port Authority Act 1926, Esperance Port Authority Act 1968, Geraldton Port Authority Act 1968, published in the *Government Gazette* of 29 June 1984, and laid on

the Table of the House on Tuesday, 31 July 1984, be and are hereby disallowed.

It is a serious matter to move in this place for the disallowance of regulations, especially considering that the regulations which are the subject of the motion pertain to a budgetary measure. I would normally prefer not to be moving such a motion.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear the honourable member.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Do you want me to elevate my voice, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: No, the member is speaking loudly enough, but so are other members.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Perhaps that is the reason that I allowed 13 of the 14 required days to pass before taking the action I did. In speaking on this subject I am sure I speak with the consent of all the people in the grain industry.

Wharfage on products of the soil was first introduced by the Brand Government in 1965. The introduction of wharfage at that time was a matter of great division within the coalition; not between the Country Party and the Liberal Party, but between members of the coalition as a whole.

It was, therefore, a reluctant assent that gave the Government the power to introduce the first of the wharfage charges for products of the soil. I believed then that it was the thin edge of the wedge and in recent times that has been more than proved.

To put the subject of wharfage on grain in perspective, I think it is important to go back in history to the original Bulk Handling Act of 1935, an Act which was introduced by the then Labor Minister for Lands, Hon. M. F. Troy, following a Royal Commission into bulk handling in 1935. Let us examine the attitude towards wharfage at that time. During the evidence given at the Royal Commission the subject was raised by the then Manager of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, Mr G. W. McCartney—Mr Dans would remember him or would know of him.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: On three occasions during the course of giving that evidence he stated that the farmer did not pay wharfage. On one occasion during his evidence he said the following—

At present we do not collect any wharfage on wheat and I do not propose that we should do so. On the other hand I do suggest that if a silo is to be erected by the Trust—

That is the Fremantle Harbour Trust as it was known in those days. It continues—

- the farmer should allow the bare labour service to be plussed-up with sufficient to meet the capital obligations involved in the installation of new machinery.

This would not mean asking them to pay wharfage which I regard as a direct tax contribution towards the cost of the harbour.

Therefore, bulk grains, in fact all grains, continued to be exempted from wharfage as products of the soil.

In the Bill introduced in December 1935, following the Royal Commission, it was made abundantly clear, on several occasions, that the Bulk Handling Act would provide that farmers would be responsible for the erection of bulk handling facilities away from the coast and throughout the agricultural area.

Initially the number of these facilities was set at 53 with the provision for further expansion as certain targets were reached by the growers and the company as laid down under the Act. It was left to the Government to provide part of the terminal facilities. This was clearly defined at that time.

The Government actually built a small set of silos in Bunbury and in 1943 the Commonwealth, through the Australian Wheat Board under its wartime emergency powers, arranged the construction of hospital silos at North Fremantle to clean and treat war stored grain. This latter silo had a capacity of 8 200 tonnes, but the capacity of the Bunbury facility was 9 000 tonnes.

Members must realise that that figure is almost insignificant as far as storage capacity is concerned, especially if one looks at the modern day facility at Kwinana which holds 912 000 tonnes.

Over the years we have operated with make-shift port facilities provided by CBH, waiting for the Government of the day to carry out its part of the agreement and provide proper port facilities for the export of grain.

During these years, every time a proposition for port development reached the consent stage, even past the drawing board stage, the Government would hold up assent always with the excuse there was no money.

In 1952 the Government decided to proceed with the development of storage at the Port of Albany as a Public Works Department project and, in fact, had materials on site in readiness to commence work. The project was halted and after much procrastination, farmers, through their company CBH, agreed to charge themselves a port equipment toll on every bushell of grain, so we could get on with the job of building the Albany Port bulk facilities. It was really the con-

sensus of CBH growers to start the development of the port.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon. H. W. Gayfer.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: During the subsequent introduction to Parliament, in 1952, of the Bill which enabled CBH to collect port equipment tolls to finance port terminals, the Minister for Lands, Hon. L. Thorn, mentioned the fact that when bulk handling was introduced in 1931-32, the Government of the day had no money to provide appropriate rail wagons and the company financed the conversion of 200 steel wagons for the transport of grain. At the time the Minister—reported on page 2201 of *Hansard* dated 20 November, 1952—said the following—

It was the intention of the Government to provide bulk terminal facilities at Albany and Geraldton, but owing to a shortage of funds for this work, it is unable to proceed. However, the port equipment toll will enable growers, through the company, to finance the construction of these facilities, subject to satisfactory arrangements being made between the Government and the company.

Further on he said—

The money collected by the company will enable work to proceed which is now held up due to lack of Government finance.

These instances are typical of the situation in which Western Australian grain growers have found themselves over the years. As a result, they have made every endeavour to help themselves. However, they now find, after having provided the terminal handling and storage facilities at all ports, that they are required to contribute to the financial shortcomings of the port authorities by way of increased wharfage charges. Eight years after the Albany Port Authority had been built the farmers, through their company, built the Geraldton silo for \$3.5 million.

Three years later the Fremantle silos were built, again by the growers, at a cost of \$7.5 million—in spite of the fact that the directors at that time had stated a preference for a Kwinana site, a site which had been turned down by the Government as grain export operations did not fit into the scheme of things for the industrial expansion of Cockburn Sound.

Esperance was built, again by levy, and then the huge Kwinana complex by agreement finally reached on a grant of land at Cockburn Sound—was made possible by the farmers from CBH committing themselves to the extent of \$86 million. This gave them the deep water so long considered necessary by CBH in its future planning calculations. Even the 210 metre wharf and

the 730 metre connecting jetty were provided by the grain growers of Western Australia at their own cost; that is, \$6 million. We now have the \$30 million extension almost completed at Albany following a \$8 million upgrading to ship-loaders only three years ago. All of these things have taken place at no cost whatsoever to the Government, to the taxpayers of Western Australia, or by grant from the Commonwealth Government.

Grain receipts by the company during this period have risen in the past 50 years from 302 000 tonnes in 1934 to the 7.2 million tonnes likely this year and without any cost storage-wise to the Government of the day. I admit the company has worked and still works on Government guarantees. However, unlike the other States of Australia, no Government funds have been used or access to Government loan funds has been sanctioned.

Not only at ports have the farmers of Western Australia built, worn out, and rebuilt an entire, modern, bulk-handling network through the length and breadth of this State. In the last 15 years, in fact, the growers, through their company, expended \$287 million of growers' funds on annual building programmes of \$20 million or more. It might interest members to know that CBH is by far the largest consistent building constructor in this State. Therefore, indirectly, by way of contracts, it is the biggest annual employer of building and metal workers in Western Australia. That point was made by Premier Court at the opening of the new fishing wharf at Geraldton.

In the meantime, since the first ill-conceived introduction of wharfage in 1965, the Government of the day has negotiated with the company whenever it sees wharfage on grain as an avenue for the lessening of harbour costs to the State's purse. I quote from a table to point out the increases per tonne since 1965. When first introduced in 1965-66 the general wharfage per tonne on wheat was 17.5c and 10c on oats and barley. There was no increase in those figures until the 1976-77 year when the wharfage on wheat rose to 24c and on oats and barley to 16.5c.

These figures stayed the same until 1980-81 when the rate rose to 40c on wheat and 32.5c on oats and barley. In 1981-82 the wharfage went to 50c on wheat and 42.5c on oats and barley. The following year it went to 70c on wheat and 62.5c on oats and barley. In 1983-84 the wharfage on wheat was 70c and on oats and barley 70c. In 1984-85 the figures are 75c on wheat and 75c on oats and barley. Meanwhile at Albany the wharfage stayed the same from 1965 right through until a period when it was altered in 1983-84 to 85c,

and in 1984-85 it increased from 85c to 90c. Bunbury remained at 70c for the 1984-85 year.

Incorporation of Material

By leave of the House, the following material was incorporated—

INCREASES PER TONNE

Year	General Wharfage c		Albany c	
	Wheat	Oats & Barley	Wheat	Oats & Barley
1965/66	17.5	10.0		
1974/75	17.5	10.0		
1975/76	17.5	10.0		
1976/77	24.0	16.5		
1977/78	24.0	16.5		
1978/79	24.0	16.5		
1979/80	24.0	16.5		
1980/81	40.0	32.5		
1981/82	50.0	42.5		
1982/83	70.0	62.5		
1983/84	70.0	70.0	85.0	85.0
1984/85	75.0	75.0	90.0	90.0

Bunbury has remained at 70c for the 1984/85 year.

Debate Resumed

It is interesting to note that during the gaps appearing in that scale I have handed in, all the groups appearing in the annual increments against other years are a result of Government and Treasury negotiations with CBH. It is recognition of the contribution that the company and its shareholders have made to the State in general and port development in particular, remembering that originally it was not the obligation of the company to provide storage at the ports.

Other port activity in Western Australia has meanwhile been languishing, and because of the falling away of other port users, leaving mainly grain, increased charges have been levied against the grain trade to bolster port finances vacated by other contributors.

I do not intend to debate the setting up of independent port authorities and their instructions to make their ports pay "or else". However, the accumulation of costs in port development generally is now being levelled at the user, and this indirectly turns any other user away because of the high costs and thereby inhibits the total spreading of port costs. This leaves the farmer as the milking cow. In spite of all the assurances in the past of firstly, "token wharfage to make other commodities chargeable" and, secondly, encouragement to be given to finance and spend on port facilities, the

increase has been going on and on without any respect for the ability of the producer to pay.

In fact, this year even while inquiries in respect of independent wharfage charges for Albany were made in 1983 and these were being investigated by a Government appointed committee, and another Government committee was proceeding on port authority internal administration structure investigation, another impost of 5c a tonne or a seven per cent increase was levelled at the farmer by way of a regulation without any prior consultation with the industry. It is the first time ever in the history of wharfage that a Government has ridden roughshod over the growers in this manner. It was just announced in the *Government Gazette* and that was that.

Every indication is that wharfage on products of the soil should never have been applied. Forgetting the contribution being made by the farmer, let us look at his ability to pay these huge increases. I understand that in 10 years up to and including 1983-84, his income by way of wheat sales per tonne—that is, income in his pocket which you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), know something about—has risen by 38 per cent. Any farmer in this audience may be interested to know that wheat farmers' actual income has risen during the 10 years to 1983-84 by only 38 per cent. I stress that figure of 38 per cent.

During that time, wharfage charges for wheat generally have risen by 328 per cent and for oats and barley by 650 per cent. At Albany, wharfage charges for wheat have increased by 414 per cent and for oats and barley by 800 per cent.

I understand that in those same 10 years, rental charges associated with those ports to CBH have risen by 234 per cent at Albany, 204 per cent at Fremantle, 565 per cent at Geraldton, 540 per cent at the Esperance depot, which is a little away from the wharf, and 1495 per cent at the new aerocell site at Esperance.

In the same period, the State minimum wage has gone up 164 per cent, the CPI has risen by 137 per cent, rail freights have moved up on average by 140 per cent—some are higher and some are lower, but that is the average—while water charges have increased by 2 200 per cent.

All these have added to the farmer's burden in covering the extra costs and charges from his meagre 38 per cent.

During that period, increases in CBH charges have been held at 81 per cent. This is a very creditable figure. Indeed, while continuing on its mammoth improvement programme about which I spoke earlier, and while keeping up with the demands made of it by modern technology and

steady increases in production, it has contained its charges. We must remember that it, too, has to pay these Government and port authority charges. No other instrumentality could have handled the huge demands of this expanding industry and done so much without any direct Government financial assistance whatsoever.

If wheat prices were perhaps \$50 a tonne higher and if farmers' incomes were commensurate with other incomes in the community, it might be a different argument. However, with my knowledge of the industry, a knowledge shared by the Government through the inquiries it has conducted of the agriculture industry by way of its rural sector hardship committee, I am forced to move for the disallowance of this regulation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Fred McKenzie.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Herd Improvement Service Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

2. Pawnbrokers Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), and transmitted to the Assembly.

RACING RESTRICTION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 23 August.

HON. JOHN WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [3.25 p.m.]: In essence, this Bill is a very simple one, but it has caused a great deal of discussion about which I will have a few comments to make in a short time. I make it perfectly clear from the outset that I support the Bill as is and do so because this is really the first amendment of the Act of any consequence, remembering that the legislation was first introduced into the Parliament in 1917, a great many years ago.

The racing industry—and it is an industry—plays a large part in the economic wealth of this State. A little research would show that this fact is thanks to many racing identities, apart from jockeys, owners, and trainers, who have dedicated their lives to the building of this industry.

If we consider the WA Turf Club, I suppose the single person who stands out as the leader of that club would be Sir Ernest Lee Steere, and who recently retired as chairman after a record 30 years. His father served as chairman before him. There is no doubt that Sir Ernest brought to the

club an element of business acumen which is sadly lacking in some industries today.

In the trotting scene we would look to such men as J. P. Stratton and Sir Frank Ledger. These days both clubs have comparatively new presidents, and they are following on in the traditional style of making these viable industries while providing enjoyment for the public. People do not enjoy the sport very much when their fancy goes down, so I do not enjoy it often because my fancies go down frequently.

One of the remarkable philosophies I have come across in people outside the racing industry is that the 50c or \$1 bets, and the money invested on novelty wagers, is considered to be money that belongs to people outside the industry; they believe they must have a part of it. If ever greed shows its head, it is when TAB moneys are mentioned.

Not so long ago football was claiming a large percentage of the money spent at TABs. The clubs said that, after all, many of their followers did their punting on a Saturday morning on races in the Eastern States and were therefore providing the bulk of the TAB's money. That is a fantastic proposition and one that is quite erroneous.

A number of people in the country say that, because they have race tracks, they are entitled to TAB money even though they may have no racing on their tracks. They believe they are entitled to money they have put on in Perth. I find that argument quite baseless.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You and I will be on a collision course, I can see.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: There is no argument about that, considering the member's amendments on the Notice Paper.

The money which is put in by the punters belongs to the TAB and the racing industry solely—football, or any other organisation, has no claim on it. It is absolute poppycock to say that because a man goes to the football, the footy should have a share of the money the man invested in the morning.

This is a simple Bill. In 1917, a certain number of race meetings per annum were fixed for the metropolitan area and for the country areas. Since 1907, the number has fluctuated by five a year and there are additional midweek meetings here and there. No-one can deny the fact that country areas support the racing industry. A lot of country people make their living from the racing industry by supplying the food which is necessary to keep these rather slow animals running. Secondly, the country benefits from the additional requirements for hay and all the other agricultural products, as well as the breeding of these horses. It can be said

that the greater the amount of racing that goes on, the greater the benefit to the economy.

Disregarding the betting, at a very conservative estimate I would say that in the metropolitan area, over a quarter of a million people derive their livelihood from racing; galloping, or trotting. That is a considerable number of people.

All this Bill seeks to do is to increase the number of permitted race days in the metropolitan area along with the agreed fixtures in the outside area, and if a club operating any country track or trotting complex feels aggrieved, a system is built into the legislation whereby an aggrieved party may appeal to the Minister. I am not very strong on that, but I am willing to let it go and give it a chance, because I do not suppose the Minister for Administrative Services wishes to interfere. However, it could well be that it is essential for the protection of the country clubs.

By increasing the racing fixtures within the city—where probably the bulk of the population is found and, therefore the bulk of the betting population—the break-down of TAB figures will show that the benefits will flow to all parts of the community. I have no conflict with that, but it is well known that the Western Australian Trotting Club and the Western Australian Country Trotting Club are one about this legislation. They are in complete harmony.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Well, well, well!

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: If there is evidence to the contrary, I would love to hear it, but on the best information given to me by both of those bodies, I believe they are in complete harmony about this arrangement. They have had more than one conference about this to decide what is a fair thing.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: While the piper plays the tune—

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Is the member talking about trotting and galloping?

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I am.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: The piper who plays the tune is the punter. It is the punter who pays. There would be no viable racing industry if there were no betting attached to it. That is obvious from a glance at the figures. If it were the case that the only people who could afford racing, just went there to race and not to bet, my guess is that the racing industry would collapse quickly.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You are absolutely correct. I know from experience.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: The only stumbling block appeared to be the Turf Club in the metropolitan area and some of the provincial clubs. I

was given to understand, as a result of asking those concerned bodies, that they too have decided to give this Bill a chance to see whether it will help them to work out their problems amicably. My understanding is that the problems have been resolved. I did have it as a written note that the country clubs, not the provincial clubs, are in no way to be disadvantaged; they can have as many race meetings as they want.

The Turf Club will not interfere in any way with their activities. One myth is that the Turf Club and the Trotting Club only disburse the profits from the TAB to the country provincial clubs. That is not correct. The membership of the boards of those two clubs which disburse the funds from the TAB has wider representation. Therefore, the clubs cannot be held solely responsible and the opposition to this Bill concerns the control of those funds. Everyone wants a share of the cake, and everyone feels he has a right to that share.

If we consider Hon. Philip Lockyer's electorate where some of us attended a race meeting, we note that an entirely different form of racing is held there. It was obvious that from time to time the race-course development fund had allocated money to towns such as Exmouth for the installation of the mobile starting gates. Often country clubs cannot afford such expensive equipment. Loans are provided to help erect new buildings and amenities. Perhaps one of the most spectacular advances in recent times in racecourse development has been in your own area, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth). Albany has one of the prettiest and nicest courses in the State. It has a race club to be proud of.

In some country areas, progressive businessmen with a great deal of acumen are running the committees and the facilities, and the amenities are second to none. The Bunbury club is another club which has looked after its patrons. It has been business-orientated from the start as a result of a clever selection of executive and committee. That racing round is now something to be seen.

I do not think the House has anything to fear as a result of this Bill's being passed, because many of the fears held are quite groundless. At present, there are more horses in the metropolitan area than there have been for many years. The latest advance has been in the last three years with the ability of finance companies to syndicate horses and to lease horses, thereby giving a great impetus to the breeding industry.

However, all of that is useless, as Hon. Tom McNeil will tell members, if one cannot get one's horse to start. If the horse cannot start, then the

owner is in bother because he has an investment on which he is getting no return. Mind you, it might be a loser as an investment even if it did run! The situation may arise where not even the metropolitan area can support such a huge number of horses. The strength of the provincial clubs would rise, therefore, if the clubs were within easy travelling distance for the racing fraternity because not all metropolitan punters want to attend country racing. However, it is extraordinary the amount of people who do attend provincial race meetings.

A horse may then get a start in the country. If it gets a start and wins, up goes its class and it would eventually qualify for a metropolitan start.

Every horse owner is vain enough to think that his purchase is the next winner of the Melbourne Cup. If it is not, he wants to know why.

I can say no more about this Bill other than that I intend to support it wholeheartedly. I hope my colleagues will also support the Bill because I feel it is a good Bill for racing generally. Members should remember that, as with all pieces of legislation and as Hon. Mick Gayfer has proved this afternoon, if there is something not quite right in the legislation, it can be brought back for consideration by Parliament.

If this measure is not quite right, if there is something wrong with it, then the people who will want it brought back to Parliament will be the governing bodies of racing in Western Australia. I have enough faith in the people administering the Western Australian Turf Club and the Western Australian Trotting Association to say that. They want to make a success of racing. They do not want legislation that will ruin the racing industry. They understand that it is vital to integrate metropolitan and country racing. I think the Bill should be passed in its entirety. I ask my colleagues to support the legislation.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) {4.00 p.m.}: This Bill proposes four alterations to the principal Act, the Racing Restriction Act 1917-1973. The Act has been amended on one occasion only since its introduction in 1917, and that was in 1972 when an amendment increased the number of trotting meetings which could be held in the metropolitan area.

In my opinion, if this Bill is passed without amendment, the title "Racing Restriction Act" will be a misnomer as the restrictions provided by the Act will have been repealed, and the Act will be one purely of control of the racing and trotting clubs and their meetings by the Western

Australian Turf Club, the Western Australian Trotting Association, and the Minister of the day.

Let us consider what the Bill does. Firstly, it repeals section 2(2) of the principal Act, and by doing so it removes the restriction on the number of race meetings held in the metropolitan area in any year—that is, 76—except of course for any meetings for charitable purposes. The amendment will give the WATC the right to conduct as many meetings in the metropolitan area as it wants. The WATC now conducts 75 race meetings, and it proposes to increase this number by taking away from country race clubs certain midweek racing days. The main purpose of that is to increase Totalisator Agency Board funds.

The prime midweek day for racing is Wednesday, and the race clubs that will be mainly disadvantaged are those at Northam, York, Beverley, and Toodyay. This was proved in 1979 when the WATC cut the number of meetings held by those clubs by 11, and it conducted midweek race meetings in Perth. To compensate for that, the WATC paid to all clubs known as "provincial clubs" an increased subsidy of \$100 for each race conducted, and a subsidy of \$400 for each race conducted during the weeks when race meetings were held midweek in Perth. This was an across-the-board subsidy to all provincial clubs, so the Bunbury and Pinjarra clubs, which were not affected, received the extra subsidy of \$100 per race, even though no other midweek racing was held during the summer months when they held their own race meetings. This created the position in which the eastern district clubs suffered a loss in receipts, in attendance, in totalisator turnover, and in bookmakers' betting tax. Therefore, they could not afford an increase in their stake money, whereas the two provincial clubs which were not affected could increase stake money without any loss.

The result, of course, was that both the Bunbury and Pinjarra clubs, by an increase in stake moneys, received an increased proportion of TAB funds distributed, and they were much better off than the other clubs. For instance, in round figures, those clubs conducted an average of 22 meetings per year and received \$17 600 per annum to add to all the stakes paid.

Now the WATC has offered to the provincial clubs a further increase of \$200 per race and a further \$350 per race when a club conducts a meeting during the same week as a Perth meeting is conducted by the WATC. Of course, a condition attaches to those increases offered, and I am informed that the clubs have been told that the subsidy will be paid only if this Bill is passed by the Parliament. On top of that, the intention of the

Turf Club is to take away at least eight meetings from the eastern district clubs and hold an additional eight meetings in the metropolitan area, bringing the WATC's midweek meetings to 19.

I foreshadow a repeat of what occurred in 1979. The four clubs in the eastern district will be disadvantaged, and the other two clubs will again receive money in several ways—that is, by increased subsidies and increased TAB allocations.

A similar situation will exist in trotting circles, in which subsidies to country clubs have been increased and more midweek meetings are proposed. I understand the intention is to have the extra midweek meetings held at the Fremantle club.

Section 3(2) will be repealed by this Bill. Of course, that is the provision which restricts the WATA to 49 meetings per year, and the Fremantle club to 14 meetings per year, giving a total of 63 meetings. Repercussions will follow from the removal of the restriction. Although the country trotting clubs are favourably inclined to this proposal, I do not believe they realise what effect the change will eventually have.

Another important provision in the Bill is that before any change is made to country racing programmes, the Minister shall be advised and shall approve of those changes. In the event of any dispute, the problem can be presented to the Minister. This provision could be called a saving grace, for what it is worth. However, with the periodical changes in the portfolio, the position could be created in which one Minister could be favourably inclined to the country clubs, and another one could be more favourably inclined to the metropolitan clubs.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: That does not matter.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Does it not, Mr Lewis? It could bring the issue into the political arena. I am not saying it is good or bad; but I do not want the power contained in the Bill to make that possible.

This Bill was introduced initially in another place last year by the Minister then responsible (Hon. David Parker MLA). It is rumoured that the Bill's introduction was at the suggestion of Mr Harry Jarman, who is now the Chairman of the TAB, purely and simply with a view to increasing TAB turnover, or at least to maintain the turnover against the pressures of Lotto, Instant Lottery, and soccer pools which, I say, are only another form of Lotto. Mr Williams virtually alluded to that in his speech.

The Government has had the report of the honorary Royal Commission into racing and trot-

ting before it for over 15 months. Two members of that commission are in the Chamber at the present moment - the Hon. Fred McKenzie and the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon. Nevertheless, since both of them were involved in the preparation of this overwhelming report, it is very interesting to see that in the 15 months since it came out the Government has not seen fit to give it due consideration by introducing comprehensive legislation to put racing and trotting on a proper basis, particularly as regards financial assistance to country clubs.

I believe that the answer lies within the reports of the honorary Royal Commission—do not fiddle with the Bill and do not take a step which is irrecoverable. There is a feeling amongst members of the racing fraternity in the country that it was and is dangerous to speak up against this Bill, either previously or at the present time. It is dangerous, in fact, to speak so that the Trotting Association or the Turf Club could have reason to remind a certain club afterwards that it had indeed spoken against this particular measure.

I have letters in my possession from clubs absolutely decrying the Bill as it stands at the present moment, and saying in fact that the open, across-the-board release of racing restrictions is something which will not be favourable to the future of the racing clubs. We know that the Beverley, York, Northam, and Toodyay clubs have become involved in expenses. Just in the past few years grandstands have been built at a cost of \$100 000 and \$150 000. Grass tracks have been provided. All of these things have been brought into being, and they will have to be looked after, but certainly not by the provision of racing days which detract from the country areas.

Because of the mistrust of the people in the country areas, because they do not believe there is any good intent behind this Bill, they believe the Act should be left as it is. Those clubs which have been game enough to speak believe that it should be left as it is and a complete resume should be made by the Government of the report of the Royal Commission and its implications.

I strongly oppose the measure before the House and I appeal to other members to defeat the second reading.

HON. FRED MCKENZIE (North-East Metropolitan) [4.14 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. As a member of the Royal Commission I intend to correct some of the assumptions which Mr Gayfer has made in trying to persuade members of this House to support this argument. With Mr MacKinnon and Mr Baxter, I was a member of that honorary Royal Commission. The chairman, Mr Baxter, was a very good chairman. Certainly

he tried to look after the interests of the country racing clubs.

At the same time, he was very fair in the report which was finally delivered to the Government. Because, as chairman, he was charged with the responsibility of writing the report, he was very accommodating, but he did, I feel sure, recognise that there was a danger to country areas where racing clubs were operating.

But the real problem with the racing industry in the eastern districts, in my opinion, is that there are far too many racing clubs. There are four between Toodyay and Beverley—one at Toodyay, one at Northam, one at York, and one at Beverley.

If one agrees there are too many, one of the problems is that no-one in those towns will agree that his race club should be the one to go. If one thinks there are too many and there should be rationalisation, the real problem is determining which one should go. I would say that Northam should stay, because a huge sum of money has been spent on it, and Northam is a fairly large provincial town. If one is to reduce them to three or even two, which does one pick?

I appreciate Mr Gayfer's concern, but we must look at the industry as a whole. It was quite clear to me, as a member of the commission—and I think to the other commission members also—that the TAB turnover is important to the survival of the racing industry.

The truth of the matter is that country racing, when conducted midweek, does not produce enough TAB dollars. I do not have the figures at my disposal, but I can assure members that the commission examined them at the time.

Add to that the fact that bookmakers do not like to travel to country meetings, a number of trainers do not, and owners do not. What is happening in Western Australia is that most of the racehorses and most of the public are drawn from the metropolitan area of Perth. In the country locations, in the eastern districts in particular— from where apparently these race dates will be lost—70 per cent of the course patrons come from the metropolitan area. There is also considerable cost in getting the horse on the course, and other costs associated with going to those areas are very high. Take Toodyay, Northam, York, and Beverley. Not many trainers are established in any of those areas. This clearly shows that most of the catchment is from the metropolitan area.

I want to give members a run-down on the history of the Racing Restriction Act, and I would like them to listen to it very carefully. In 1917 the Racing Restriction Act was not introduced to protect country racecourses; it was introduced for a

different reason altogether. The racing industry has probably failed to make its case to Parliament. The Racing Restriction Act should have been got rid of many years ago.

Midweek racing was extended during the 1960s in order to increase TAB turnover. A problem occurred in that the restrictions which were applied in 1917, prevented midweek racing in Perth, because of the limitation on the number of racing dates permitted. The problem should have been tackled then. However, we are tackling it now, many years too late; but how often does that happen?

I refer members to the provision drafted by the chairman and supported by both members of the commission in respect of the history of the Racing Restriction Act. I shall read it, and I ask members to listen closely. It appears on page 21 of the report of the Royal Commission, and reads as follows—

The WATC notes that when the Racing Restriction Act was proclaimed in 1917, the structure of racing was vastly different from that which exists today. Racing was conducted both by the WATC and clubs registered with that body who ran a total of 50 meetings and a number of unregistered clubs who ran 52 meetings. Public opinion was against racing and popular demand for some restriction rested largely on the volume of street betting and excessive night trotting. It was, however, generally recognised that the over-racing in the metropolitan area had not been in regard to clubs controlled by the WATC but that the offenders had been the unregistered clubs. The Act envisaged that the 50 meetings previously held by clubs affiliated with the WATC would continue, while the meetings previously run by the unregistered clubs would be reduced to 26.

That is how we arrived at the figure of 76. It comprised the 50 meetings that had been conducted by the WA Turf Club and 26 of the 52 meetings that had been conducted by the unregistered clubs. The purpose was to restrict the number of race meetings held in the metropolitan area, at the same time curbing excessive night trotting, bearing in mind that, at that time, the public were against racing. To continue—

The Goodwood course was to be registered and all other unregistered meetings closed down. The 50 days under WATC control were distributed: WATC 17; Belmont, Canning Park and Helena Vale 10 each; Tattersalls 2; and the WA Hunt Club 1. In later years the WATC purchased the pro-

prietary clubs and made financial arrangements with the Tattersalls Club and WA Hunt Club, thus acquiring the rights to race on 76 days in any one year.

The unregistered clubs have disappeared and that illustrates how we finished up with the WA Turf Club and the 76 racing days.

I emphasise that point, because the Racing Restriction Act was never intended to safeguard the interests of racing clubs in the country. However, over a period the TAB was introduced and, in order to increase TAB turnover so that the racing industry was more viable, because of the restriction, it was decided to hold more race meetings on the outer-metropolitan courses such as those in the eastern districts.

I will not go over the ground covered by Mr Gayfer, but he described the position accurately when referring to the changes which took place in 1979. It was determined then that additional race meetings should be held in the metropolitan area. It should be borne in mind that, at that stage, racing did not take place every day. In 1979, an arrangement was made under which some of the provincial clubs would give up some of their race meetings and a subsidy would be paid to them. That decision was made for the benefit of racing and the WA Turf Club did the right thing by providing a subsidy which, initially, was \$100 and which was later increased to \$200. That subsidy was paid when a midweek race meeting was held on a metropolitan course when it would normally be held on the course of one of the provincial clubs.

Mr Gayfer mentioned the trotting industry. Let us look at what the commission had to say about the WA Trotting Association and the position of country and city trotting clubs. I turn to page 20 of the report. At the time we made our deliberations it was quite clear—and no evidence to the contrary has been given by Mr Gayfer—that there was unanimous agreement within the trotting industry.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I thought I gave you clear evidence as to why there was no evidence. They were scared out of their pants!

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I can base my assessment of the position only on what was presented to us. A conference was held and agreement was arrived at.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I shall ask Mr MacKinnon to read a letter later.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The relevant passage reads as follows—

The WA Trotting Association in its submission stated the following—

"The Western Australian Trotting Association has been developing an overall industry plan relating to the meetings to be conducted at Gloucester Park, Richmond Raceway, major TAB country venues and country non-TAB courses. This study has included the scheduling of additional mid-week metropolitan meetings with stakes lower than our traditional Friday night.

Discussion and negotiation with the Western Australian Country Trotting Association

I assume the WA Country Trotting Association represents the industry. To continue—

over many months has resulted in a recent conference of country clubs reaching unanimous agreement, in principle, to the Racing Restriction Act being amended to provide for a gradual increase in metropolitan meetings from the current 73 to 104 maximum by 1990.

At the top of page 21, the following comment is made

From that submission it is apparent that the matter of mid-week trotting meetings in the metropolitan area is well on the way to being sorted out within the trotting industry itself. The same cannot be said about the racing industry.

We then went on to quote a problem in the racing industry which was outlined by Mr Gayfer, and it occurred because no such agreement had been arrived at in that case. However, the trotting industry quite sensibly reached an agreement between the WA Trotting Association and the country trotting clubs. It was a unanimous agreement that the number of meetings held in the metropolitan area should be increased ultimately to a total of 104. This Bill seeks to lift the restriction completely.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What a lot of rot!

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I do not think a restriction is necessary. A different set of circumstances applied at that time. The Racing Restriction Act should have been repealed years ago, because circumstances have changed completely. It might be said that new circumstances apply now and that is fair enough; but it is important to remember that the first Bill which was presented in the Legislative Assembly, and which Hon. Mr Gayfer said was different, contained different provisions, but it did not contain the provision found

in this Bill which is in line with the recommendation of the commission, and which gives the Minister the power to make a decision in respect of any problems which arise in the industry. That is a step in the right direction. It is what the commission requested. Before reading to the House the recommendation which appears on page 24 of the report, I shall outline what occurred before that decision was reached.

This is very important because it indicates why this Bill was brought forward and why it is necessary to lift the restrictions in the interests of the racing industry. We said—

From the evidence before us we acknowledge that mid-week city racing will—

(1) Increase TAB and on-course turnover thereby providing greater profitability for the racing and trotting industry.

If we do not look at the profitability of the racing and trotting industries, they will be threatened and not only will there not be racing in country areas, there is likely to be no racing in the metropolitan area because of this very fine line of viability in the industry. It is a very expensive industry; it employs many people and unless we remove these restrictions so that the profitability to the TAB can be improved, both racing and trotting will be threatened. I do not need to tell members that all forms of gambling are coming to the fore. The gambling dollar is under pressure and we should not continue to restrict the racing industry. There has been no real Government interference in the racing and trotting industries and they have managed to survive up until this time.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Is not the Minister's making a decision, Government interference?

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: If the member does not want that provision he should say so.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I have said so.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Yes, but the member wants to insert a restriction which will mean that the industries will be threatened. He wants to lay down a number of racing dates.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If they only want to race eight extra days, why not put it in the Bill? What is wrong with that? That is all they say they want. If the provision is not contained in the Bill, it means they want more.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: At this point maybe that is the case.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They come back here and attack the industry—

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: The member is only talking about the racing industry. As I quoted

earlier, the trotting industry is prepared to go to 104 meetings by 1990.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Those who have been vocal enough to say so inside the committee room!

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: They are in the minority. The club has agreed unanimously. Always some people will not agree, but the sensible people realise the position that the racing and trotting industry is in. Many more forms of gambling are being introduced and they are in a very competitive area in respect to attracting the dollar. It is critical that the industry be allowed to recommend matters to the Government, and for the Government to take them on board, but at the same time to provide the safeguard contained in the Bill, safeguards which I will soon deal with.

We acknowledge that the increase in midweek city racing will—

- (2) Increase attendance at race meetings.
- (3) Have the support of the majority of owners and trainers and race patrons.

However, the commission went on to say—and we acknowledge this too—

However, it is also clear that such a move is likely to have a detrimental effect on some Provincial Clubs and could threaten the existence of others.

I think this is what Mr Gayfer is saying. Therefore we said—

As the WA Turf Club is currently conducting almost as many meetings as is permitted under the Racing Restriction Act it will be necessary to amend it if any additional mid-week city meetings are to be held.

I hope Mr Gayfer is listening to me.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I am taking it all in, Mr McKenzie.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: These are the words of the racing commission—

...the Racing Restriction Act, if amended, should provide an avenue of appeal for country and provincial race clubs to the Minister where agreements between the various bodies cannot be reached.

That is precisely what is contained in the Bill. We have removed the racing restrictions that we recognise are included in the Act. Mr Gayfer said the title of the Act will now be a misnomer because of the amendment and the title, and I will concede that point.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: There is nothing in that point.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is a very apt name.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: There will be no restrictions if this is taken up, and therefore I concede that point also.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is very big of you, Mr McKenzie.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I am a very generous member and Mr Gayfer should realise that. The amendment is very simple, given the origins of the Racing Restriction Act and the problems facing the industry, because the TAB turnover is either not increasing or is certainly not increasing in line with increases in the CPI. The holding of these additional race meetings in the city will give the industry a boost. That does not mean to say that Beverley, York, Northam, and Toodyay will not be able to continue their race meetings. If they do not hold their race meetings on a Saturday, they might be able to hold them midweek. They certainly would be able to hold them on a Saturday because on many Saturdays throughout the year there is no country racing.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Big deal!

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Country people are not denied any compassion if they want their meetings on a Saturday.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I repeat, big deal.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Why does the member say that?

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How much profit would they make?

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You were going to say they would be in a bit of trouble, and that is exactly what we are trying to avoid. You are saying yourself they will be in big trouble.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: Unless these additional midweek meetings are allowed, the whole industry will be in trouble; that is a fact of life. We must face up to it. There has been a drift of population over the years to the metropolitan area and this fact is well documented. Look at the figures for midweek meetings in the metropolitan area against those meetings held in the country and members will see that turnover has vastly improved. Enough meetings have been held to obtain a pretty firm average. More money will be put back into the industry, to lessen the costs to the owners and trainers, and the costs and time involved with the travel that takes place into those areas. I note the Turf Club realised it is necessary because of the number of horses racing to have country race meetings. That is where horses initially race in most cases. They recognise that point. I do not think it is the intent of the Turf Club to do anything other than that. I know I continually talk about the Turf Club rather than

the Trotting Club because I assume we have no problems in the trotting industry.

I indicate my support for the Bill. I note that many amendments are on the Notice Paper. I hope those amendments are defeated because the Bill contains sufficient safeguards by way of appeal to the Minister and it has taken on board our recommendation because the commission was not silly.

The committee realised the pressures were there to have more midweek metropolitan meetings. The whole of the industry, from the punters to the trainers, owners, and bookmakers—

Hon. Tom McNeil: And jockeys.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: —and I assume the jockeys too, are faced with the increase in travel, and they want additional meetings in the metropolitan area. Unlike some other States, Victoria for instance where one can go to country areas as we did—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How many races are held in the metropolitan area compared with country areas in Victoria?

Hon. P. H. Wells: Victoria is all metropolitan area isn't it? It is only a small State.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I cannot answer that; it is a different scene. Even over there they have tried to come to grips with the problem. A couple of country courses have closed or amalgamated with other clubs—I forget which ones. But in Victoria there are more trainers in country areas than in the metropolitan area, so it is an entirely different situation. Here, most are in the metropolitan area, and there are some at Pinjarra and Bunbury. How many trainers are in the eastern district? Mr Gayfer did not mention that; there are very few.

I am talking about the question of costs. I think this is a good measure because it does not restrict the industry. Why have restrictions on the metropolitan area? Given time, the clubs to which Mr Gayfer referred and which he said he had fears about will realise their opposition was ill-founded. There will be more dollars in the industry because the TAB is the success story of the racing and trotting industries. Without the TAB the whole industry is finished. If more money is generated, everybody will be better off.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Your words will be of great assurance to those clubs.

Hon. FRED McKENZIE: I am pleased Mr Gayfer said that. I have given sufficient reasons, irrespective of whether members come from the country or metropolitan areas, for the restrictions to be removed in the interests of the racing indus-

try. We should bear in mind that if the Turf Club or the Trotting Association come down with a heavy hand and are not reasonable, the Minister is the final arbiter in determining what should happen. That is a sensible provision and I believe it is an adequate safeguard for the community of Western Australia in general.

HON. TOM McNEIL (Upper West) [4.44 p.m.]: I rise to support the legislation before the House, and I will not try to convince other members to vote for or against it. As it is a House of Review I know every member obviously will vote as they see the situation anyway.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is why my amendments are on the Notice Paper.

Hon. TOM McNEIL: I heard with some concern Mr Gayfer's remarks that he feels some country clubs have been threatened and that in a number of instances their members have been too afraid to speak out and voice their true feelings. He said they were of the opinion that if they said too much it would bounce back against them and they would be disadvantaged. That concerns me; that type of approach has not been made to me.

There are no trotting clubs within my province, but there are some racing clubs. The only approach I have received from a racing club was to support the measure before the House.

As a racehorse owner, I know that if one is given the chance of a day in the country, there is nothing nicer than going to a country track and perhaps winning or losing a few dollars, but it is a drain on the owner's pocket to have to take his horse there. As Hon. John Williams has said, country racing is an integral part of the racing scheme. He touched on the fact that if one is an owner and one's horse has not graduated high enough to get a start in Perth, one must take it to the country. The only way it can race in Perth is for it to win in the country.

Last month the horse of which I am a part owner won two races in a row. It had not qualified to run in Perth, but when we got the chance and it had graduated high enough, we decided we wanted to go to a country race for a reason not to be disclosed here because members would knock off the price! That is why we went to Northam last week or the week before. I say with all modesty that the cost of taking a horse to the country is quite prohibitive. It costs \$96.50 to put a horse on to a float, and to take it there and back.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer interjected.

Hon. TOM McNEIL: I allowed Mr Gayfer to make his speech without interruption. If he wants to know something he has only to read the part of my speech in which I said country racing is an

integral part of the industry. It is put there to support the metropolitan industry without which there would not be an industry. Horses must go through the qualifying races in the country to gain a start in the metropolitan area, unless one is lucky enough to have a champion filly or colt which wins or is placed early in its career, and commands attention in Perth. Otherwise one has to take one's horse to the country.

I have nothing against country racing—the people involved are a very hospitable bunch. They work hard to build up facilities and make one welcome when one goes there. I am not knocking country racing; I am pointing out that the cost to the owner, trainer, and jockey of taking horses to the country is prohibitive. However, it is necessary if one wants one's horse to graduate. I am simply pointing out that there are drawbacks in going to the country.

Six weeks ago I floated a horse to Northam; three races were run and the meeting was called off because of the state of the track. We all went up to see the horse run and the jockey, trainer, and everyone had to come home again. That was not the fault of the country club, but it is an additional expense for those involved in the industry.

As Fred McKenzie has pointed out, support for the racing industry is predominantly based in the metropolitan area. The horses, trainers, jockeys, and owners come from the metropolitan area so that is where the horses are stabled. Therefore, to a great extent they are subsidising the continuation of country racing. The owners are obviously happy to do that because there must be a graduation system so that horses can get a start in Perth.

Mick Gayfer stated he felt that this legislation was a nail in the coffin for country racing, but the WATC gave assurances that there would only be a marginal effect on some provincial racing clubs. That has to be expected. However, the small decrease in the number of meetings at provincial clubs will be balanced by the increased cash subsidies through the returns from the TAB. As Mr McKenzie has pointed out, no racing club will survive without the turnover and returns coming from the TAB. Without that the industry is dead. I suggest to members that the measures they have been asked to approve by the Turf Club and the Trotting Association are not solely doom.

I point out that even if this legislation is passed tonight, it has tied the hands of the racing and trotting clubs in bringing forward their schedules for the next 12 months.

Racing clubs want to know the racing dates for which they will be permitted to apply, and because

they were hopeful that this legislation would have been passed prior to this House's rising some weeks ago, they have been put in the situation where they have had to wait to find out where their future lies and the number of meetings that can be held in the metropolitan area.

I have covered what I consider to be the rapid escalation of costs of floating horses to the country. The other costs are consistent—the percentage of the prize money that goes to the trainer, the percentage of the prize money that goes to the jockey, the farrier fees, the veterinary fees, and the training fees are all part and parcel of the racing scene. All owners absorb those fees as costs.

I did a quick précis on how my syndicate went with one horse. In a 28 day period, although it ran a first, a second, and a third, it was down the drain when it came to returns. By the time it paid all other costs such as float fees, veterinary fees, etc., the syndicate was behind. The only interest one obtains from racing is that of being involved in it. It really is a magnificent sport and I strongly support the Bill.

With the thought some months ago that there was to be an axing of some country clubs, I would have been one of the first to jump to the defence of those clubs. I do not believe that the promulgation of the Turf Club or the Trotting Club as having an interest in the axing of country clubs was on the right track.

Mr McKenzie pointed out that if a country club wanted to hold a race on a Saturday, it was quite entitled to do so. I can understand the feelings of Mr Gayfer and other members that it would not be a profitable exercise. I guess it would not be profitable because the best known horses would be racing in the metropolitan area on that particular Saturday. I can assure members that if it were necessary for a country club to hold a Saturday meeting, they would be surprised at what the attendance would be. Firstly, the families of all those people connected with the trainers, the jockey, and the owners, would be in a position to travel to the country on a Saturday when during the week that is not always possible.

Until such time as the Turf Club decides to take the bit between its teeth and have Saturday country racing, we will never really know. As far as the people with whom I am involved in the racing scene are concerned, they would be prepared to travel to the country, particularly if it meant the horse would have a chance of graduating in order to race for bigger prize money.

I support the Bill.

HON. TOM KNIGHT (South) [4.54 p.m.]: Members may remember that last year we had somewhat of a controversy in this House when it was thought that the Mt. Barker Turf Club would be eliminated from the racing scene. This House came to the fore and showed the racing club that it cannot do that sort of thing.

I believe that this Bill warrants support because, believe it or not, the clubs I represent—particularly Albany and Mt Barker—support it. It came about as a result of the support this House gave at the time of that threat, support which showed that it was not prepared to accept that country clubs could be wiped from existence.

This Bill is to amend the Racing Restriction Act and it will eliminate the restrictions imposed on the number of racing or trotting meetings held by either the WATC or the WATA in the metropolitan area. That does not mean that the Act will disappear from the Statute book and that is a very important point. At a later stage the Parliament could reimpose restrictions if it is considered that the WATC or the WATA step out of line as we, the members representing the country areas, think could happen in the future. If it does happen, I am sure the necessary action will be taken.

The WATC and the WATA have fully supported the move and have received the support of their country membership. In particular, the WATA received a letter from the President of the Country Trotting Association, which represents some 21 country clubs, stating that at a recent meeting it agreed unanimously to support the amendments to the Racing Restriction Act as laid down in the Bill before the House. The letter is signed by John F. Higgins, the President of the WACTA. Most of the major country clubs and, of course, the major provincial clubs, also support this Bill.

It has been said by previous speakers that the Bill will result in more money passing through the TAB and, in turn, that will be passed on to the industry. At the moment, the industry is floundering.

You, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), may remember that some weeks ago you and I attended a meeting of the Katanning Turf Club and we were told that over the years what had been accepted as a 60 per cent subsidy on the stake moneys of the previous year had dropped some 48 per cent. This was making it harder for country clubs to operate. We must look at this on the basis that the differential of 18 to 20 per cent on a 20 per cent share makes a difference, when that 20 per cent is cut down by any amount whatsoever.

It was explained to us at Katanning that the problem facing the picnic race clubs—the smaller country race clubs—is that they require an unplaced horse dividend. They said that if they could reap the benefit of an unplaced horse dividend as a result of his legislation, they could operate properly.

In the discussions between the association and the Katanning Turf Club it was indicated that it was up to it to chase sponsorship, organise stake money, and organise the club. At that time the Katanning club was paying a \$40 dividend for unplaced horses, and that was having a great effect on its financial situation, so much so, that the Katanning Turf Club was facing dissolution because financially it could not continue. Later on in this address I will give members what I believe to be the answer to that problem.

Following the introduction of the Bill into this House and the approaches to me by different clubs, I was still not totally prepared to accept the Bill because I believed that, as had happened with the Mt. Barker club, it could be detrimental, particularly to country clubs.

I wanted the assurance, particularly for the clubs I represent, about some points before I could support the Bill. I had a meeting with Mr John Roberts, the President of the WATC, Mr Ray Campbell, the chief executive, Mr Ray Warren, and Mr Harold Jarvis—four prominent members of the WATC. Following that meeting they sent a letter which I intend to read to the House in order that it is placed on record. It shows the genuineness these people have towards the amendment to the racing Act in the interests of the racing community. The letter reads as follows—

Thank you for the opportunity of discussing with you a number of matters relating to the proposed amendment to the Racing Restriction Act and, in particular, the position of the Mount Barker Turf Club.

They say that, because I relayed to them what had happened last year regarding the Mt. Barker Turf Club and the fact that members in this house thought it was a move to eliminate country racing. The letter continues—

As promised, I confirm the following points of our discussion:

1. It is not the intention of the Western Australian Turf Club to change the present status of the Mount Barker Turf Club. That Club need have no fears regarding its future.
2. If the Act is amended permitting increased metropolitan mid-week racing dates, it is not our intention to take mid-

week dates from Bunbury and Pinjarra. Consequently, there is no threat to the Mount Barker Turf Club.

I can also add that subsidy arrangements to be introduced following the amendment to the Act do not provide for a subsidy to be paid to Bunbury and Pinjarra if they race on Saturdays.

3. We have no objection to a limit of 104 metropolitan meetings being included in the amendment to the Act.
4. I enclose copies of letters from the South West Racing Association and the Eastern Districts Racing Association indicating their agreement with the proposed action to amend the Act.

Thank you again for your interest. I hope, in the light of our discussions, you will now be able to support the amendment.

The first letter was dated 23 August 1984. I then contacted the WATC again because I wanted a further point clarified, and I received a reply in a letter dated 10 September. I will not read out my letter in which I asked for clarification in particular of clause 2 of the previous letter. The WATC letter read—

Dear Mr. Knight

Your letter to Mr R. H. Campbell dated 30th August, 1984 was considered by Committee at its meeting on Tuesday, 4th September and I have been requested to advise that this Club has no intention of taking any further midweek meetings from Bunbury and Pinjarra and it is therefore unlikely that they will want to apply for additional meetings on Saturdays and Public Holidays in competition with Ascot.

During discussions with Clubs on racing dates there has been no indication either from Pinjarra or Bunbury that they intend to increase their Saturday meetings and to discourage these Clubs from making application to increase Saturday meetings Committee has decided that there will be no subsidy paid to any Provincial Club which races on a Saturday or Public Holiday.

Thank you for your prompt reply to our letter. I hope that this satisfactorily answers your question and that you will now be able to support the amendment to the Racing Restrictions Act.

Yours faithfully,

THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN
TURF CLUB

This proves to me that these people have dared to put down in black and white what they intend doing—without innuendos, mystery, intrigue or that sort of thing which has been floating around this Chamber this afternoon about what might happen.

I mentioned earlier that because the Racing Restriction Act will remain, although amended, we will still have a Racing Restriction Act which we can reintroduce at some time if members of Parliament feel country clubs are being prejudiced by whatever the Turf Club or the Trotting Association does to them.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I can imagine how that would be viewed sympathetically in this hostile House!

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: I think that was proved last year when the Mt. Barker issue arose.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That was totally different.

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: I think the member is reading the remarks incorrectly. As a result of that, we must leave the Act there and leave it to the House to see whether it is affecting these country clubs. We have done it in the past, and proved country clubs were prepared to fight for the retention of their clubs. Last year, the Mt. Barker club was threatened with being wiped out of existence. Mt. Barker is still racing as strongly as ever, it still holds TAB meetings, it still receives racecourse development trust funds, and it still retains the support of the WA Turf Club.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Thank goodness!

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: Exactly. As a result of discussions with the Katanning Race Club a couple of weeks ago, I have had a further discussion with Mr Roberts. I asked for a guarantee that a subsidy will be paid for unplaced horses. As there is not a meeting of his committee for another week or so, he has given me, at this stage, his personal guarantee of \$100 000, which works out on an approximate basis of \$30 per unplaced horse. He intends to carry on and make an approach to his committee to lift that to \$168 000—the amount which they believe is required to make a subsidy of \$40 per unplaced horse to all clubs throughout the State.

This will keep the little clubs going. This is all the little clubs have asked for, because it is something they never had before. They are not losing anything that was there before; they are just against the fact that in the initial stages they are being pushed slowly out of existence. Because they cannot arrange sponsorship, they have not been able to arrange money to attract horses from city areas or from the major country areas. This proposal will help them tremendously.

I have known Mr Roberts for some 14 years, and his word is as good as his bond. He has never let me down. This guarantee is given by him. I told him I would push that point on the floor of this House so that country members, people from small country clubs, would be aware that the WA Turf Club is genuine, and that therefore the country clubs will not suffer and be responsible for the \$150 000 or \$160 000 that they are putting out at the moment to pay dividends for unplaced horses.

Many country clubs believe that the development trust money will stop with this Racing Restriction Act. The racecourse development trust was introduced by this Parliament as a means of funding the establishment of facilities and amenities for race clubs. If that board of management is dominated by the WATA or the WATC and they intend to make sure that those funds do not go to the country clubs, we should move in this House to change the constitution of that board to ensure that it has representatives of country areas on it.

I say that because so many of the clubs believe that this Racing Restriction Act will take away their right to receive allocations from the racecourse development trust. It has nothing to do with this Act, except that members on the board are with the WATC or the WATA. If the WATC and the WATA dominated that board, they could work against particular country clubs. I believe I would have the support of this House in moving an amendment to change the constitution of that board to ensure that those country clubs are looked after.

I rang the President of the Katanning Race Club last night.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How many races a year does it hold?

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: I am pleased to say that I can give that information to the member. It held four race meetings two years ago, three race meetings last year, and this year it intends to hold one. The point is that that dropped off without anything to do with the Racing Restriction Act. That club could not carry on financially. What we are doing today is not having any effect on any of those small country clubs; it is a financial situation which exists everywhere today.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They would be a lot bigger than Pingrup.

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: Pingrup runs a race meeting every year. I have been to both meetings and Pingrup attracts more people. Pingrup is some 150 miles from Albany and some 80 miles from Katanning. It has a couple of stores, a garage, and a hotel. Katanning, 80 miles to the west, with

something like 5 000 or 6 000 people, has fewer people at its race meetings. So what the member has suggested is not correct.

It is not the area in which the meeting is held which affects the attendance, it is the effort the people put in, or the parochialism of those people wanting to support their own areas.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Have you been to a meeting at Northam, York, Toodyay, or Beverley?

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: No, I have not because I do not represent that area. I am busy enough supporting the race clubs in the area I represent.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How many are there?

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: Five, and the trotting club.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How many races?

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: There are 15 or 18 at Albany, nine at Mt. Barker, the Albany club has something like 13 races, the Esperance Bay turf club would have five or six races, and the Katanning Race Club, as I said, up to this year had four one year, three last year, and one this year, and Pingrup race club has one.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: So you are in the big time.

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: I am glad the honourable member appreciates that. I am here fighting for what my clubs think is best. They believe this Bill will be in their best interests and will help the racing fraternity.

The WATC has indicated it will provide \$580 000 by way of subsidies to country clubs and it has made this known through Press and media releases. I want it on record that I do not expect the WATC to leave the figure at \$580 000. Because of inflation and indexation, the amount should be increased in years ahead on a *pro rata* basis. It would be most unfair if we were asked to accept that this amount would continue without there being *pro rata* increases, especially when we realise that racing costs go up, when the WATC's return from racing increases, and its return from the Totalisator Agency Board increases. I expect that figure to be indexed to allow country clubs to benefit fairly from funding by the WATC and the WATA year by year.

The Turf Club and the Trotting Association differ in that the Trotting Association has two bodies: The Western Australian Trotting Association which is metropolitan based, and the Western Australian Country Trotting Association which is country based. This makes it harder for the parent body to control the industry. The WA Turf Club is based in Perth and just has representatives from country areas attending its meetings. I have been told that on some occasions the

country members, immediately upon being seated at these meetings, are handed an agenda and the meeting starts. To show the country clubs that they are an important part of the racing industry, the WATC should in future circulate agendas for each meeting a week ahead so that the country delegates can discuss the agendas with their clubs prior to attending the meetings at headquarters.

The information in the letters I have received has pleased me and my racing clubs greatly. The guarantee given to me by Mr Roberts, the Chairman of the WATC, about the subsidy for dividends for unplaced horses is in the interests of the smaller clubs and is to be applauded. This subsidy will be available to them in time for the next racing round, which means that the subsidy will start with a guarantee of \$28 to \$30 a horse, and he has promised that he will put a recommendation to the WATC which will ensure the clubs meeting the full cost of \$40 for unplaced horses. This is a major breakthrough. The Katanning club approached Hon. D. J. Wordsworth and me, and its president indicated that the club was delighted with the news.

I hope the racecourse development trust will approve an application before it to provide \$12 000 for work on the tote building at the Katanning Race Club. I trust that it will show that it does not intend to favour particular country clubs or the metropolitan area and is prepared to provide the funding, which would eliminate 99 per cent of the Katanning club's problems.

I am sure the people I represent are delighted with the outcome of the negotiations of the last couple of weeks. I support the Bill in its entirety.

HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [5.14 p.m.]: I suppose I ought to put in my penn'orth worth, because Mr McKenzie did mention that he and I were members of a committee which was chaired by Mr Baxter, and which inquired into the racing industry, and he quoted from the report we presented.

I think members are gradually getting the impression that the racing industry is complex, and that would be a perfectly correct impression. One of our regrets was expressed on page 67 of the report, and I quote as follows—

Your Commission is aware that very few Ministers responsible, in the past, for racing in Western Australia, have been involved to any degree in racing and trotting, nor have they been race followers and therefore lacked a general knowledge of the industries.

That has been a regrettable factor in our racing industry. Victoria has provided a contrast, because a number of its Ministers were very interested in

racing, people such as Sir Henry Bolte, Murray Parker, Arthur Rylah, and its present Minister, Nugget Tresize.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Bob Hawke.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not know whether he is interested in racing. I say things only about matters which I know are correct.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You have changed.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Perhaps it is because I am not getting paid enough to stray from the narrow path of veracity.

It has been hinted in the House that there is a degree of fear and concern within the racing industry about saying anything. I want to state unequivocally that that is a fact. I was surprised, as I am sure Mr McKenzie was, at the amount of anonymity demanded by witnesses coming before our inquiry, and by their requests for confidentiality. That theme runs through our report.

The report points out that many of the payments made by the WATC, and to a lesser extent by the WATA, are gratuitous in the sense that they are not spelt out in legislation as being payments as of right. There is no doubt that the Turf Club has been generous to many country clubs. It has paid quite handsomely to get the extra race meetings which it wants for the city, and I will come back to the reason for this in a minute.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It could be buying affection.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There is very little doubt that there is an element of that in it. The point the report tried to make was that it was comparatively simple in legislation to make provision for those payments and to make them a right and so remove the Big Brother aspect. When we understand that this Big Brother attitude exists with Turf Club payments to provincial and country clubs, it is little wonder that a delegate from such a club will be careful in any opposition to the WATC. He would not want to risk any payments his club was likely to receive and he would not want to cross these people. This view was put quite clearly to the committee by these people.

It has to be remembered that racing in this State is expensive—more expensive than is the case in a number of other countries. We race on grass. That might not mean much to the average person and it did not mean much to me when I first took an interest in racing in the days when the TAB was established. It is surprising, in a nation the people of which to a man are reported to be rabid gamblers, that this Parliament should have been short of members keen on racing. There

has always been a dearth of members who have fully understood the racing industry here. I certainly do not. What I know is as a result of a study of the report and the action taken in the late 1950s and the early 1960s.

I wish to speak about what makes racing tick financially in this State. It must be borne in mind that it is the profitability of a race meeting, in relation to the TAB betting, which keeps racing afloat. It is no good talking about a country meeting if the TAB activity is not included, because a race meeting cannot be run without the TAB. A race meeting cannot be run in a country area on a Saturday afternoon in competition with any other events.

The logic of bringing race meetings to the city was that such a system would make money. There is no way one can make money in racing without betting. There is no doubt that the racing industry is worried about the proliferation of activities chasing the betting dollar. I am referring to Lotto, bingo, and the proposed casino, as well as soccer pools. All of those activities are competing for the gambling dollar. It must worry the racing business. If they can get more gambling into the racing industry it means more profitability. It also means more profit for the Treasury, and as politicians we must applaud that because it brings us support from a percentage of the electors.

My argument as a country member is that we seem to be tackling this matter in the wrong way. Mr McKenzie said that the majority of the breeding, training, and stabling is done in the metropolitan area, because it is allowed. There is no reason that it could not be pushed out to Northam, Pinjarra, or Bunbury where indeed it is already.

Mr McNeil pointed out that this is a totally integrated industry. If a person wishes his horse to get a start it has to race first in the country. One would have to float his horse to York, Northam, or Beverley. It is no good saying it is too pricey, one can subsidise it if necessary.

I understand Mr Williams spoke about this subject, but I was not present because I was representing Mr Hassell at a naturalisation ceremony. Mr Williams said that it is the punter who makes racing possible in Western Australia. It was by accident that we did not lead Australia with this type of legislation. I think Victoria or South Australia beat us with an Act—it was only a matter of the different sitting times of our Parliaments which prevented our being first.

If we examine carefully the arguments which have been put forward about moving racing from the country to the city, let me assure members that exactly the same argument could apply to

moving racing from Perth to Melbourne. In that way we would get more profit out of it, because in that city a bigger crowd is attracted. We stopped that with the establishment of the TAB. In the days of the illegal SP betting, most of the gambling was done out of sight, and frequently out of sound of racing, because there were few television sets and frequently the radio reception was poor.

The men who ran the betting, the Healys, Humphries and others—names forgotten by most of the young people who are interested in racing now—did not care where racing was held. The Eastern States races were reliably reported and the form of the horses was very good, because racing was strictly controlled. We will not talk about the current controversy in Queensland!

It was well controlled because it represented big money and the beauty of it all was that it finished by 3.00 p.m. because the Eastern States were two hours ahead of us. With the arrangement of local betting shops and subsequently the TAB, the race-horse industry in Western Australia was saved.

The arguments about the difficulties of floating horses to York, Northam, Beverley, or Bunbury could be applied to cancelling racing in Western Australia and holding it in Sydney and Melbourne and watching it on television.

I say as a country member that it is simply not good enough, and there ought to be a deliberate move to encourage racing back to the country areas. I do not know whether anyone has mentioned the fact, but because of the nature of the courses here it has been necessary to have a winter course and a summer course. Most people to whom I have spoken are quite concerned about the state of the metropolitan course during winter. I refer to Mr Williams' comments on this because he is probably the best authority on metropolitan racing in this House. Mr McNeil is probably the authority on country races.

Mr Williams will be aware that at the last couple of meetings in Perth the horses were almost bogged down because of the damp and muddy conditions. This happened to a couple of horses close to the rail. With grass courses that is always the risk. Indeed, in the country areas of Beverley, York, Northam, and Toodyay there are occasions where the courses are washed out. Mr McNeil referred to that happening when he went to the races last week. That is the reason country courses were established. They are close enough to the city, and my argument is that the whole programme could have been reversed and the industry pushed out.

One of the best recommendations of that report to my mind was aimed at the establishment of a

proper organisation of committees to which meeting dates have to be submitted. If a decision could not be agreed upon, then some sort of appeal should go to the Minister. While I think the Minister is foolish to take as much authority as he has under this Bill, I have never worried about the final appeal being made to a Minister, because Ministers usually do their best to be as fair as they can.

Within that committee structure we suggest a racing council which would meet and advise the Minister and discuss problems with all the interested people. At present the control of racing is firmly in the hands of the Turf Club, as is the control of the administration of the moneys.

Certainly, there is a formula which sets out how much money is spent in country areas and how much money is spent in city areas. However, there is no laid-down rule which states, for example, that Bunbury shall get so much and Beverley shall get so much. We believe that there should be registered divisions between the TAB clubs and the non-TAB clubs. They should be properly organised and people should be seen to have a say.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What consideration has been given to that recommendation.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: None, unfortunately. I agree with Mr McKenzie. If one takes a little snippet of the report then this Bill endeavours to see that that is done. It has allowed for appeals to be made to the Minister in cases where disputes arise. However, it has not allowed for people to have frank and open discussions without being overseen by what I call "the Big Brother" paternalistic attitude of the Turf Club in relation to the distribution of money. It is a bit like a father saying that he runs his household on democratic lines, but when the children back-answer him, he takes away their weekly allowance.

I am sure that Mr McKenzie will agree with my alarm about so many people in the racing industry being afraid of saying the wrong thing because their club's financial interests would be jeopardised, and the Turf Club would not treat them as kindly as it should.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I think a lot of that was groundless, but you are quite right.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The member took the words out of my mouth. I was about to say that if one approached the past president and the present President of the Western Australian Turf Club who, as most members know, are both honourable men, with those thoughts, they would be horrified. Nevertheless, if consideration were being given to allocate a club \$100 000 or \$110 000 and that club had been causing trouble,

it would not be difficult to give the club only \$100 000. It would be difficult for any of us to be fair-minded under those circumstances.

I am suggesting that there are people who feel, rightly or wrongly, that they are being penalised. That applies to other aspects too.

We have mentioned already the appeals system available to the jockeys. Many jockeys feel that personal aspects creep into their system of appeal. I do not agree with that either. I know that Mr Tresize in Victoria is seriously thinking of changing the system there from a committee jury system to a system of appeals to a board. I do not think that system will prove to be any better despite some very real problems that have occurred in Victoria over charges of graft and corruption. I think the stewards do as good a job as we can expect them to do. I know that an august member of this Chamber disagrees with me violently. You would be aware of that, Mr President. Nevertheless, I do not think that a new system would make much difference to the jockeys.

There are ways in which the feelings of country clubs can be assuaged. There are ways of returning racing to the country areas. I sat and listened to Mr McKenzie, who is a conscientious city member, and I sat and listened to Mr McNeil, who is a conscientious country member, with feelings of great sorrow. I have been thinking recently that the Liberal Party is tending, to my mind, to being a little more centralised and city-bound. Perhaps a few of us should join the Country Party and make it a country-based party. There has been talk of that across Australia.

It seems to me to be inevitable that everything is moving to the city. Country areas might just as well give up the ghost. It might surprise members to know that I am firmly of the opinion that, if a young family living in the country moved to the city, it would be \$3 000 better off because there are many more advantages for a family living in the city. There are better education facilities, museums and art galleries, better athletic facilities, and better facilities for football and other sports. There are even better racetrack facilities. It is very easy to say that, because the continuation of racing in the country is difficult, it should be moved to the city. What will be next? Will we move all junior athletics and nipper football to the city? Will we cut the arts grants to country areas? Members should make no mistake: Every political party does the same thing because there is little option.

You and I know, Mr President, that, when the figures for Sydney and Melbourne were in for the last Federal election, the election was over. That

sort of thing is happening more and more. We all talk about decentralisation and about stopping Canberra from taking more control. Members should make no mistake: Where I come from, people are very concerned about that movement and that concern is growing. Many people are moving to the city. Mr McKenzie said that we should move everything to the city.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I did not say that.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I know you did not; I am exaggerating. However, the implication was there. I am sure that if we began with racing, we could make every effort to encourage the country clubs to continue.

Mr McKenzie was with me when we visited clubs in Victoria. There are first-class track facilities in country areas close to Melbourne and people come from the near metropolitan area and from country race tracks to train their horses at those facilities.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That has a far different population base.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is right. A lot of country clubs have combined. However, they were clubs which rarely held meetings. That can be misleading because there are country clubs such as the club at Dardanup which held its meeting in Bunbury and because of that was wiped out.

Hon. Fred McKenzie interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the member not to interject because Mr MacKinnon knows we have to finish the Committee stage before 6.00 p.m.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr President, you know how religiously I speak to you and avoid speaking to members because I am aware of the need not to encourage interjections.

One of the recommendations which seems to have been forgotten was the one for a racing advisory committee comprising a chairman and two other members. Matters would be discussed with controlling bodies and the committee would maintain constant liaison with clubs and other racing industry groups in order to make everyone feel they are part of the one industry.

I hope that what I have said does at least strike a chord somewhere along the line when the Under Secretary is studying this matter and advising his Minister and when other Ministers in this Chamber are considering the matters submitted in Cabinet. I hope they remember, as Tom McNeil has said, that country racing is a very important and integral part of the racing industry. Mr Williams has said that it employs a quarter of a million people, and I have no reason to argue with that figure. It is a good industry which takes

people outside into the fresh air, and it is an exciting industry. It makes the money go round in all sorts of ways and gives revenue to the Government.

Country racing is essential; horses have to be given a start in order to move up the ladder and so that they can be sorted into classes. The way we are progressing it will be necessary to run horses in the country in front of a few track television sets to make sure everything is honest and above board because nobody will be there to watch the races. Tracks will have to be maintained somewhere because horses must be given a start. The industry cannot be run on the basis of one track only in the metropolitan area during the winter months.

It is not practical to have one grass track on which to race and train. Unless things have changed in the last couple of days, the track at Helena is used for training, although there has been some talk about selling it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It has been sold.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: So we have the situation of one track which has to absorb all the water in the winter and be available for racing and training horses. It simply will not work.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It worked this year.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We have had a number of dry years and this is the first wet one for a long time. I understand that it only just worked this year. I am not a racegoer myself, but I am told that horses were practically bogged down on the rails in the last couple of weeks.

Having made those points, I will hasten to resume my seat.

HON. MARGARET McALEER (Upper West) [5.43 p.m.]: The other day at Dongara races I had occasion to say that punting through the TAB was certainly the lifeblood of the racing industry in Western Australia. However, if it were only a question of betting on the TAB, all racing might as well be centralised in Perth. In fact, there would be no need for any in Western Australia and it could all take place in Melbourne and Sydney. I had not remembered hearing Mr MacKinnon make that comment, but when I returned I realised that I had been quoting him. The fact is that racing is more than just placing bets on the TAB. It is a whole industry which involves racehorse breeders, owners, trainers, and jockeys, not to speak of bookmakers, agents, feed merchants, and farriers. The industry exists though not to the same proportion in the country as in the metropolitan area because we know how out of proportion the population is in the metropolitan area compared with the country population. Mr MacKinnon has claimed that the indus-

try exists in Bunbury as though that were the only place. Certainly a number of trainers, for instance, work in Geraldton and round about.

As far as the country is concerned, racing provides a great amenity. I do not claim that all the country population, to a man, go to the race courses, but a considerable number do go and enough to support the meetings in a respectable way and provide good crowds. The number of horses which have been bred, bought, and trained in Western Australia, as a number of speakers have mentioned, particularly Tom McNeil, has increased tremendously in recent years. It has become extremely hard to get a start for a horse in Perth and on many occasions in the country also.

On the race day at Dongara only half of the horses nominated could be accepted. There was a programme of six races and 12 horses were accepted for each race. The number nominated for each race was 24. There is a great need for further opportunities for horses to be nominated for races within Western Australia. Apparently this arises because apart from the metropolitan area, race rounds are staggered so that programmes for Geraldton, Murchison, and for the north do not really overlap. Therefore, it is often very difficult to find a race in which to start a horse. On that occasion the horses came from all over Western Australia and had raced in the Pilbara, the Murchison, the metropolitan area, and the eastern districts. Many of them certainly came from Perth and whatever Hon. Tom McNeil may say about the expense, the owners and trainers appeared to be glad to travel from Perth in order to race their horses. It was a most successful race day with the tremendous crowd and very good fields. It was held on a Thursday which happened to be within the school holidays. Therefore, it catered for many people on holidays from other parts of the State. Many metropolitan people attended. In this way Dongara was providing an amenity for the holidaymakers and it was doing something to boost the economy of the town.

The Dongara race club is one of the small clubs to which Mick Gayfer was referring slightly. It holds only three race meetings a year.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Where is the race track? I have never been able to find it.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: On the north of the town by the old stone silo. The race club is getting ownership of the land through the shire council. The race track was preserved but a crop was grown in the centre of the track. The crop was harvested in due course because it was very successful.

Dongara race club is a small non-TAB club. It has been threatened with the loss of racecourse

development funds at a time when the club has obtained ownership of the ground and needs to improve facilities. My remarks were made in response to the comments of the chairman of the race club who said it was becoming more and more dependent on sponsorship. The sponsorship is largely from local people, but some Perth firms do sponsor the club. Good as that sponsorship may be, it would not be sufficient to make the race club viable if that was the only income it had.

I was surprised to hear John Williams say how much the Western Australian Turf Club appreciates the importance of country racing and that there was no way that it would disadvantage it because it understood its importance to the whole industry.

I was surprised, because it has taken months and months of protests from the country clubs themselves, and from members of the Legislative Council, and inquiries from the Minister responsible for racing, to get the sort of compensation which the WA Turf Club is currently offering to the country clubs in return for their support of the Bill.

It is no wonder that the non-TAB clubs, and a certain number of other country clubs, still wish that this House would not pass the Bill, because they feel that, in doing so, we will remove the last influence and the last vestige of control over the WA Turf Club. That influence and control act as a protection for the country clubs which consider they have a possible hope, if not a guarantee, that they will obtain better funding in the future. This certainly does not apply to all the clubs in my province. The Toodyay racing club in the eastern districts association has accepted the WA Turf Club's proposal. The Geraldton Turf Club, which is strong and is doing well, has also accepted it and has written to me to say it would be glad if I supported the Bill.

However, there are other clubs which, although they have not written to me, have expressed their fears that, once this Bill is passed, they will have no further redress if the WA Turf Club does not continue in a more generous manner than it has in the past. I do not agree entirely with them and I was pleased—I do not wish to be churlish about it—to hear of the assurances which were given by the Chairman of the WA Turf Club to Hon. Tom Knight.

I do not think we have gone nearly far enough and, without holding up the House any more, I indicate that although I strongly support the stand taken by Hon. Graham MacKinnon, we should be looking to implementing the Baxter report. We should create a commission or committee and a council so that the control of racing not only is

fairer or more just, but also appears to be so to all clubs involved.

While I am prepared to support the Bill, I am not prepared in any way to sit by and let the country clubs, small or large, be disadvantaged as a result of it. There are enough horses in Western Australia and the position of the racing industry will be such, with the increased number of dates granted for the metropolitan area, that it will not absolutely affect racing in the country; but it is something that needs watching, because if the horses no longer come from the metropolitan area and circulate in the various circuits of Western Australian racing, it will be very unfortunate. If that occurs, we should take some steps in line with the proposal outlined by Hon. Graham MacKinnon to rescue racing in the country for the country and for country people.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [5.55 p.m.]: Unlike Hon. Graham MacKinnon, I do not know a great deal about racing and perhaps I am speaking without great authority. However, as a member of Parliament, one must look at the problems of one's constituents and I have endeavoured to do that in respect of this Bill.

I do not frequent the race track very often. I am not as strongly opposed to racing as is Hon. Peter Wells, but I have never found any great attraction in it. As a Cabinet Minister, I used to be sent along to the races to show that Cabinet was interested in them. I am not sure what that did for them. I enjoyed the pleasure of the company of the President of the WA Turf Club (Sir Ernest Lee-Steele), who used to look after one very well. However, with the more humble country meetings, if I may describe them in that way, one goes along and looks at the problems the clubs experience and one realises those problems are very different from the problems of the WATC.

I attended the Katanning Race Club with Hon. Tom Knight. The people at the meeting indicated their problems and asked for our support in respect of this Bill. A rather frightening picture is seen when one looks at the annual statement of income and expenditure of the Katanning Race Club. It indicates that the WATC subsidies amounted to \$22 560 out of a total income of \$57 000; in other words, nearly half of that club's income came from WATC subsidies. One wonders how it was possible to operate the club successfully when one sees its subscriptions amounted to \$330 and its gate takings to \$960 annually. It is clear that, unfortunately, not many people are attending the meetings and one must bear in mind the expenditure incurred these days in getting horses to the track, and in paying jockeys' fees and in-

surance, and the like. The costs of running a race meeting are very high.

The secretary of the club told me that there would not be a lot of money in it for people who participated in country meetings. I refer here to Mrs Adams, who said that her experience was that two of her horses came third at a TAB meeting and she collected \$34 for each of them. If one gets only \$34 for a horse which comes third, one would not want to travel very far to get to the meeting, bearing in mind travelling expenses.

Hon. Tom Knight: It would get you halfway down the straight.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: One must also take into account the cost of one's jockey and everything else. The fees the country clubs have been collecting from the WATC have been essential.

When I first became a member of Parliament, it was put to me that, if I donated a trophy worth a couple of hundred dollars, the WATC had a system whereby it would subsidise that the following year. Indeed, the club would get back 60 per cent of what was put in. Unfortunately, the WATC has dropped the figure from 60 per cent to 48 per cent and this has caused some of the major problems experienced by small racing clubs.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What is the assurance it will not go even lower?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: One wonders why that money has been given to those clubs and whether this Act has been a major influence in that regard. I sympathise with the comments made by other members.

I shall use the example of the Katanning Race Club to indicate the effect the dropping of the subsidy from 60 per cent to 48 per cent has had on these clubs. In 1980-81, the Katanning Race Club had stake money of \$31 500 for its four meetings. In 1981-82, the TAB distribution fell by \$142 a month. It is worked out on a monthly basis; therefore, the figure has to be multiplied by 12. However, the club managed to continue its race meetings with stake money of \$33 500. The TAB distribution fell by \$242 a month the following year; consequently the club had to reduce its number of race meetings to two with \$18 700 stake money, because it did not have the money for any more meetings.

At the end of that year, the TAB distribution fell by \$687 a month and now it looks as though the club will go into liquidation. The funds that clubs get from the WATC determine whether they exist.

It is interesting to look at the amount distributed to country clubs because we find that Mt. Barker, which totalled \$105 000 in stake money last year—incidentally it is receiving \$5 000 a month now—looked to be a club that would be closed down by the WATC until this House protested. Up till then no committee man of the WATC had ever attended a meeting there to the club's knowledge. I do not think any official of the Turf Club had ever bothered to visit the club, either.

I can understand the problems country clubs are facing and the feelings they must hold towards the WATC. Of course they are grateful for anything they get, because they would not survive without it. I am concerned about what will happen to these clubs if this Bill goes through unamended.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Minister for Administrative Services) [6.02 p.m.]: I thank the members who have expressed support for the Bill and I take into account the comments of members who have not supported the Bill. I have noted the concern of members for non-TAB clubs, and a number of members would know that I have made it my business to visit places such as Cue, Mt. Magnet, and Roebourne. I will be returning to Mt. Magnet for the cup.

I would very much regret it if non-TAB clubs went out of existence, because I believe we cannot boil everything down to dollars and cents. The picnic race meetings—as they are referred to—are part and parcel of Australia's heritage and they should be preserved. Some members will know of the works of Banjo Paterson and others and will have read about the Geebung races. If members

go way outback they will know these events are still alive.

Just about all non-TAB clubs have written to me over the last few weeks expressing concern, and no doubt they have written to many other members. They have been concerned about the stake subsidies paid to non-TAB clubs. They are concerned that the subsidies paid to provincial clubs could have a detrimental effect on non-TAB clubs. I have made it my business to discuss the matter with both the previous chairman and the present Chairman of the Turf Club. The latter has assured me that he will do everything in his power to see that the \$40 fee is provided for unplaced horses. He will maintain a regular contact with me or whoever is the responsible Minister to ensure that some of the concerns expressed, whether real or imagined, do not occur, concerns which see the Turf Club in some sort of superior situation. We have overcome these problems.

This Bill represents the only way our very great racing industry can continue. I have taken into account the comments made by Hon. Graham MacKinnon, and perhaps at some other time I can discuss with him a lot of factors which influence country racing and which are helping it to go down the gurgler.

Country areas are banding together into regional centres, and one has only to drive around the country to see derelict towns which were once flourishing communities. I give an assurance that there will be an appeal to the Minister. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PLANNING: CANAL DEVELOPMENT

Dawesville: Relocation of Landowners

159. Hon. C. J. BELL, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

With reference to the proposed Dawesville cut south of Mandurah, is it the Government's intention to relocate owners of affected land to a mutually agreed alternative property if the owners seek this course of action instead of purchasing the land outright?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

No. When the Premier met with the affected landowners on 8 September, he advised the affected small landholders that the Government was prepared to negotiate the sale of their property at market value plus 10 per cent prior to a final decision being made about the Dawesville cut. At the same meeting, the major property owner in the surrounding area gave an undertaking to help the small property owners to relocate in the same general area.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Patients: Costs

161. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What was the cost per patient day at—

- (a) Osborne Park Hospital;
- (b) Wanneroo Hospital;
- (c) Royal Perth Hospital;
- (d) Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital;

as at—

- (i) 30 June 1983; and

- (ii) 30 June 1984?

- (2) What was the charge for public patients at these hospitals as at above dates?
- (3) What was the charge to insurance and workers' compensation at these hospitals as at the above dates?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Costs per inpatient day, inclusive of outpatient/casualty costs, were—

	1982-83	1983-84
	\$	\$
(a) Osborne Park	156.02	185.55
(b) Wanneroo	180.61	*239.25
(c) Royal Perth	325.54	354.82

1982-83 1983-84

	\$	\$
(d) Sir Charles Gairdner	334.63	357.38

*Note: Includes an amount of \$16.04 relating to the provision of a casualty service.

- (2) No charge was raised for public patients as at 30 June 1983 and 30 June 1984.
- (3) *Postponed.*

DISCRIMINATION: ABORIGINES

Landholding

171. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Were Aborigines ever prevented, by law, from owning or leasing land in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, will the Minister provide details?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The member may be aware that under British law, Western Australia was regarded as being "settled" rather than conquered. The land was regarded as being *terra nullus* i.e., nobody's land. Many authorities have regarded this as a "legal fiction" which enabled the earlier settlers to dispossess the indigenous inhabitants. Therefore in the philosophical sense, by virtue of such dispossession, Aborigines were prevented from what could be perceived as their traditional and therefore rightful ownership. The Aborigines' Act 1905 took away from Aborigines the power to deal with their property and in place made provision for the Chief Protector to manage all property of any person under the Act.
- (2) As above.

PLANNING: SUBDIVISION

Bunbury: Zoning

206. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Planning:

I refer the Minister to an advertisement placed in *The West Australian* newspaper on Saturday, 15 September 1984, in which the State Housing Commission is inviting registration of interest for requisition of land in a proposed stable subdivision of Lot 1, Brittain Road, Bunbury, and ask—

- (1) What is the present zoning classification of this land?

- (2) Has the proposed subdivision been approved by the City of Bunbury?

Hon. J. M. Berinson (for Hon. Peter Dowding) replied:

- (1) Low density residential.
 (2) No, because subdivisions are determined by the Town Planning Board and not council. However, the City of Bunbury is still considering its recommendation to the board.

207. *Postponed.*

EMERGENCY SERVICES: ROYAL FLYING DOCTOR SERVICE OF AUSTRALIA

Subsidy

208. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

- (1) How much subsidy did the State Government pay the Royal Flying Doctor Service in 1983-84?
 (2) Were any of these funds included in Commonwealth grants?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) \$2 790 000.
 (2) No.

ENVIRONMENT: ERMP

Chapman-Spencer Roads Link

209. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will the Minister please list the authorities involved in the preparation of the environmental review and management programme for the proposed Spencer-Manning Roads link?
 (2) Bearing in mind the other bodies which have asked to be consulted, but which are not represented on the committee preparing the report, is the present committee best suited to the preparation of an objective report?
 (3) What influence will the report of that committee have on the procedures which follow its delivery to the Government?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Canning City Council, Town Planning Department, Main Roads Department.
 (2) These authorities are the joint proponents of the project and therefore have the responsibility to prepare the environ-

mental review and management programme.

- (3) Normal planning and environmental procedures will be followed.

EMERGENCY SERVICES: ROYAL FLYING DOCTOR SERVICE OF AUSTRALIA

Aircraft: Clinics

210. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What was the total amount paid to the Royal Flying Doctor Service for use of their aircraft for medical clinics in the financial year 1983-84?

- (2) Where are these clinics carried out?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The State Government makes an annual contribution towards the operations of the Royal Flying Doctor Service. The contribution in 1983-84 amounted to \$2 790 000.

Accounting records supplied by the RFDS are not based on a functional format and the proportion applied for the use of aircraft for medical clinics in 1983-84 is therefore not known.

- (2) RFDS (Victorian Section).

Derby Base
 La Grange
 Lombadina
 One Arm Point
 Balgo/Lake Gregory
 Station Circuit
 Wyndham Base
 Kalumburu
 Oombulgurri
 Halls Creek
 Station Circuit
 RFDS (WA Section).
 Carnarvon Base
 Onslow
 Denham
 Useless Loop
 Meekatharra Base
 Wiluna
 Cue
 Mt. Magnet
 Sandstone
 Yalgoo
 Pt. Hedland Base
 Shay Gap
 Goldsworthy
 Marble Bar

Wittenoom
Perth Base
Paynes Find

RFDS (Eastern Goldfields).

Leonora

Warburton Range

Menzies

Warakurra

Giles

Cundeelee

Rawlinna

Coongana

Reid

Forrest

Eucla

Mundrabilla

Madura

Moonera

Caiguna

Cocklebiddy

Coonana

Lake Varley

Station Circuit

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: HOUSING

National Aboriginal Council

211. Hon W. N. STRETCH, to the Attorney General representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Will the Minister list the number of houses purchased by the National Aboriginal Council (NAC) over the last six months in—
 - (a) Wagin;
 - (b) Narrogin;
 - (c) Williams; and
 - (d) Kojonup?
- (2) Does the NAC consult with the relevant local government authorities before and during negotiations to purchase?
- (3) Are such houses, as are purchased, bought at the request of, and in the location requested by, local families who wish to rent them?
- (4) Are they purchased to fill a future possible need for Aboriginal accommodation?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (4) I am not aware of any houses being purchased by the National Aboriginal conference in the towns named. However, as the National Aboriginal Conference is a Commonwealth agency, any questions about its activities should

be directed to the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

WATER RESOURCES

Local Distribution Works

212. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

In respect of water connections to subdivisions of land in country townsites—

- (1) What is meant by the term "local distribution works" as distinct from reticulation costs and quotation fees?
- (2) How are the costs associated with the above arrived at?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) "Water supply local distribution works" are the facilities such as service reservoirs, elevated storages and pumping equipment, and trunk distribution mains which receive water from the source works and distribute it throughout the supply areas.

"Water supply reticulations" refer to the pipework excluding trunk distribution mains which convey water to all land holdings in the supply areas. It is generally limited to water mains not exceeding 200 millimetres in diameter together with valves, fire hydrants and other fittings, but excludes boundary services.

"Quotation fees" refer to the charge levied for the investigation and design work which is required to be carried out by the Public Works Department.

- (2) The water supply local distribution works lot charge is the average cost of the necessary works needed to meet the average demands of a single residential lot.

Reticulation costs are based on the estimated total expenditure for materials, labour, etc., required for the construction of the reticulation works to serve all lots within a subdivision.

Quotation fees are currently 3½ per cent of the capital cost of the required work. This fee is in effect a deposit which is included as part of the total cost of the work if it proceeds. If the work does not proceed, the fee is retained to offset the

design and other costs involved in the preparation of the estimate of cost.

ROADS

Manning-Spencer Roads: Link

213. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the Minister's answer to a question on 16 August 1984 indicating that construction of the Spencer-Manning Road link would have no significant effect on the traffic volumes in Manning Road, and ask—

Why have plans for this proposal, which have previously been prepared, shown such a strong connection—i.e., high standard facility—at the link with Manning Road?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The construction of the Spencer-Manning Road link will cause a redistribution of traffic in the vicinity of the existing Manning Road junctions with Albany and Leach Highways.

The proposals will allow for this and provide adequate connections between the Spencer-Manning Road link and both Manning Road and Leach Highway.

As there are no proposals to improve the standard of Manning Road, it can be expected that this road would continue to carry out the same traffic function that it does at present.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: MARINA

Sorrento: Alternative Sites

214. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

- (1) What sites in the northern coastal region were considered prior to the Government's decision to accept the Sorrento site for a marina?
- (2) What are the expected costs for the establishment of a marina at—
 - (a) the proposed Sorrento site;
 - (b) the Ocean Reef area; and
 - (c) any other sites considered?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) General characteristics of site suitability for recreational boat harbour develop-

ment within wet moorings have been examined at—

Trigg Island
North Beach
Pinaroo Point
Whitfords Beach
North Mullaloo Beach
Ocean Reef Boat Harbour.

- (2) (a) The indicative cost of basic development of the proposed Sorrento boat harbour is \$6.5 million;
- (b) and (c) detailed costing of equivalent developments has not been undertaken for any other site; the breakwater costs at Ocean Reef could well be double the costs applicable to Sorrento because of the greater depths of water.

GAMBLING: INQUIRY

Terms of Reference

215. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

- (1) What are the terms of reference of the inquiry into gaming laws in Western Australia?
- (2) Are submissions from the public invited?
- (3) In particular, will the committee investigate the legalisation of "two-up" after country race meetings?
- (4) When will the inquiry report to the Government?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) *Terms of reference—*

1. To review the gaming legislation in Western Australia with a view to considering rationalisation of the gaming laws of this State into a composite Gaming Act.
2. To review the licensing and control of gaming in limited circumstances and on certain premises such as—
 - (a) licensed clubs, including the playing of card games on a regular basis;
 - (b) sporting and social clubs;
 - (c) public amusement parlours;
 - (d) public places such as coffee lounges, hotels, taverns, nightclubs and restaurants;
 - (e) major sporting events including horse race meetings;

(f) the playing of two-up at race meetings and elsewhere.

3. To review any other aspects of gaming in Western Australia which the Government Gaming Study Group considers relevant and necessary.

(2) Yes. The closing date for submissions is 5 October 1984.

(3) Yes.

(4) No time limit has been fixed, but it is hoped that the committee will report within three months.

COMMUNITY SERVICES: HOSTEL

Naberu Hostel: Leonora

216. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

(1) Is it the Government's intention to close the Naberu Hostel at Leonora?

(2) If so, why?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

INSURANCE: PUBLIC LIABILITY

Showmen's Guild

217. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

(1) Has the State Government Insurance Office received approaches from the Showmen's Guild over the question of public liability insurance for showmen?

(2) If so, what has been the outcome?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

ROAD: MITCHELL FREEWAY

Traffic Counts

218. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) What are the traffic counts of vehicles using the Mitchell Freeway at—

(a) Hutton Street and Karrinyup Road section; and

(b) South Hutton Street?

(2) What is the expected traffic density and use of the new section north of Karrinyup Road?

(3) When is the next section of the freeway to Warwick Road expected to be completed?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) (a) 48 800 vehicles per day in March 1984;

(b) 52 800 vehicles per day in March 1984.

(2) Estimated usage of Mitchell Freeway north of Karrinyup Road after opening is 35 000-40 000 vehicles per day.

(3) Mid-1986.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Plantations: Carnarvon

219. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

(1) How many applications for water allocation for plantations in Carnarvon are currently before the Gascoyne River advisory committee?

(2) Since a ministerial direction was given for a water allocation for one grower in Carnarvon, how many applications has the Minister received direct to his office?

(3) Will the Minister direct that allocations be given to these applicants?

(4) If no, what are the differences between these applicants and the one to which the Public Works Department was directed to give an allocation?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) and (2) None.

(3) and (4) Not applicable.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Leinster

220. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Education:

(1) Has the Minister received a request from the Leinster P & C Association to have an extra teacher appointed to the Leinster Primary School?

(2) If so, will the Minister accede to the request?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. A reply left the Education Department on 13 September 1984, on my behalf, but over the signature of the Director General of Education.
- (2) The extra teacher took up duties at Leinster on 10 September 1984, to cover aspects such as specialist teacher and administrative relief that all other schools have and which Leinster lost because of some recent resignations.

FISHERIES: TRAPS

Shark Bay

221. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

How many fishing licences, either under Commonwealth or State jurisdiction, are endorsed to enable the fishermen to use "fish traps" in Shark Bay or adjoining fisheries?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (a) The use of fish traps in State waters of Shark Bay is prohibited;
- (b) forty-six boat licences have been endorsed for the taking of snapper by means of fish traps in waters adjoining State waters of Shark Bay;
- (c) no licence endorsements are required for boats taking fish other than snapper by means of fish traps.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: MARINA

Sorrento: Environmental Study

222. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

What are the terms of reference to the consultants retained to carry out the environmental investigation for the proposed Sorrento marina?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The consultants have been commissioned to complete an environmental review and management programme in accordance with the guidelines developed by the Environmental Protection Authority following its receipt of the notice of intent.

This is a six-page specification, accompanied by a seven-page general guidance note.

WATER RESOURCES

Yalgoo

223. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

Was the report in the *Geraldton Guardian* of 6 July 1984 that Yalgoo would receive a reticulated water scheme in the 1984-85 financial year correct?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Engineering planning for a reticulated water supply at Yalgoo is well advanced. The timing of construction is dependent upon the allocation of funds in the capital works programme which will be introduced into Parliament later.

PRISONS: FIRST OFFENDERS

Spouses: Counselling

224. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Prisons:

- (1) Is any counselling or advice available to the spouses of first offenders who are often in a position of not knowing who to turn to for advice?
- (2) Are such spouses advised officially as to where a prisoner has been taken?
- (3) If not, would the Minister consider instituting a system whereby, upon a first offender's arrival at his destination, an official note is despatched automatically by the prison authorities to the spouse with all relevant information, including where the spouse can go for help and advice?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes, by prisoner service staff directly or by a referral to a community agency such as the civil rehabilitation council.
- (2) No. However, where a prisoner requests that his family be advised of his location, he is enabled to contact them by telephone or telegram.
- (3) It is considered that the initiative in this matter should remain with the prisoner.

POLICE: AIDE*Wiluna: Housing*

225. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Attorney General, representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

(1) Is it a fact that housing for the police aide at Wiluna does not receive the same facilities—i.e., air-conditioning—as other police houses?

(2) If so, why the discrepancy?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Police aides are not eligible for Government Employees' Housing Authority accommodation and are housed by the State Housing Commission. Commission housing is not supplied with air-conditioning, while authority housing in the Wiluna area is.

**INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT:
WITTENOOM***White Industries*

226. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Regional Development and the North West:

(1) Has the Government made a decision on the proposed White Industries development at Wittenoom and if so, what is this decision?

(2) Is it a fact that no new connections or reconnections for power and water are being made at Wittenoom?

(3) What is the Government's current policy on the future of Wittenoom?

(4) Has the Government analysed the report prepared by Hames Sharley Pty Ltd, entitled "New Wittenoom", and if so, what is its reaction to the report?

(5) Has a costing for the cleaning up of asbestos fibres in the existing town of Wittenoom ever been made by Government, and if so, what is the total cost?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) No.

(2) Yes. This policy was introduced by the previous Government and is being continued at present.

(3) During the early stages of the development of Wittenoom townsite, asbestos mine tailings containing crocidolite were spread around the town as fill and used for roadworks. Crocidolite fibres are

regarded as the most dangerous respirable fibres in the world.

Expert medical advice is that long-term residents in Wittenoom are subject to serious health risks.

As a result the previous Government in 1978 decided to close the town. Later decisions were made to provide services to existing residents but to contain growth.

This Government's policy is to obtain an equitable solution to the Wittenoom problem. A number of possible sites for future development will be evaluated.

(4) Analysis is continuing. The proposed site 4.5 km east of the existing town of Wittenoom will be evaluated in detail although preliminary advice is that this site could still be subject to contamination.

(5) I am advised that the presence of millions of tonnes of asbestos tailings a few kilometres up the Wittenoom Gorge and being constantly washed down the creek, adjacent to the town, makes the effectiveness of any clean-up in the town area extremely doubtful. Although a costing has not been made, it is estimated that a total clean-up would involve many millions of dollars and has not been contemplated.

PRISONS: PRISONERS*Transfers*

227. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Prisons:

(1) Are the spouses of prisoners notified when prisoners are transferred from one prison to another?

(2) If not, why not?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) Yes, if the prisoner so requests.

(2) Not applicable.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: MARINA*Northern Suburbs*

228. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

What is the expected timetable of events in the establishment of a marina in the northern suburbs?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Key dates anticipated at present are—

Environmental review and management programme to the Environmental Protection Authority: mid to late November 1984.

Approval to construct: February 1985.

Breakwaters complete: winter of 1986.

Available for partial use: spring of 1986.
