

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

**FISH RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 2010, REGULATION 6 —  
DISALLOWANCE**

*Motion*

**MR E.S. RIPPER (Belmont — Leader of the Opposition)** [4.00 pm]: I move —

That regulation 6 of the Fish Resources Management Amendment Regulations 2010 under the Fish Resources Management Act 1994, a copy of which was laid upon the table of the house on Tuesday, 23 February 2010, is hereby disallowed.

The importance of this motion is that it will disallow the new fishing tax introduced by the Liberal–National government. We believe that imposing a licence on recreational fishing from a boat is a new tax. It has nothing to do with saving endangered fish because the licence does not provide any useable research data other than the intent to fish. The changes that the government has introduced follow last year's budget, in which 70 days of funding was stripped from the patrolling capacity of the Department of Fisheries. We have a government that has withdrawn resources from the Department of Fisheries, cut the budget for the Department of Fisheries and asked recreational fishers to pick up the difference. The new fee, after some backing and filling from the government, is \$30 for an adult who wants to fish from a boat, or \$15 for a pensioner or a person aged under 16.

A lot of people fish recreationally; it is a huge pastime. When the government announced its first proposal for new recreational fishing fees, there was considerable resistance across the community. We found a lot of support for our “axe the tax” campaign. Wherever we went and whenever we talked about this issue, recreational fishers would come up and support us. There was a very significant community campaign, involving a petition, letter writing and email, against the government's fishing tax proposals. The government did respond, in part, to the pressure that the campaign placed on it. The more elaborate licence proposals to deal with demersal fisheries were withdrawn; nevertheless, there is still a general tax for fishing from a boat, a pastime much loved by hundreds of thousands of Western Australians. This pastime was not taxed by any previous government, though proposals were put to us when we were in government. The member for Balcatta will remember sitting in committees when those proposals were put to us. We rejected those proposals for a general fishing licence. As soon as this government came in, it did two things: it cut the budget for the Department of Fisheries and then it shifted the burden to Western Australian families.

I want to quote from a letter that I think has been quoted before. It is a very good letter from Shelley O'Brien in Busselton. She states —

Recreational fishing from a boat is a social pastime; it is common for a boat owning family to share their boating outings with other families and friends during the course of a year. For most boat owners sharing their boat with others for a few hours is a major aspect of pleasure from owning a boat. Sometimes fishing is the prime reason for a boating outing, but often it is secondary to the pleasure of being on the water or accessing a beach or island. There are more than 70,000 recreational boats in WA, and with an estimated 250,000 persons using the boats the Recreational Boat Fishing Licence could be required by more than 100,000 persons. To require more than 100,000 persons to hold a Recreational Boat Fishing Licence where in most instances they may only fish for a few hours a year for fish that are not endangered (eg herring, squid, tailor, salmon) and not subject to special limitations, is unfair and irrational.

That very clearly and cogently sums up the argument against the government's new fishing tax.

I am surprised when I look at the figures. According to the figures, this tax will raise an additional \$1.9 million. In the global budget, this tax will not raise an awfully significant amount of money. It will cost a significant amount to collect, it will irritate a lot of people and it will impact—together with the government's other fees and charges—on family living standards, yet, in the overall scheme of things, it does not appear that it will raise a significant sum of money. It qualifies clearly as one of those “nuisance” taxes—taxes that are not worth the trouble they cause the government, are not worth the trouble they cause the bureaucracy and are not worth the trouble they cause the taxpayers who have to pay them. I wonder why the government has been so stubborn on this issue. For such a relatively small amount of money in a large budget, why has the government been so stubborn on this issue? There is no support in our community for a new recreational fishing licence.

The government has offered up as its defence the suggestion that this is a conservation measure. On this side of the house, the Labor Party supports the conservation of endangered species. Of course we support the conservation of endangered species and of course we support measures to encourage the sustainability of fishing. We want people to enjoy fishing now without paying a fishing tax. We want our children to enjoy fishing. We

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

want our grandchildren to enjoy fishing. We realise there have to be some measures to reduce the overall fishing effort. Quite frankly, what has happened is that people have become more efficient at catching fish—they have more powerful boats, there is GPS technology and all sorts of other technology. All those things have added to the efficiency with which people can catch fish. That means that we have, for the same number of people, an increased fishing effort. Worse than that, because of the growing population, an increased number of people are fishing. There is an increase in the fishing effort. We have to undertake some artificial measures to restrict the fishing effort in order to preserve vulnerable species. But that is not what this is about. This tax will not save a single fish. It will not even help in the collection of data that will help to save a fish. It is not a conservation measure; it is a taxing measure. That is how the community views it.

What the government has done, of course, with regard to the conservation of endangered species is to water down the proposals that it inherited from the previous government. It inherited a season closure for the five most vulnerable species, and it deferred that season closure for a year. Arguably, while the government says that it is trying to conserve endangered species, its very first action in the fisheries portfolio was an action that threatened endangered species. The government lost a year.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** Do not intervene in this debate. The member has a serious conflict of interest, so she should stay quiet!

**Dr K.D. Hames:** Don't tell our members to stay quiet. They will speak when they want to.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** Not if they have a conflict of interest—I will point that out.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker):** Members, I do not think it is a case of members speaking when they want to; I think it is a case of members speaking when they have been called to stand and speak and have permission to speak. Leader of the Opposition, would you take the floor again.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** One of the government's first actions was to threaten endangered species by deferring the season closure that we introduced. When the season closure came back a year later, it was for a reduced period of time. I am not arguing that every last detail of the previous government's conservation measures should have been implemented forever by the incoming government, but I do argue that it was an irresponsible act to defer these season closure measures for a year, leaving those threatened species unprotected against the increased fishing effort that I have been speaking about. It adds salt to the wound for the government to come into this place and say that it is introducing this new fishing tax as a conservation measure and that if we oppose the fishing tax, we are opposed to the conservation of endangered species. Nothing could be further from the truth. We took action on the threat to those endangered species, and we did so before the election, so we did not hide our hand at this but openly took an action that might have been politically controversial. We took that action before the election. We were open and frank with the people of Western Australia. We took a stand. The incoming government, having exploited the politics of our taking a stand in support of conservation during the election campaign, as one of its first decisions, deferred the implementation of those conservation measures. I will not have the Labor side of politics lectured by the Liberal-National government on support for conservation of endangered species. Our record speaks for itself. The government's record does not justify its claims to be interested in conservation. What the government is interested in is revenue. It has demonstrated that by cutting the resources to the Department of Fisheries and then coming along and imposing a new burden on families.

It is not as if the burden on families has been lessened by other government actions. This fishing tax is on top of what the government has already done with household fees and charges. Family bills in Western Australia have skyrocketed under this government. Its first recourse when faced with budget difficulties is to the Western Australian family. We have debated this on a number of occasions, but I am going to keep mentioning these figures because it is important to ram this point home to the government over and over again. Those on the conservative side of politics have taken \$1 500 a year out of family living standards. They were elected in only September 2008 and already they are into Western Australian families for \$1 500. How was that calculated? It is a combination of the withdrawal of family support—things like the cancellation of the pay-to-learn allowance and things like the end of the subsidy for government high school fees. That is one set of measures it has taken. The other set of measures it has taken is to very substantially ramp up family bills, in particular for electricity costs. Once again, on some of those costs we were open with the community and we told the community, unusually for any government before an election, that there would have to be significant rises in electricity prices over a prolonged period of time. We outlined a plan to deal with that and we put aside \$780 million of funds to deal with it. We have found that the incoming government has taken that \$780 million, spent it on other things and then passed the burden back onto families, so families will see their average electricity bill rise by more than \$1 100 a year to more than \$2 100 a year by the time we get to the next election. What has the government done?

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

It has tried everything to avoid responsibility for it and has tried to pass the responsibility onto others. The government has tried hard to blame salaries in the electricity utilities, as if they account for more than a tiny fraction of the overall amount of revenue that is raised. The government has tried to blame the split up of Western Power, which is a desperate lie, in my view, to evade responsibility. If the government chooses to look at the reports of the independent Economic Regulation Authority on the operations of the electricity market, it will see that that independent authority has reported very favourably on the operation of the electricity market and how the electricity market is working to achieve its objectives. I think the government might have more information to release on that matter, because I notice, from looking at the Economic Regulation Authority's website, that its 2009 assessment of the operation of the competitive electricity market since the split up of Western Power is now with the minister. I hope that the minister makes that assessment public fairly soon, because I am very interested in what the Economic Regulation Authority has to say in 2010 about the operation of the electricity market in 2009. When in 2009 it reported on the operation of the electricity market in 2008, it reported in very, very positive terms about the operation of the electricity market established by the split up of Western Power and other aspects of the electricity reform program.

But I digress, because the point I am trying to make is that this government has severely dented family living standards in Western Australia; \$1 500 a year has been taken away from those family living standards. The price of electricity has had the worst impact, with bills going up by 26 per cent last year, and by 18.25 per cent this year. The price of electricity is forecast to go up by another 50 per cent between now and 2013. Through a decision made a couple of weeks ago, \$216 will be added to the average bill, according to budget assumptions, and another \$700 will be added to the average family bill.

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** What's this got to do with fisheries?

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** What has it got to do with fisheries? If a family was paying those electricity prices, why would it want to pay yet another new tax to the government? This is another tax to go fishing! Families have paid the electricity price increases, they have paid the water price increase, they have paid the increased public transport fares, they have paid for the new landfill waste levy—they have paid and paid and paid and paid—and now, when they want to go fishing on the weekend with their children, they have to pay again!

This is not a hard argument to make; the government has been far too savage on family living standards and the way in which it has added bills. This is just one more bill. It is not merely an increase in an old bill; it is a completely new bill that families will have to pay, as is the landfill levy bill. The government is going too far. It has dressed it up as a conservation measure, which it is not; this tax does not have any connection, in its mechanics, to the conservation of fish. The government's record on other conservation measures gives the lie to the claim that it is all about conservation and that it has to do these difficult things because they are necessary for the sustainability of fishing. It is not necessary for the sustainability of fishing to have a fishing tax. It might be necessary to do other things, and we certainly support measures to conserve fish stocks and encourage the sustainability of fishing, but we do not see that a new fishing tax is the way to go.

I know there are members on the other side of the house who agree with the proposition that this regulation should be disallowed.

**Mr W.R. Marmion:** Who are they?

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** We will let them out themselves. I am not one of those people who identify the perpetrators of corridor conversations. I do not identify the source of corridor conversations in the house, but I do sometimes report the general tenor of the conversations. I can report that I am aware that there are members of the Liberal Party and the National Party who are opposed to this fishing tax; it remains to be seen whether they have the courage of their convictions.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** The genetically modified canola debate showed that they don't!

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** The GM debate was very interesting. It was a lot of fun, member for Collie—Preston, seeing the visible arm wrestling on the other side, the gymnastics being engaged in and the glum looks on the faces of the members for South Perth and Southern River as they were forced by their seniors in the Liberal and National Parties to vote against Labor's motion to disallow the regulations that allow the planting of GM crops.

Once again, we put the Liberal backbench and the National backbench to the test. Do they have the courage of their convictions? Are they prepared to say, in this house, what they say privately and quietly outside the house? Are they prepared to say in this house what they say to some of their electors—namely, "It's not my fault. That was decided by people more senior than me; I can't do anything about it." They can do something about it; they can vote for this disallowance motion. If three or four members opposite vote for this disallowance motion, they

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

can disallow the fishing tax and go back to their electorates and say, "I made a difference. I helped preserve family living standards in Western Australia. I stopped an unnecessary tax on top of all the other fees and charges on Western Australian families." If members opposite do not do that, we will go back to their electorates and say, "Your member didn't stand up for you." I am looking at the member for Swan Hills—I bet there are a few people in the electorate of Swan Hills who like to go fishing. It is interesting that the member for North West is not in the chamber; he is absent during this debate. The member for North West represents, or should I say purports to represent, an electorate that has an enormous number of people with votes who are interested in fishing. If we go to Karratha, Carnarvon and Exmouth, what is the main recreational activity in the electorate of North West?

Several members interjected.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** It is fishing. I heard somebody from the government side say that the member for North West has been paired. Paired! How did that happen? How did the member for North West get out of voting against the disallowance motion on the fishing tax? What a rort! He knew that the issue was coming on for debate; we foreshadowed 24 hours ahead that the issue was coming on for debate, and it has been on the notice paper. If the member for North West is paired, he has squibbed the vote. He has evaded the opportunity to help protect his own electors against a new government fishing tax.

I do not want to say a lot more. I have a very capable colleague in the member for Collie—Preston who is extremely well versed in all sorts of fishing issues. He has extraordinary experience in fishing and knows very well about the strong desire that members in many communities across the state, particularly the community of Collie, have to go out and get their share of our ocean's bounty. This issue boils down to a simple question: should the government be allowed to raise yet more revenue at the expense of Western Australian families? The only answer to that question is no. It has to be no because of the serious way in which the government has savaged family living standards with all its other family bills. This new family tax, this fishing tax, is not supported by our community—members opposite know it is not supported by our community—and we have the support of the people of Western Australia in moving this disallowance motion. Will members opposite join with the people of Western Australia and the opposition to defeat the fishing tax or will they stand against the people of Western Australia? Will they tell the people of Western Australia that they do not agree with them, that they want to make them pay this new tax and that they want to tax one of their beloved traditional pastimes? That is what I think members opposite will do because —

**Mr F.A. Alban** interjected.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** I think the member for Swan Hills will do that because he will lack the courage to stand up for his electorate. I commend the motion to the house.

Several members interjected.

**MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie—Preston)** [4.23 pm]: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, I seem to have had a cheer before I even got up, so that is quite good! I certainly am very, very disappointed in the so-called fishing licence, which, as the previous speaker said, is nothing more than a tax—it does not matter which way we look at it. Furthermore, this is a tax on children, as well, who do not earn an income. According to the schedule, which has changed so many times that I am not quite sure whether I have the right one before me but I like to think it is the latest one, the recreational fishing from a boat licence—that is, RFBL—is a new licence type with a \$15 fee for pensioners and people aged under 16 years. What a disgrace that is. A couple of young kids who wish to go fishing in a motorised dinghy—rowboats without a motor are exempt from the licence—will have to pay a fee. That is absolutely un-Australian. I bet many members would recall the days of being down at the beach with Dad, and Dad says, "Righto, son, out you go and fish; don't go out of sight in the dinghy". The same applied to crabbing, but there is now an anomaly with crabbing that came about to please the member for Dawesville; people do not have to pay if they are fishing for crabs from the shore. That was designed to keep the member for Dawesville happy; talk about pork-barrelling! It is one of the worst examples I have seen.

I return to the tax on children. It is an attack not only on dads and mums who go to the beach for a family weekend or school holidays; kids will also have to have a licence, otherwise we will turn them into criminals. That is unfair on the family unit. Further to that, if we add it all up—rock lobster, abalone, marron, south west freshwater angling, net fishing and recreational fishing from a boat—it will cost \$230. To say that that is not substantial and that it will stop people fishing is probably true, but it will not stop the people it is aimed at. People who own 30-foot boats will grizzle about it, but it will not hurt their income. It will hurt the people we see coming down to the seaside or to the lakes or rivers with a tent and a battered old 14-foot boat. They will be

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

penalised to the tune of \$200 a head if they want the full licence. If people want to go fishing with their kids, they will have to say that they will stay under the licence fee.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker):** Members, the member for Collie–Preston has the call. I would appreciate not having a low level of debate going on behind his back.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I ask the member for Scarborough whether she supports fishing licence fees for people under the age of 16. No preamble—yes or no?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Absolutely I do.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I think it is an absolute disgrace for the member for Scarborough, who is in the industry and sees young kids buying hooks and line. How can she come out and say that? It is an absolute disgrace that she supports licences.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

*Point of Order*

**Mr A.P. O'GORMAN:** I distinctly heard the member for Scarborough accuse the member for Collie–Preston of exceeding bag limits.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I ask the member for Scarborough to please not yell across the chamber. If the member for Collie–Preston invites debate, he will get that, so I ask him to restrict his comments to the chair.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** It is very easy to see that we do not need much bait to put someone on the hook here!

I have seen kids down at the river with a length of handline, probably about 20 or 30 feet long, and half a dozen hooks. They will now have to pay a licence. That is something that has been missing in this debate. People's kids fishing inland waters will have to pay a freshwater licence. However, if they fish from the Busselton jetty they will not have to pay. No-one can tell me that that is not another anomaly in the system. Why should those kids who wish to go fishing on the Collie River or the Blackwood River have to pay a licence, while the kids at the seaside do not have to? Can anyone tell me that?

**Dr K.D. Hames:** You supported licences for kids fishing in the rivers.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I do not support any of these licences.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** It happened under your government—licences for fishing in rivers.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** This government had a chance to fix that anomaly, and it did not take it. This government has left that tax there for people who not only fish along the coast but also who fish in freshwater lakes and rivers inland. They also have to pay a licence. I see kids on their push bikes go past my place all the time with their dog and a little bag over their shoulder, carrying a small flick rod that is probably a bit over a metre long, and a couple of spinners. Now they need a licence to fish. In Collie recently Mr Italiano took his two grandchildren and two fishing rods out on the river. When he threw out the line for one of the six-year-olds, he was fined \$100 because he did not have a licence to supervise those kids when they were fishing. That was in December, just before Christmas, prior to when the RFBL was required. Does the minister think it is the Australian way when a person who is doing the right thing as a grandfather can be fined for taking his children down to the river to go fishing, without much intention of catching anything? That cost him a \$100 fine. What have we come to in this state? It is just another tax so that the government can pay its way. Will it put more fisheries officers on the beat? I do not think so; it is not going to do that. There are not enough there now.

Several members interjected.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Certainly; any time. Members opposite can laugh. I am guilty of a couple of misdemeanours; I do not walk away from that. But I am saying that this licence fee will cause kids to become criminals. A couple of lads coming home from school who have a licence might say to a mate, "Come on, come with us; we're going down to catch a couple of fish." That lad could be fined for not having a fishing licence because he went fishing with his mates. That is definitely not an Australian thing to do. It is just appalling.

**Dr K.D. Hames** interjected.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

*Point of Order*

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** I cannot hear the member for Collie–Preston because the Minister for Health is continually moaning and groaning.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker):** Minister, I will call you if you do not stop interjecting across the chamber without an invitation from the member on his feet.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, for your protection.

What also disappoints me is that people fishing from a 14-foot dinghy are not exempt from paying the fine. Many people, many of whom are pensioners, along the coast to Geraldton and even further up have small boats. It does not look like members opposite will change their tune about this tax. However, if there must be a fee, why not consider exempting people who fish from a 14-foot dinghy? Most of those people are pensioners who travel with a dinghy on the roof of their car. Some could probably afford the tax, but most of them are day-to-day pensioners. People from up that way, including the member for Geraldton, should consider applying the licence fee to people who fish from boats larger than 4.4 metres. For safety reasons people in 14-foot boats do not travel far off shore; they go inside the reef with their craypots and fish for a few herring or a few reef fish, or whatever is in the area, to eat for the day. They do not do a great deal of damage, if any, to the sustainability of the industry. Has the government thought about that? Obviously not, otherwise it might have been in the regulations. That proves the government has not thought about anything other than raising money. It comes back to the fact that the money raised is only a tax. This tax is not about conservation, people enjoying themselves or recreation as we have known it for many years in Western Australia. Western Australia has a huge coastline, so again, when some of those old people are further north, they could think, "I am further up north so I might be able to get away with not having a licence." But when they get pinched they will be very disappointed to find that they have a fisheries record. The consideration that has been given to this issue is very narrow. It is not about sustainability or looking after our pensioners or young kids; it is about collecting money. It is as simple as that. Why do we not need a licence for crabbing? I need a licence to catch rock lobster. Guess what? The biggest crab fishery borders whose electorate? Maybe it is the member for Dawesville's electorate or the member for Murray–Wellington's electorate. Maybe a bit of bias has come into play.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** The member does not have the areas in his electorate.

It is a lax and higgledy-piggledy system. No thought has been given to conservation measures, such as conservation parks. The public accepts the idea of setting aside areas for conservation purposes. Fish can breed in conservation areas before filtering out to other areas. That measure is far better than a tax. The people who have come into my office to talk about this issue have said that conservation areas are a great idea and that if someone is caught fishing in a conservation area, he should lose his boat—or the whole lot. I accept that that is how it should be. One area that comes to mind is Geographe reef, a spot 30-odd miles off the coast of Bunbury, which is a reef break for surfers. It is a great spot that is easily identified. The Department of Fisheries could declare the five or 10 square kilometres around that spot as a breeding area. Why did the government not think of such a measure? It did not think of such a measure because there is no money involved in it.

While on the subject of conservation measures, the introduction of bag limits has been a good idea. It is great to see, at times, a fisheries inspector on the ramp. Yes, people make mistakes; I am guilty of making mistakes. When people who have done the wrong thing are checked on a regular basis, that helps the conservation of fish supplies. However, that system is not working properly. If someone has a good catch, he can ring his mate from his mobile phone and tell him to meet him two miles offshore so that he can throw his catch onto his mate's boat.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** As if!

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I hear about these things.

Several government members interjected.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Members opposite can say what they like. I would like to have gone fishing recently, but I have not had the time. I know that is happening. People brag about it. I have heard about charter fishermen in the Carnarvon area sending down 20 kilos of fillets after people have put their 20 kilos into their cars. That is a fact. Has a fisheries inspector gone to Carnarvon? No, because it is a local issue and the department will not touch it for fear of upsetting the local bloke who has the charter boat. This happens, believe me. I am sure that the member for Scarborough, who is involved in the fishing industry, has heard the same thing time and time again.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I've never heard it in my life!

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Cut the waffle and get to the facts. The problem with the member for Scarborough is that she is defending the indefensible, which is a fishing tax.

I again turn to the issue of children being able to fish. That issue has to be thought through. Members who have children or grandchildren who like being outdoors will know what I am referring to. Some kids do not like being outdoors. I have seen a few who do not like being outdoors. As I look across the chamber I can see that a member opposite has pinched one! It is a thrill to take kids fishing whether they are our kids or other people's kids. If a person wants to take his child or grandchild fishing while on holiday, he cannot do so unless he has a licence. That is wrong. If kids in the inland centres want to go fishing for redfin perch—it is a good eating fish and grows to about two kilos—they must have an inland fishing licence, yet the Department of Fisheries states that if people catch redfin perch they have to throw them onto the river bank to let them die because they are considered vermin. There is no sense in that. Is that a conservation measure or a money-collecting measure? It is a tax. The government does not want those fish in our rivers and it wants people to pay money. That tax is particularly unfair for families in inland towns. I plead with members opposite to talk to the Minister for Fisheries about the unfair rule that means that people who want to fish redfin perch must have a licence to do so, but people who accidentally catch redfin perch could be in trouble for throwing such fish back in the water. The logic of that defies me. How can the government even think along those lines, unless it is just for the almighty dollar?

The member for Murray–Wellington is nodding his head. The Murray River runs through his electorate. It was named after him! He knows that the kids go there and fish. Now, they will need to have a licence. Is the member aware that under this new rule, they will need to have a licence? I do not think so. The member for Murray–Wellington might have a heap of kids on his block who want to go fishing. But they do not have a licence. They might get on the Internet, but if it is a Sunday, it will be too late; they cannot get it. They cannot backdate it and do those sorts of things. So these kids are denied a day of fun and the opportunity to do something that is part of the great Australian way of life.

The other thing we need to remember is that children are not breadwinners. If they cannot get \$15 from their mum or dad because of financial circumstances and go fishing anyway, they are going to break the law.

Several members interjected.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Well, if they have a bit of spirit, they will break the law, because they will say, “Our mates are going fishing, so we'll go too; it'll be okay”, and they will take off.

**Dr K.D. Hames** interjected.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Some members on the other side, like the member for Dawesville, are trying to defend this tax. I am surprised at the number of people who have phoned my office—I do not know why; it must be something to do with the member—to complain about the inaction of their own member, because he supports high taxes in his region on people who have boats.

**Dr K.D. Hames** interjected.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** It is not a joke; it is serious. People in Dawesville have phoned me to say they are disappointed about the inaction of their member.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** They have phoned me as well!

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** They have phoned the member for Mandurah, for the same reason—they cannot get any action from their own member. The member for Dawesville is nodding and saying that we should tax people who go fishing. This is an extremely high tax if we include the boat tax. People might use their boat to get across the river, and they might then walk along the riverbank with their fishing rods and go fishing. However, they will still have to pay the tax, even though they have not fished from their boat. That does not make a great deal of sense. I see a few members on the other side frowning and shaking their heads. Why have they allowed it? This is obviously a money issue. We have heard how the Treasurer cannot add up. Surely members opposite could fudge him for the \$1.7 million that is to be collected by this tax! I am sure he would not even notice it! If he could not find \$215 million, why would he miss \$1.7 million? I am sure he just would not know.

The other thing I want to say is that the days when people used to catch a huge number of fish have gone. It was legal then; it was not illegal. People used to catch as many fish as they could. They would fill up their esky and then give some of that fish away, or swap it for a tank of juice on the way home. I am sure that has now been

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

really controlled and brought into line, not only by the fisheries inspectors, but by the fishers themselves, because they do not like doing it either. People are starting to realise that they should catch only what they and their family can eat, and perhaps put a spare feed or two in the freezer. That is the good side of education. I think that, over time, the education has started to work. One of the first things we hear from young kids now when they go fishing is, "Are we going to throw it back? Is it too small?" That is tremendous. We should be doing more of that. That is what we should be working on. We should not be trying to just tax people out of the game. We should be encouraging the kids who are on the streets to put their energies into other things, such as fishing, instead of hanging around shopping centres and the like.

I will finish with one comment. I will be encouraging all my constituents who like to go fishing up north, and all the people who live in Karratha and Roebourne, to try to get a royalties for regions grant so that they can afford to go fishing, because otherwise they will not be able to afford it.

**MR P.B. WATSON (Albany)** [4.44 pm]: I would like to talk about the disallowance motion concerning the boat fishing licence tax. This is just a new tax. It has nothing to do with endangered fish because it does not provide any useable research data other than the intent to fish. How will people be caught doing this sort of thing under the new fee structures? The government announced in its last budget that it would strip 70 days from the patrolling capacity of the Department of Fisheries. The member for Ocean Reef said that the government would increase the number of patrol days, but the government is actually taking away 70 patrol days, which will put a dent in the ability of the Department of Fisheries to patrol this. City people might be different from people in the country, but a lot of young children get out a dinghy and go fishing on the river or in the sea. I have been talking to some of our seniors —

**Mr P. Abetz** interjected.

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** When was the last time the member for Southern River went fishing?

**Mr P. Abetz:** About 15 years ago.

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** There are a lot of other things the member has done in his life that he is not proud of either. Just let me talk. The member will have a chance to talk later. I am sure that he will have another very interesting debate and say something silly that will get reported on the front page of *The West Australian*.

Some senior citizens have told me that instead of taking out a boat and using a motor, they will use oars. They can go to Princess Royal Harbour, which will create a problem for the fishing people. Our pensioners are saying that they will not pay these ridiculous taxes. We have whacked up their water, power and gas rates and they have not received their seniors' cost of living rebate, which was promised by this mean and uncaring government. Now the government is asking seniors to pay for this fishing licence. If we look up and down York Street in Albany during the school holidays, many grandparents can be seen looking after their grandchildren while the parents are at work. A lot of the grandparents take their grandchildren out in a dinghy. If they go fishing in the inlet, Lower King or up to Kalgan, they will need only one licence but they will be allowed to catch only the amount of fish permitted for the person who owns the licence. If a grandfather wants to go fishing with his three grandchildren, they will be allowed to catch the permitted bag limit of the person who owns the licence. That will take away the kids' excitement of catching the fish.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** They can catch the other fish such as whiting and herring. It is only the demersal fish that are limited. They can still catch a bag of 30 whiting. That is good fish for kids to catch. That is what my kids do.

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** The minister will get his chance to talk about this. If I were the member for either Ocean Reef, Scarborough, North West, Geraldton or Dawesville —

**Mrs C.A. Martin:** Or Broome.

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** I do not want the member for Kimberley to lose her seat. Those members should be very wary in their electorates because of not only this issue, but also the issue of genetically modified crops and the increase in the cost of essential services. We want to see people out in boats. We have programs to get seniors to do things. We want them to be allowed to get out in boats and to continue to do what they can do now. A lot of seniors have told me that they will either go out in a rowboat or not at all.

**Mr W.R. Marmion:** Rowing is good exercise.

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** It might be good exercise in the Swan River, but the wind changes and tides in Princess Royal Harbour make it more dangerous than paddling up and down the Swan River, which is probably where the member for Nedlands would go.



Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

I turn now to fisheries officers. Fisheries officers are already under pressure. I know that when they catch people in my electorate, they do so with a vengeance. They apprehend a lot of people in a very short time. If 70 patrol days are to be lost each year, I bet they will be lost to regional Western Australia, because we have a city-centric government. Therefore 70 patrol days will probably be lost from regional areas, not the city.

I know that other members wish to speak to this motion. I listened with interest to the member for Collie–Preston and I agree with him that education is the best way to go. We educate the public not to smoke by saying that cigarette smoking is bad for them and could kill them. We have to say that we do not mind people fishing, because it is a great pastime; however, they must take only a certain amount of fish, because we want sufficient fish stock that will allow our grandchildren to take their grandchildren fishing.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** That is what we are doing.

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** No, all that this government is doing is taxing. It is a money grab. There is nothing in the regulation to indicate that people will be educated in this area. There will be fewer people to do it and it will cost more. Who will be the winner? It will be the state government, through more taxes.

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah)** [4.51 pm]: I am pleased to speak on this subject again. This is the second time we have had a major debate in this Parliament about the government's fishing tax and the impact that it will have, and is now having, on the boating fraternity in the regional and metropolitan areas of Western Australia. We know that some regions in this state—for example, the Peel and Pilbara regions—have some of the highest boat ownership rates in not only this state, but also the nation. A huge number of people own boats. The boats vary in size and value, but they are very much part of the lifestyle of the people who live in the regions of Western Australia. Part of the reason many people live in regional WA is the great lifestyle that is offered by the natural environment.

Members need look no further than to my region, the Peel, to know that it has a history dating back to the early Indigenous people. Fishing was an integral part of their culture, and it is still an integral part of the culture of the people who live in the Peel. Many people have been attracted to the Peel waterways for the opportunities those waterways offer.

It is very clear that there is a stench in this government. There is a very bad smell on the other side of this house, because opposition members know that there are government members who are very nervous about this tax. They have admitted it freely to us. I will not embarrass those government members who have indicated their deep concern to us by naming them in this place. We know that late last year a delegation of Liberal members went to the Liberal Party room and fronted “Uncle Norman” about what he was doing. They told him that the tax that he was introducing not only was unfair but also is hurting, and will continue to hurt, our electors, particularly those people who enjoy fishing as an integral part of their lifestyle.

Fishing is, of course, an important part of the reason that people visit regional Western Australia. People in the metropolitan area who decide for recreational and holiday purposes to visit the north west, Mid West, Peel, South West and Great Southern choose those places because they enjoy the recreational fishing opportunities that those regions offer.

Let there be no doubt that this is a tax and it is a tax that joins a long list of taxes that this government is imposing in its declaration of war on the people of Western Australia. Every time a family goes to turn on their lights or run the essential appliances in their home, they are paying more for power. When families turn on their gas heaters to heat their houses in winter, whether they be pensioners or families on fixed incomes, they will know that they will be paying more. This government is determined to drive the people of Western Australia into the ground, particularly vulnerable people on fixed incomes who do not have much leeway in their budgets. The government has done that with power; it has done it with gas; and we know it intends to do it with water. However, the government cannot stop at that; it is now looking at something else. It is now attacking one of the wonderful opportunities that many people have enjoyed over many decades; that is, the opportunity for recreational fishing.

One thing that members must understand is that the people in our communities do understand that our fishery is under pressure. People of all ages tell me that. Many come into my office and I have met with them recently. Older people who have been in the crayfishing industry and people who have been fishing the waterways of Mandurah for decades have come to me and said, “We know that there is a pressure on the fish stocks.” They know that the population has increased in my electorate around the Peel–Harvey estuary system and they acknowledge that there is pressure on the fish stocks. They acknowledge that we must take measures to ensure the protection of those species so that generations to come can enjoy the opportunity for recreational fishing into the future.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

But what answer does this government have for that? It does not have an answer that refers to proper, effective and informed ongoing education. No; the government wants to tax people. It wants to tax boat owners who go out fishing every day with their grandkids. Many of them in Peel and Mandurah in my electorate are grandfathers and grandmothers who have grandchildren who visit them during school holidays and long weekends. When they go there, one of the great things that they can do with their grandmother or grandfather or both is to go out on a boat with them, have a fish and enjoy the opportunity of sharing that very important intergenerational relationship. What are government members doing? Once again they decide that they will tax that activity because they see only dollars in their eyes. It is absolutely appalling that this government is not listening to the families of Western Australia. I will be very interested to see what happens this afternoon or early evening when we vote on this disallowance motion.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** Can we turn the volume down?

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I will be watching to see where the member for Dawesville will go. I know where he will go; he will sit on his side of the chamber.

**Dr K.D. Hames** interjected.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** The member for Dawesville rabbits on about all sorts of things, but he will sit there with his party and make sure that he votes with the government for this tax. The people of Dawesville will know; they will be told more than 100 times in the lead-up to the election.

I tell the member for Murray–Wellington that the people in his electorate are also watching him very closely because they have heard a lot of rhetoric from him. I respect him because I know that he has raised a lot of issues and I know that he is disgruntled. I know that he is one of the most disgruntled members of the government. He tells me all the time how disgruntled he is. But the proof will be in the pudding. The proof will be in the fish pie this afternoon when we watch to see where the member for Murray–Wellington decides to sit; unless he decides to sit outside or decides that he will not hear the bells.

**Mr M.J. Cowper** interjected.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I will not give the member for Murray–Wellington a pair. No pair for him or for the member for Dawesville. No pairs for either of them because they do not deserve them. They have got to stand up for the people of Mandurah, for the people of Pinjarra, for the people of Dwellingup, for the people of Dawesville and for the people who live along the coastline from Peel to the South West. They have to stand up, and now is their chance. Now is their chance to thumb their nose at “Uncle Norman” and say, “We are not going to cop this. We are going to cross the floor. We are going to tell you that this is not appropriate; that this tax is absolutely unfair; that this tax hurts vulnerable people—people who just want to go about doing something that they have been going about doing for many decades.”

This is an appalling tax, but I will be watching carefully, as I know what will happen. The members for Murray–Wellington and Dawesville will come out with all the reasons why they will vote against this motion. They will come out with, “You’re a hypocrite; you said this.” They will come out with all sorts of reasons why they will vote against it. But what will happen at the striking out? When the big man asks them where they are sitting, they will sit with their own kind and support the non-disallowance of this regulation. If they do that, be it on their heads. I have a couple of emails I will read in the short time I have left.

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** I am going from here to there.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Is the member for Murray–Wellington going to cross the floor and support the opposition? He is not going to cross the floor; he is going to support the tax. Is the member for Murray–Wellington going to support the tax?

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** When the vote comes, I will go from here to there.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Is the member going to support the tax?

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** I will be going over to your side.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I will tell everybody that the member for Murray–Wellington did not support the disallowance. He folded. I thought the member had more in him than that! He is going to fold like a pack of cards. I will read out a couple of emails as examples of the many emails and phone calls I have received, not only in the last week or so but also before then when we had a previous debate in this place. I will read this email from an elector in Mandurah, David Adams —

Dear David Templeman

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

I would like to voice my total disapproval of this new recreational fishing boat licence. I understand there is 'Disallowance Motion' to be voted on in State Parliament and it is my wish as a voter in your electorate that you vote to not have this new tax.

I only own a small boat but would class myself as an keen fisher, and mostly I am a catch and release fisher.

Members can see that he is responsible —

Fishing has been my primary pastime for most of my life although I am not that taken with eating fish, hence mostly I release my catches.

To have to pay for the already expensive but very rewarding activity of boat fishing I find disgusting and a mean, penny pinching act by the current government.

I implore you to support the wishes of your electorate.

That was from Mr David Adams from Mandurah. I can assure Mr Adams that the Labor Party in Western Australia opposes this tax, and the Labor members of this Parliament will be supporting the disallowance of this Barnett government tax. We will make sure that we stand up for the people of Western Australia. We stand up for the seniors, the grandparents who have their kids and grandkids down on weekends and holidays. We will make sure that the people of Western Australia, including those in our electorates, are aware that the Labor Party will oppose this tax and vote for the disallowance motion.

Stephen Jorgensen is another person who lives in Mandurah. I will read out his email, which is addressed not only to me but to every member of the Legislative Assembly —

I strongly urge you to support this Motion and stop this tax on the pleasure we get out of fishing from our boats.

There are other ways, already in place, to derive the funds to achieve the same result.

Between this year and last year, boat registration fees have gone up. I have an 8 metre pleasure boat. Registration fees for this boat have gone up by **30%** (\$124.30 to \$161.40).

I also have a tinny less than 5 metres in length which we use to go out into the Peel Estuary and from which we derive a great deal of pleasure. The registration fee for this boat has gone up **20.03%** ...

Those boat owners in Western Australia who own boats between 10 and 20 metres in length have copped a **40%** increase in their registration fees,

This is another tax. This is all this government knows: how to keep on taxing people; taxing them out of existence —

those over 20 metres in length have been hit with a massive **49.82%** increase.

Nearly a 50 per cent increase —

In the Peel region many people have private jetties. These jetties have a licence that costs \$109 per year. We get nothing in return for this licence. That's over 3 times the RFBL fee. Use some of that money.

This Licence will only encourage people to take more fish than they need and even take undersize catches. If you want people to accept responsibility and fish in a manner that sustains our fisheries, the big stick approach will not work.

Several members interjected.

I will read further. Mr Jorgensen says —

The depth of feeling in the Peel Region —

This is the big message for the member for Murray-Wellington and the Deputy Premier, the member for Dawesville —

about this tax on the pleasure we get from our boats should not be underestimated by Members Murray Cowper and Kim Hames. If this Disallowance Motion does not pass and the RFBL becomes reality then, gentlemen, start looking for an alternative career because you will be punished at the Polls.

Other members are in Electorates that have families that go fishing from boats. A lot of these Electorates are on the coastline. You will also risk being punished at the Polls if you do not support this Disallowance Motion.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

Take note, member for Geraldton, member for Ocean Reef, member for Scarborough, member for Hillarys and any other members on the coast with the ocean licking their electorates.

Mr Jorgensen concludes by saying —

Get the Licence off the table and give the whole issue a lot more thought.

I will repeat it for those who did not hear —

Get the Licence off the table and give the whole issue a lot more thought.

That is what the people of Western Australia are saying. That is what the grandfathers and grandmothers—the seniors in our community, the people who have been using boats, both small and large—have been saying to us over past months. The email concludes by stating —

It is pointless to have Premier Barnett talking about the billions of dollars in royalties coming to the State through the massive projects planned for the North West and then trying to tax the pleasure families get from their boats.

It is petty and un-necessary.

Please support the Disallowance Motion this Wednesday evening and despatch the RFBL to the deep forever.

I could not have said it any better. Steve Jorgensen said it brilliantly. Mr Adams said it brilliantly. Why will the government not listen to the people of Western Australia? Why will it not listen to the families who are vulnerable? They do not need an additional tax, an additional cost on top of increased power, gas and water bills that have been imposed on them. The government should listen carefully to people such as Mr Jorgensen, Mr Adams and many thousands of others in Western Australia. Maybe if the government does what Mr Jorgensen says and gets the licence off the table and has a rethink, members opposite might not only save their own seats but also they might make good policy because that is what this should all be about—good policy that does not hurt families, does not hurt people who are vulnerable and does not hurt those people who seek simple pleasures from something that is a wonderful historical and cultural part of our heritage.

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [5.06 pm]: I rise to support this disallowance motion. There is no doubt that the idea of putting a tax on fishing in Western Australia is a measure that has no benefit from a conservation perspective. Many people in the community are concerned about the plight of our various fisheries, particularly demersal fish species. The decline in population numbers around our coastlines is of concern to us all. We have to take action to protect the remaining fish that we have in those areas that have been heavily fished over recent years. They have been fished using technology such as fish finders and global positioning systems that enable people to return to the same spot to get those demersal fish species with great efficiency, leading to the detriment of those species.

A tax is not the way to go about solving this problem. The best way to go about solving the problem is through the creation of protected marine areas. I will come to that matter later. First, I would like to address where this tax will go. What will this tax be used for? Is there some sort of hypothecation? Is it true that the money will principally go to Recfishwest? I have some respect for Recfishwest. I know Frank Prokop, the man who heads up Recfishwest. Frank and I have worked on campaigns together. Indeed, we successfully worked together on the Halt the Salt campaign, a campaign to stop the construction of a massive salt field on the eastern edge of the Exmouth Gulf, a field that would have covered some 410 square kilometres. It would have disrupted the whole groundwater flow of the Yannarie delta into the Exmouth Gulf, disrupting the fish species, the nursery ground in the mangrove areas and other parts of the eastern side of the Exmouth Gulf. I am pleased to report to the house that that campaign was won. I am extremely disappointed to say that it is no credit to the government that that campaign was won. That campaign was won through the combined efforts of recreational fishers in Recfishwest, conservationists and commercial fishers. The MG Kailis Group was notable for its participation in that campaign. That campaign convinced the proponent to withdraw its proposal. It is a tribute to all who participated in the campaign. I say that because I have respect for Recfishwest but I do not believe that it is legitimate for Recfishwest to receive the proceeds of this fish tax. There would be all kinds of problems about accountability. Recfishwest has a membership that fluctuates enormously. Over the past five years there have been reports of membership being down as low as 80 people and as high as 300. Under Minister Jon Ford, during the Carpenter government, Recfishwest's membership got up to 1 000 at one stage. We are talking about an organisation that does not represent the whole of the recreational fishing community in Western Australia. It would be highly inappropriate for this fish tax to go towards one organisation—Recfishwest. It would be very problematic when we do not really know what that organisation's objectives are.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

That brings me back to the point I was making about the need for marine protected areas as our primary means of looking after our marine environment and vulnerable demersal fish species and other species.

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** How would they work?

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I will come to that, member.

The whole issue of funding Recfishwest is problematic because as unrepresentative as that organisation is, it has a position, as I understand it, that opposes the creation of marine protected areas.

I heard the member for Murray–Wellington ask how a marine protected system would work. Before I get into that in any detail I want to talk about the situation we have seen on the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. That was a controversial case at one time. In 2004 there was a proposal to increase the no-take area on the Great Barrier Reef from 4.5 per cent to 33 per cent. Thirty-three per cent was the final outcome of it. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park now has overwhelming support from the recreational fishing community. I would be very happy to table a copy of a report, or direct members to it. The report is from a scientific journal *Environmental Conservation*. A large number of recreational fishers aged 15 and over who reside within 50 kilometres of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park coastline were surveyed. The results of the survey are astounding. Sixty-eight per cent of recreational fishers are now quite happy to support the concept of marine protected areas. They say it is a good thing. The report gets into why they support it. There are multiple reasons. One is that recreational fishers, quite legitimately, want to feel proud of their recreational pastime. They want to be able to say to their friends and families that they are not involved in a recreational activity that plunders the natural environment and depletes it of stunning and spectacular fish that are associated with the Great Barrier Reef. They are proud therefore to be able to say: yes, they engage in recreational fishing. Recreational fishers go to areas that are open to fishing. They respect the no-take areas for biodiversity conservation reasons, which enables regeneration and improves the catches gained when they go fishing at other times. They are able to benefit from fertility increases that are brought about by ensuring that the older and bigger fish are able to breed on a regular basis. They are the ones that produce the most offspring. They are the ones we want to be able to save. There was a time when our thinking was often, “That fish is a bit too small so we’ll throw it back. We’ll go for a bigger one instead.” From a conservation perspective and from a fish husbandry perspective, that is not the best approach. We want to look after the bigger animals, the ones that are the big breeders.

I have touched on this issue of where the fish tax is going to go. What is it going to achieve? Reports indicate that the annual revenue from the recreational fishing licence would be \$1.9 million. We need to know if that is an accurate figure and if it has changed since it was last announced in September. We need to be assured that the licence income will not replace existing core funding that goes into the research grants for the Department of Fisheries. Furthermore, we need the minister to table documents outlining the objectives and governance arrangements of the recreational fishing trust that Recfishwest would be drawing down on. We need to know very clearly what those objectives would be and what the governance arrangements would be. It is all very well to give a big advance of money to organisations such as Recfishwest, but if they do not have the accountability mechanisms in place, there is potential for all sorts of abuses and misuse of funds.

We also need to know what the spending priorities for the recreational fishing trust would be and what the objectives of the recreational fishing trust would be, but I think above all else, we need the minister to tell us how a fishing tax would actually be used as a tool to reduce recreational fishing effort; in other words, how is this tax actually going to achieve a conservation outcome and how is it going to preserve the fish stocks. I think the evidence that has been provided so far is appallingly light on this subject. There is no sound evidence at all that suggests that a fish tax would lead to the conservation outcome that I believe we all genuinely desire.

That leads me to the point that I began with, and that is that the most satisfactory results for fish conservation can be achieved through creating marine protected areas. That is where this government should be putting its priority effort. That is what we need to be creating.

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** Where would you put them?

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** There are many discussions that outline where marine protected areas should be. The commonwealth has a process in place. It is very interesting to see how state waters, which extend some two nautical miles from the coastline, would work in with those commonwealth marine protected areas as well. Those are the sorts of studies that need to be looked at closely. Obviously, there are multiple stakeholders involved. There are commercial fishers, recreational fishers, people in the oil and gas industry and, of course, the conservation and community sectors as well. All that needs to be taken into account when determining where those marine protected area boundaries would go. Above all else, it has to be based on the science. We need to know what areas need to be interconnected with different breeding habitats. We need a good scientific basis to

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

determine where those marine protected areas, those no-take zones, should be located. That work needs to be given top priority. Instead I see the Barnett government being distracted by this proposal to put a tax in place that will perhaps then enable the government to stand back and imagine that it has done its job and it has put in place a measure that will help us protect those fish species, such as baldchin groper, some of the snapper, and dhufish, which have been so aggressively over fished and that are, in some cases, so hard to find.

My preference is to go snorkelling and actually see these fish rather than to kill them. I openly admit that. I think it is appalling, though, that when I do go snorkelling, I cannot see some fish and that we are not putting in place measures that will enable those remaining stocks to regenerate, so future generations can snorkel and dive in Western Australian waters and enjoy the spectacle of seeing so many magnificent fish.

I will conclude my speech there, but I think it is very clear that the scientific benefits from a fish tax have not been presented, whereas there is an overwhelming body of evidence supporting marine protected areas. We know that marine protected areas will deliver the conservation outcome. We really want that conservation outcome, and we know we must have it. We should therefore choose the option that is going to deliver it for us, and that is creating a comprehensive marine protected areas network along the Western Australian coast.

**MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro)** [5.19 pm]: I have been inspired, primarily by the member for Mandurah, to make a contribution to this disallowance motion debate. On behalf of the constituents of the electorate of Warnbro, I confirm that I support this disallowance motion wholeheartedly. It is not just that the licence is a shameful and obvious money grab and that, clearly, a large number of the Western Australian population oppose the imposition of this tax; I oppose this tax primarily because of the point that the member for Gosnells articulated very clearly—it will not work. It will not make a contribution to the maintenance of our fish stocks and it will not help to preserve endangered species. This issue was discussed last year during a longer debate on the subject, during which I said I believed that a form of exclusion zone would have to be implemented—what is the correct terminology?

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** No-take marine parks.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Yes; no-take marine parks. I have experience as a patrol boat captain in offshore fisheries management, and during the debate I said, in effect, that Australia imposes a no-fish zone in its exclusive economic zone. We say where traditional Indonesian fishermen can and cannot fish and we impose a zone, and we also police it. It is essential that there is not just a zone that people are told not to go into —

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** Exactly; that's the point!

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** A bit of plastic will not police it. What will police it is real investment in resources, personnel, boats and the other assets that are required. It should be linked with other agencies to ensure that we build our intelligence database and maximise the effort through all available means to monitor and police those zones. This measure, however, will not achieve that, and the funds raised will be inadequate to do any more than pay for the plastic cards. I do not think that the government will be able to pay for the operation of boats from the proceeds of these funds. All that this will probably do is encourage undesirable behaviour, whereby people who have invested that money will go out and ensure that they catch up to the limit, whereas they might otherwise not have. Beyond that, it will exclude people from engaging in a pastime that has been readily available to all members of society who were able to access a boat. Therefore, I am quite proud of the Labor Party for moving this disallowance motion, and I am very happy to participate in, and support, it.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough)** [5.22 pm]: I rise to oppose this motion. I have to express my measure of disbelief —

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I thought you were going to say you had an intimate knowledge!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** — that those opposite would move this motion a week after the regulations were introduced and fishers have already started purchasing their licences. I thank the member for Albany for bringing to the house's attention my sixteen-year background in recreational fishing. I am very proud of the fact that I have a background related to this issue.

Several members interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I thank members for their interjections, but they cannot have it both ways: firstly, the opposition says that if a licence is introduced, it will adversely affect the industry; secondly, members accuse me of gaining financially by the introduction of a licence. What is it? Members cannot have it both ways.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** You can't have it both ways either!

**Mr P. Papalia:** It's a disallowance motion; you've got to wait until it's introduced before it can be disallowed.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** Order, members!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Members might be interested to know that there has been an enthusiastic uptake of the new recreational fishing boat licence: 25 423 licences have been issued since 2 March, just over two weeks ago. That is not a bad effort, and it is hardly indicative of the backlash those opposite would have us believe exists out there. The opposition has not suggested what the government should do about those responsible recreational fishers who have already purchased their licence and are taking their responsibility in the management of their fishery seriously. What do we do with them should the disallowance motion proceed? Quite clearly, the opposition has not thought this through. What is its alternative plan for managing the fishery?

I have looked into the policies of members opposite with regard to managing our precious fishery and it always seems to come back to the same old, same old—lock it up, deny access, shut it down, mismanage the resource until it is near collapse, such as happened in Shark Bay, and then shut it down for years. This recreational boat fishing licence is about effective management.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** If you were so passionate, you wouldn't have to read from a script!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The member for Albany had his turn!

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Dr K.D. Hames** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** Order, member for Albany and the Deputy Premier!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** We cannot manage a resource without knowing the pressures that are on it. At present there is no effective tool in place to accurately and efficiently measure the number of recreational fishers who access our resource. We know the numbers of commercial fishers, the number of rock lobster fishers, the number of people who are fishing in the freshwater courses of this state. I note the member for Collie–Preston's argument; he is the only person I have ever heard complain about the inland fishing licence, which was introduced decades ago. The funds from that licence go to improving the fishery and restocking efforts for the trout fishery. The member for Collie–Preston is the only person who has ever been on the record complaining about it. It is fantastic; it works really well.

We do not know the dimensions or the extent of what is believed to be one of the most popular recreational pursuits in Western Australia.

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order, member for Albany and member for Collie–Preston!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Why do we not know this? We do not know this —

**Mr P.B. Watson:** She knows everything! She knows who the Unknown Soldier is.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The member for Albany has had his turn!

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Albany!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The member's inane contribution and his opportunity have passed.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I have noticed during the time I have been in the chair that members on my left were heard in relative silence, and I expect the same —

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Albany, I am on my feet. That is the third strike today. I want to hear the member for Scarborough and all members in relative silence.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** We do not know the number of people accessing the fishery, despite the fact that the Department of Fisheries has repeatedly asked for the introduction of a recreational fishing licence since about 1989, and despite successive governments presiding over a declining resource, which is believed to be near collapse in some areas —

**Mr M.P. Murray:** Before the member goes on further about the inland fishing licence, does she think it is fair that under-16s now have to pay for that fishing licence —

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I support the recreational boat fishing licence, member for Collie–Preston. I do not know how much more emphatically I can express that to the member. I 100 per cent support the minister, Hon Norman Moore. He is the first minister who has made the tough decision to register the numbers of people who are fishing recreationally across our oceans. I applaud the minister for taking decisive action to give the Department of Fisheries a long-awaited essential management tool—a mechanism to measure the pressure on the fishery by asking fishers to register with the government and assist it down the track with data research into the pressures on the fishery. The modest \$30 fee for adults, and \$15 for children and pensioners, has cost my family \$90 to fish from our tinnie for a year. We purchased our licences online; it took fewer than 15 minutes and we now feel well pleased to be taking some responsibility for our participation in the pastime of our choice. In fact, my daughter took her first-ever licence in to school today and showed it for news. Our four licences are all that is needed for our entire family on our next trip away together. We will take our nieces and nephews out fishing from our tinnie and they will be able to fish to our bag limit, although my nieces and nephews are pretty keen to get their own licences now that they have seen ours.

The Leader of the Opposition distributed a media release stating that this licence is an example of government red tape. Having recently chaired the committee looking into red tape, it is no surprise to me that the previous government presided over an almost unprecedented explosion of red tape. Clearly, that is because members opposite do not know what red tape is. The usual business definition of red tape is the requirement to complete extensive paperwork, especially paperwork that is complex and time-consuming, to gain approval from several people or departments in order to accomplish a goal. The Oxford Dictionary defines red tape as excessive bureaucracy or adherence to formalities, especially in public business. Webster's Online Dictionary is more concise, and defines it as a needlessly time-consuming procedure. Members opposite should listen and learn. How can four online transactions that took less than 15 minutes to perform, resulting in licences being posted to our registered address within three days, be described as “red tape”? What a joke! I am advised that I could have legally fished with the electronic receipt from the transaction. This licence can be obtained from a mobile phone on the way to a boat ramp. That is hardly red tape. In my view, red tape is what proliferated on the watch of the previous government—a proliferation of confusing rules and regulations, bag limits, size limits, booklets, maps, charts and drawings showing where people can and cannot fish, sanctuary zone boundaries and no-fishing zones; not to mention the plethora of sizes, lengths, bag limits and seasonal closures. I could go on. On the watch of the previous government, recreational fishing almost required a tertiary degree. This simple, pragmatic, easily processed recreational boat fishing licence is the antithesis of red tape. It is simple and easy, and places some level of responsibility onto the people who are accessing our precious resource—a resource that needs effective management to become sustainable.

When I tried to find out what the opposition's fisheries management plan was, I found that the best it could do was to dredge up some flaky stuff about sustainable management and promoting compliance and education. There was nothing about how it would be funded and there was no opportunity for users of the fishery to take personal responsibility for management of the fishery; just vague references about something sustainable. How can a resource be sustainably managed if the department charged with its management is involved in a guessing game about who is actually accessing the fishery? I fear that the plan for those opposite is likely to be similar to the plan of its former Minister for Fisheries, and involves long closures of the fishery, access denial and management by exclusion. I also fear that there appears to be support from members of the opposition, such as the member for Gosnells, for their federal colleagues' plans to lock up thousands of square kilometres of Western Australia's coastline and oceans in marine protection zones.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I bet that the member for Collie–Preston is not going out to the recreational fishing community and stating that his party's preferred position is to shift the fishery from management as a primary resource to management that is focused on marine conservation, which means more fishing exclusion zones. He is not telling people that. Although I support and understand the concept of the establishment of marine parks as part of a management strategy, there have been moves by the federal government to take control of large parts of Western Australia's oceans, lock them up and deny access. It is happening in Queensland.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** What percentage of marine protected areas?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I do not know the percentage in state waters, but I believe it is looking at a 30 per cent take of commonwealth waters.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** That's what we have in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and also at Ningaloo.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will come to that.



Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

In Queensland, large areas have already been cut off to recreational fishing, and the federal government participated in a long, involved process of paying compensation to those people. Large areas are being eyed off in Western Australia as well.

**Mr M. McGowan:** Which government did that?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Does the member want to know which government has a great environmental and conservation record in Queensland?

**Mr M. McGowan:** The Howard government.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Yes, the Howard government.

**Mr M. McGowan:** Why are you attacking it?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I am not attacking it.

**Mr M. McGowan:** Isn't the Great Barrier Reef one of the greatest things it did? One of its great achievements?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I am saying that if we are going to introduce exclusion zones, we have to have a plan for funding it. If we do not have a plan for compensation, members opposite should not come in here and criticise a government that actually has a plan for funding what it is trying to do to manage its fishery. The Liberal-National government is working towards a responsible management regime that still allows fishers access—a set of management measures to manage and protect the quality of our fishery for both recreational and commercial uses. The recreational boat fishing licence will help the government to better understand the pressure on our fish stocks. History shows that mismanagement can result in stock collapse, a situation that Hon Monty House found himself in back in 1998 when faced with having to implement a total closure of the Shark Bay eastern gulf snapper fishery. Perhaps that Shark Bay snapper stock collapse could have been avoided had those recreational fishers not been fishing unchecked in the eastern gulf of Shark Bay for years, unaccounted for in a data vacuum that prevented proper management. Perhaps if there had been a licensing system and therefore a way to measure their numbers or impact, the fishery could have been managed effectively, the collapse averted and the subsequent closure avoided. What a sensible, practical tool to give the Department of Fisheries to allow for proper fisheries management.

It is important to remember that this recreational boat fishing licence is only part of a multifaceted management strategy. The department is already undertaking research into shore-based fisheries and the impact of participation in those. That was funded to the tune of \$330 000 in December last year. In July last year the government gave a \$660 000 boost for research into the stock levels of our bread-and-butter species such as whiting and herring. It is yet unknown whether there might be an effort shift resulting from the closure of the demersal fin fishery from October to December last year across to the bread-and-butter species. This government is funding proper research into the stock levels of those species to ascertain what is going on with the stock levels. It is spending \$330 000 to try to work out how many people are fishing in shore-based recreational activities. Our strategy includes further research, better education and compliance and, quite sensibly and with wide community support, seasonal breeding closures.

This holistic management strategy also includes the streamlining of the entire licensing system to make it easier for both consumers and government to use and understand. This government strategy includes better education of fishers and upgraded compliance activities funded in part to the tune of \$1.9 million, as the Leader of the Opposition has already indicated, so that the fishers using the fishery help to fund the compliance and educational efforts in the management of the fishery. I am looking forward to seeing the results of these new management measures in the balance of the recreational fishing fund. I am also looking forward to seeing some cost-effective management regimes as they come into play. Imagine what we could do in fisheries scientific research if the Department of Fisheries had a database of fishers to survey in trying to determine the levels of participation. How could the previous government have allowed the department to fly blind for so many years without it. It is about time users of the fishery started contributing towards the management cost of recreational fishing. I recall the recent effort on Forrest Highway—I am sure the member for Collie-Preston was watching—where fisheries compliance officers caught a number of illegal fishers. That is just one example of how upgrading the compliance regime will yield results. Every recreational fisher I know has an underlying resentment and anger towards those whose catch greedily exceeds bag limits and who catch undersized fish, crabs and lobster. They devour stories about those who have been caught and the fines imposed.

This government has also put \$2 million of extra funds from consolidated revenue towards supporting recreational fishing management and it has employed an additional 13 fisheries and marine officers. The recreational fishing fund into which the licence fee will go will help, among other things, with education

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

campaigns on sustainable practices, restocking efforts and perhaps even some artificial reefs to provide habitat for species under threat. We are talking here about species that are potentially under threat not, as has been asserted by members opposite, endangered species. None of these Western Australian fish are on the endangered species list.

*Point of Order*

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** Mr Acting Speaker, standing order 1 says that members may not read from their notes. The member for Scarborough has read completely from her notes. Under standing orders, that is not allowed.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** Order! Before you continue, member for Scarborough, I would like to make a comment on the member for Albany's point of order. My advice is that if you are reading word for word, that is not allowed, but if you are referring to your notes, that is allowed. If you are referring to your notes, I will ask you to continue.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** Just refer to your copious notes!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will refer to my notes. Actually, I have enough notes here to refute the erroneous information that was put out by the speakers previous to me.

One advantage of the recreational boat fishing licence is that it will free up funds that have previously been poured into rather expensive creel surveys. Creel surveys were previously the only mechanism available to measure the number of recreational fishers who were accessing the fishery. The problem with creel survey data is that most of the people in the recreational fishing industry doubt that data. It is a hotly debated topic, because the integrity of the creel survey process is not understood, and the data that is gathered is not trusted by recreational fishers. I can see that the member for Murray-Wellington is agreeing with me with regard to the recreational fishers' view of the creel survey data. The RBFL is an essential component of this government's recreational fisheries management plan. Am I reading? Well at least I can read, member for Albany!

I cannot support this disallowance motion. I do not know why I should be so surprised that the opposition can be so irresponsible as to call this effective and essential management tool a tax. It is another Labor lie—calling a licence a tax. It is unbelievable. Members opposite remain silent on their alternatives. They do not go out to the community and say, "Our alternative is to lock it up; our alternative is to destroy the charter boat industry; and our alternative is to destroy country towns, livelihoods, family traditions and the Western Australian culture"—all for the sake of an ideological bent and apathy towards consultative and effective fisheries management practices.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** You should go and speak to the recreational fishers in Queensland!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! That will do, member for Gosnells.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The member for Gosnells has made a really interesting point. Over the past three months, my husband and I have had over 20 000 recreational fishers come through our business. Not one of those people has actually grumbled and said that they disagree so seriously with the recreational boat fishing licence that they are refusing to pay for it.

Several members interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Just one moment. I am addressing the member for Gosnells' request that I should speak to the recreational fishers in Queensland. The member for Gosnells might be interested to know that my husband and I are very, very good friends with at least 14 recreational fishing tackle shop owners in Queensland. Those people support fishing licences, because in Queensland fishing licences have been in place for over 20 years—and, guess what? They can manage their fishery!

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It is interesting, member for Albany. I have been trying to find something of substance that the member for Albany might have said in his contribution earlier today that I could have used, but there is actually nothing there.

**Ms M.M. Quirk:** He was sticking up for families!

[Member's time extended.]

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Sticking up for families! A member opposite—I do not know which one—mentioned that a \$15 fee for pensioners who are travelling up north to go fishing is a dire impost. I ask members: how much does it cost to fill up a four-wheel-drive with fuel? How much does it cost to fill up a tinnie with fuel? How much does it cost to run around in a tinnie for a day? I do not think any members opposite know. Have they researched that? Let me put it into context. The \$15 recreational boat fishing licence allows someone to fish recreationally for an entire year at Ningaloo Reef, Exmouth or wherever else they are allowed to fish. People who travel up north for four months on a grey nomadic adventure could catch a feed of fish every night for \$15. What kind of impost is that? Members opposite do not live in the real world. I implore all members to support the Liberal-National government's responsible recreational fisheries management and to not condemn the fisheries of this state by supporting a backward, anticonservation move to disallow this regulation. The Department of Fisheries needs the appropriate management tools to manage the fisheries. The \$1.9 million that we estimate will be raised from the recreational boat fishing licence will go into education, compliance and restocking efforts, and it will help our research projects and allow us to find out what our stock levels are and how many people access the fishery. Already, 25 423 people have bought their recreational fishing boat licence.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** They have to. It's the law.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Of course they have to. Fantastic! It is about time a Minister for Fisheries had the guts to introduce it. There is conjecture about whether 100 000, 500 000 or 600 000 people fish recreationally. We now know that in the past two weeks, 25 423 responsible Western Australians have bought a recreational fishing boat licence because they support what we are doing. That is in just two weeks. It will be interesting to see what the numbers are after April, Easter and the school holidays, which is one of the key recreational fishing periods. I will be in Kalbarri fishing with my nieces and nephews. The fish that they catch will be part of my bag limit and they will not need to pay a cent. I have bought my \$30 recreational fishing boat licence and my nieces and nephews can fish with me on the boat using my bag limit.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** Are you going to go out in a tinnie?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Yes, I will. We will catch two Spanish mackerel per day per adult. That is about 10 kilograms of fillets. Two mackerel will feed our entire camp for a night. The recreational boat fishing licence will allow every person on the boat to fish to my bag limit, if they choose. My nieces and nephews wanted their own special fishing licence with their name on it that they could take to school and show to their friends. It is their very first licence, which is a very proud moment for them. I plead with members to stand up for the responsible and well-funded management of the fisheries and to vote against this disallowance motion.

**MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands — Parliamentary Secretary) [5.47 pm]:** I am very pleased to support the responsible approach the Minister for Fisheries, Hon Norman Moore, is taking to the management of the fisheries and I fully support the introduction of the recreational boat fishing licence. I do not claim to have the same amount of knowledge about fishing as the member for Scarborough and it has been a long time since I went fishing. We are very lucky to have the member for Scarborough in the chamber to share with us her very outstanding knowledge of fishing. I will make a brief contribution to support the Minister for Fisheries and the people in the electorate of Nedlands who fish.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** Who fishes in Nedlands?

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** There are many boats in my electorate, and some of them are used to go fishing.

Several members interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** There is a big river in Nedlands. The recreational boat fishing licence is a very responsible measure and I assume that many people in my electorate will apply for it because they are responsible fishermen. This licence is part of the minister's overall package to protect our fish stock. I will get to many of the points made by members opposite shortly. Some members called this recreational fishing from a boat licence a tax. It is actually a licence and the money collected will be hypothecated to the Department of Fisheries for the protection of our fish. It will help to employ 13 additional inspectors and produce a database. All available information will be gathered. It will be a wonderful package that will, combined with a reduction in bag limits, be a responsible approach to conserving our valuable fish stocks.

Members opposite spoke about the huge burden of \$30 for an adult to obtain a fishing from a boat licence for 12 months. I was going to refer to other taxes later, but I may as well do that now.

Several members interjected.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** Sure, people have to pay a licence fee for their boat, but what advantage do they get from paying that fee? They get very expensive infrastructure, including boat ramps.

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** Member for Albany, that may be a worthwhile motion. However, we are not debating the boat licence fee; we are debating a recreational fishing from a boat licence fee of \$30 for adults and \$15 for young persons and seniors. That is what this debate is about.

The fishing from a boat licence is \$30 for an adult for 12 months. What would \$30 buy? It would buy a large Red Rooster family meal or two tickets to the theatre. How long does a Red Rooster family meal last? For my kids, it lasts half an hour. A \$30 recreational fishing from a boat licence lasts for 12 months. The member for Riverton might be able to tell me what that is per day. It would be in the cents.

Several members interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** Why would members opposite vote against a responsible \$30 fishing from a boat licence? Members opposite have spent the last hour and a half trying to persuade government members to do that.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Bring back Sue Walker!

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** That was a cruel comment. That interjection did throw me. It was a good one.

Several members interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** Where do members turn to find evidence to support the opposition's disallowance motion? I turned to the Leader of the Opposition's press release that he put out last week. It is a useful document. There are 14 sentences in it and I went through each of them to find some evidence to persuade me to cross the floor on this motion.

**Mr P. Papalia:** This sounds a lot like the member for Scarborough's speech.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** The member for Scarborough's speech was far better than mine, because she knows a lot about fishing.

I come back to the Leader of the Opposition's press release, released last week, which is headed, "Labor Moves To Axe The Fish Tax". What a red herring! It is not a fish tax; it is a fish licence.

Several members interjected.

**Mr F.A. Alban:** It's good to see that members opposite have something to laugh about.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** That is right.

The Leader of the Opposition repeats the mistake that was made in the heading in the first sentence of the press release. It states —

*Labor will introduce a disallowance motion to Parliament today to oppose the general boat fishing licence as part of its campaign to axe the fish tax.*

He said that it is a licence, not a tax, which is the point I am making. The press release continues —

... Western Australian families would be forced to pay \$30 per adult and \$15 per child each year to fish from a boat.

Families will not be forced to pay \$30 per adult and \$15 per child. Only one person in a boat is required to have a licence. Somebody in my electorate might have a big boat—there may be one or two people in my electorate who have big boats—and, hypothetically, that boat might be so big that it can have 500 people on it. I say to the member for Collie–Preston that only one person on that boat needs a fishing boat licence. If there were 500 children on the boat, they could all fish off the boat provided the skipper had a licence.

Several members interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** There is a bag limit, which is part of the minister's very responsible conservation package to protect the fish stocks.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** If I want to take the boat to the other side of the river to fish and drop off those 500, they've all got to have a licence.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** I am sorry, it is a river licence.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

The point the Leader of the Opposition made in his press release was that families would be forced to pay—this is what he said—\$30 per adult and \$15 per child each year to fish from a boat. That is erroneous.

**Mr C.C. Porter** interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** I thank the Attorney General.

The next point the Leader of the Opposition made was that the boat fishing licence was nothing but a new tax by stealth. He said —

... it is a new tax on families, which comes on top of the huge increase in electricity bills ...

When the Leader of the Opposition made his speech, he moved away from talking about the fishing boat licence and talked about all the other taxes. We are talking about a very small imposition on families—\$30.

I must confess that about 40 people came to my electorate office with a concern about the original regulations for a fishing boat licence. I understand the Minister for Fisheries consulted with the community and got feedback on their concerns about the original regulations.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** And he responded.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** And he responded. There was a legitimate concern. Even my father, who has a boat and lives in the member for Mandurah's electorate, was on the phone.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Who is that?

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** My father lives in the member for Mandurah's electorate.

**Mr M.W. Sutherland:** He doesn't vote for you though!

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** No, he does not. I do not know that for sure. He may vote for the member for Mandurah; I do not know.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Tell me his name; I'll doorknock him!

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** He may vote for the member for Mandurah; I do not know.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Give me his number and I'll tell him his son's talking rubbish tonight!

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** He is probably listening.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** I'm going to tell all your cousins!

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** Do not do that!

My father raised with me—he is not even in my electorate—a concern about the original regulations that required everyone on a boat to have a licence. The minister listened and since then he brought out these regulations and I have not heard from one person. I did get an email from one person, which went to every member.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Mr Jorgensen.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** Mr Jorgensen; that is right. I did read Mr Jorgensen's email. One of the important points that the Leader of the Opposition was trying to make in his press release was a legitimate point to make but, again, it is invalid. He said —

It will not result in a reduction of fish being caught and it will not tell us how often people fish from boats or how many fish are taken.

That was in the Leader of the Opposition's press release. It may reduce the number of fish caught, for two reasons. I am very pleased that the minister is in the chamber to make sure that I say the right thing, because I may not.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** I do not understand the point.

There are two reasons why the fishing boat licence may reduce the number of fishers. As members of the opposition have said, if it is really a deterrent for people to go fishing, straightaway it will work. That is point number one. Let us say that it does not work, then what will it do? Let us assume that everyone still goes fishing; they will all pay their licence fee and there will be no difference. Some people might say that the increase in the licence fee will not make any difference, but the other part of the package is the bag limit. That is another way that we are reducing or conserving fish numbers.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm*

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** I had got up to the sixth point of 14, but I would like to conclude. I also did not have time to deal with the comments of the six speakers on the other side. However, in conclusion, I congratulate the Minister for Fisheries on a very responsible approach to conserving the fish stocks in Western Australia. It is only a start; however, not one constituent has come into my office and complained about the recreational fishing boat licence. I fully support it, and I urge all members on both sides of the house to vote against the disallowance motion.

**MR M.J. COWPER (Murray–Wellington — Parliamentary Secretary)** [7.01 pm]: I would like to have had a better opportunity than that provided by the time that is left to speak on this issue to perhaps highlight to members of this place the more serious undertones of the motion that is before the house. Had the opposition perhaps been more across the very serious nature of the recreational fishing matter, it may have been able to present a case to this house that would have enjoyed a better discussion on the seriousness of this whole issue.

This very weekend I will be travelling up the coast with a bunch of friends, and we will be enjoying the company of our respective sons. It is a father and son weekend, and that will involve a whole range of activities, including a bit of fishing. I have a boat, and the weather forecast looks remarkably good for this weekend. I think I might be able to shoot out to a couple of spots that I am familiar with and enjoy the company of my son, and my friend and his son. That is something that I enjoy doing. I am sure that I have mentioned in this place before my keen interest in fishing. I have a photo here of my son with his very first dhufish. This is going back a few years now. As members can see, he was in the 14-foot Quintrex, with a 30-horsepower Yamaha engine.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** How much did it cost him to catch that one?

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** In fact, it cost him nothing, and it will continue to cost him nothing, because last night I did the responsible thing and bought myself a licence. I was in my office upstairs, and I dragged out my credit card and splashed out \$30, somewhat reluctantly, but at least I know that it will hopefully go to a very worthy cause—that is, research and providing more fisheries inspectors out there. Hopefully, we will be able to demonstrate as a government, as a state and as a responsible community the good management of our fisheries. I do not think anyone in this place would argue that our demersal fishery is not under threat. That is pretty much a given. The issue that should be raised by the opposition is how we can best responsibly manage that situation. I am very thankful that this weekend, with my licence, I will be able to go out and catch two dhufish. I will be happy to catch two dhufish that are similar to the one that I caught about two weeks ago before the licence was introduced. If I can catch two fish like this in the company of my son, and a friend and his son, then we will have had a pretty darn good day. It will be one of those times that I will be able to savour with my son, knowing that I have instilled in him the virtues and values of responsible fishing. As long as my son, being only 14 years of age, is on the boat with me, he is not required to get a recreational fishing licence. He is covered under my licence. I can just about guarantee members that I shall not be catching these fish because, if my son is on the boat, he is guaranteed to catch them. He is one of these fluky people who manages to pick up a fish, generally before I get a chance to put a line in the water. My son has learnt over a period of time that it is a privilege to be able to go out and catch a few fish. Unless we do something about our demersal fishery, there will not be a day in the future, perhaps, for him to take his son out fishing and demonstrate sound, responsible practices in the demersal fisheries. Yes, the dhufish is a targeted fish and is under considerable pressure, but I have heard nothing from members on the other side about how they propose to manage the fishery. It is all very well for members opposite to stand in this place and say that they do not like new taxes and to try to throw grenades over the fence to somehow disrupt the attempts of this government to ensure sustainable fishing for the future.

When this issue first raised its head, we were in opposition. The then Minister for Fisheries, Hon Jon Ford, was proposing a number of measures. One was the closure of fisheries and fishing zones and various other matters that caused concern, particularly in the recreational fishing industry. However, there were no indicative maps on where those closed areas might be. I ask members to try to appreciate the serious impact that closing areas of our coast to fishing would have had on not only the recreational fishing industry but also the livelihoods of many thousands of Western Australians. Mr Speaker, can you image up your neck of the woods at the wonderful place of Kalbarri what would happen if this closed fishing zone were to be extended to Kalbarri? We would just about hear from here the screams coming from that part of the world. Not only would that affect the recreational fishermen, it would also impact on hoteliers, shop owners, caravan park owners and all the various associated businesses that go with the recreational fishing industry. I am not sure what the figures are. The member for Scarborough may recall the income that is generated from industries associated with the recreational fishing industry on an annual basis in Western Australia. It would be many millions of dollars and probably billions of dollars.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** At one stage it was estimated at \$1.2 billion.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** Who would be the arbiter of which areas would be closed? Why the good people of Kalbarri? Why not at Augusta or Busselton in the member for Vasse's electorate? What if there were a no-go area in the Treasurer's electorate? This might sound a little off-the-cuff, but let me tell members that the debate over recreational fishing will be with us for a long, long time. This is only the beginning of this debate. The member for Gosnells would agree with me, as would those who know the industry perhaps a little better than others. They know that this current situation most likely will not be the saviour of the demersal fishery. We hope that it will be, but there will always be those people out there who will not do the right thing. I am happy to go out in my boat with my son this weekend and catch our two fish. If I can do that next month, next year and for another 10 or 20 years, I will be happy. The days of going out and plundering the sea are gone. The days of going to the north west, as the member for Collie-Preston said, and filling up freezers with fish and bringing them back home are gone.

Fishing is all about enjoying somebody's company in the pursuit of fishing. A range of issues in the current laws still do not sit comfortably with me. A fair bit of work has been done behind the scenes by members opposite and, in particular, by a lot of members on this side of the chamber. They went to the Minister for Fisheries, Hon Norman Moore, and put forward a case for the people they represent. Moreover, just before Christmas I held a forum. Because of the interest generated in my electorate, I encouraged as many people to attend as I could. They met with the Fisheries people, representatives from the University of Western Australia and the various people who were involved in this decision. It was held at the Murray RSL in Pinjarra and was well attended. The entry fee was a \$5 donation. The money that we raised went to Waroona District High School's trip to Anzac Cove next year. We raised some money on the side.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** Not to your election fund?

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** I give a guarantee to the member that it went to the very good young people at Waroona who are aspiring to go to Anzac Cove next year. There were people at the forum from my electorate, the member for Bunbury's electorate, the member for Mandurah's electorate and the member for Dawesville's electorate but most of them came from my electorate. They were able to ask questions directly of the people who made the decision. A number of presentations were made. There was some interesting and robust debate. To say that the member for Dawesville and I have been errant in not representing our people is totally false. I believe that the members on this side of the house have been very active in lobbying the minister to arrive at the current situation. Initially, the licence fee was going to be \$150. That was rightly argued by many people as being a little over the top and beyond the reach of a lot of people. I acknowledge that some people may not be able to afford the \$30 fee, which I am fortunate to be able to pay so I can do what I need to do. We should try to put it into perspective. I do not have a big flash boat. I do not come from a "silver spoon" background. I worked for everything that I have. If I want to go fishing, I have to get a recreational fishing licence. I happen to have a master class 5 licence from a previous life. I go down to the shop of my friend the member for Scarborough —

**Mr F.M. Logan:** Do you get a discount there?

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** I do get a discount because I have been getting fishing tackle from that shop for 20 or 30 years. Without giving the business too much of a plug, I will just say that I went down there and bought myself an emergency position indicating radio beacon. As members would know, if one wants to go out in a boat, one must have an EPIRB. I had a 27.5 megahertz EPIRB but it was obsolete so I had to get myself a new one. I will not say how much it was—I got a bit of a discount—but it cost me close to \$400. It costs \$400 for an EPIRB before one even goes out fishing. Then one has to buy sinkers. On a good day—or a bad day, whichever way we look at it—I would probably lose \$20 worth of sinkers getting snagged on the bottom.

A number of issues were raised by the member for Collie-Preston that I would like to take up as they relate to certain sections of the current fishing arrangements that could be modified. To say that these arrangements have been etched in stone like the Ten Commandments is not right as I think we can still work through some of these issues. One of the issues that came out of the forum that I held at the Murray RSL related to the number of fish that are brought to the surface. One could go fishing outside the season and inadvertently catch a dhufish. Because the season is closed, the fish would be let go. Despite the good attempts to send the fish back to sea, it would result in barotrauma, where the fish would float and be wasted. That is something the fishermen told the fisheries representatives and me that we need to work on. That is one area we can work on.

Another matter raised by members in this place was the fact that there is a bag limit of only two fish per boat. That pushes people into other boats and puts more boats on the water to catch the limits. As has been demonstrated, if there are three licence holders on a boat, the limit is not six fish; it is actually only two fish.

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

Two into three does not go. Realistically speaking, I would like to see a proposal put to the minister whereby that could be examined and hopefully discussed in a forum that is welcomed by opposition members. They can be involved in the process rather than throwing grenades over the fence.

I know I am eating into the member for Dawesville's time and I appreciate his indulgence, but, in closing, the issue here is this: if we do not demonstrate that we can manage our fishery now, the threat to the fishery in this state is that an organisation—for instance the Pew foundation of America, which is a well funded lobby group—will come onto the federal scene and take it out of our hands. If we cannot demonstrate that we have the capacity to manage our own fishery, we will lose it. Take that into consideration, members.

**MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn)** [7.16 pm]: In keeping with the agreement we have with the government, I will speak for a short time.

I want to raise a few things. My first point relates to the cost of the new licence that a person requires to go fishing. The recreational fishing from a boat licence will add to the list of species that a fisher has to have a licence for anyway. Most of us normally get our licence in December. We do it online and receive our licence, which covers all the species, for nearly \$88. Probably everyone in this house who fishes would occasionally fish from a boat. We now have to have a fishing from a boat licence. That will be \$230. This year I got my full licence and it cost me just under \$88. Next year, when I renew it, it is going to cost me \$230. That is the most expensive fishing licence in the world! That is not an exaggeration; that is the truth. Government members can tell their constituents they have done a great job putting up fishing licence fees to be the most expensive in the world. I think members will probably get a pretty horrible response from their constituents.

That was the first thing I wanted to raise. The other thing I want to raise —

**Mr M.J. Cowper** interjected.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I listened to you in silence, mate. Why don't you just keep quiet!

I would also like to point out licence versus effort. The member for Scarborough and the member for Murray–Wellington think that simply because licences will be introduced, somehow that will save the fish stock. That is not going to happen. The government may know how many people are fishing but it will not know what their effort is. It is a ridiculous argument. It gets made over and over and over again. It is a false argument and it has no credibility whatsoever.

The other thing I want to point out is: do members know how much a person will be fined if he or she fishes from a boat and does not have a licence? Does anybody in the house know how much a person will be fined? If a person fishes from a boat and does not have a licence, after July that person will be fined \$2 000. That is more than a person is fined for driving a boat without a skipper's ticket and it is more than a drink-driving fine. The fine for drink-driving is \$1 500, it is \$200 for driving a boat without a driver's licence and it will be \$2 000 for fishing from a boat without a licence. The government members all think that this is good. They should explain it to their constituents and the kids who may well get pulled up and face a \$2 000 fine for not having a licence. Government members really have to be joking when they say that it is equitable to fine people more for fishing out of a boat without a licence than for driving a car when drunk. Are they for real? This is absolutely ridiculous. The worst part is that none of them even knew. They want to vote against this disallowance motion and put these fees in place, and they do not even know what the penalties are. They are an absolute disgrace as a government for wanting to do that. We will be letting people know that we stood out for fisher people in this state.

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** No, you did not.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Yes, we did. The member for Murray–Wellington did not even know what the fines are. He is a joke. He reckons that he knows about fishing but he did not even know what the fines are. As for who will be affected and how they will be affected by this demand for a licence to fish from a boat, members opposite said that it would be only \$15 for pensioners and people under the age of 16 years.

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** It is not much.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** It is not much to those who take a four-wheel-drive vehicle to Ningaloo and fish for a month, but that is not what the majority of people do. The biggest number of people who go fishing go fishing out of my electorate at Woodman Point boat ramp. It has the largest number of fishing boats that go out from this state, according to the Department of Fisheries' figures. Having been there and having spoken to all those people who go out fishing virtually every single day, a lot of whom are pensioners, I know that they are appalled by what the government is doing, because \$15 for them is a lot of money. They do not spend that \$15 now, and they need that money. It comes on top of the cost of their boat licence, the licence they may have for collecting



Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

abalone, the licence they must have for their trailer, the licence they must have for their car, the petrol they must put in their boat and their car —

**Mr M.J. Cowper:** And the skipper's ticket.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** And the skipper's ticket. It comes on top of all those. This is a government that is determined to reduce red tape! How many licences have I just referred to that people need to get before they even put a boat in the water? It is an outrageous and disgraceful set of circumstances. I will tell you what is driving this, Mr Speaker. It is not as if we have not heard this proposition before. Hon Jon Ford in the Legislative Council, when he was Minister for Fisheries, had this proposition put to him. He rejected it because it was unnecessary. The only reason Hon Norman Moore is picking it up now is that it is a way of cost shifting and getting money for his department. Money will be cut from his department and he will be able to get supplementary money from a new fishing licence and a new tax in order to supplement the operating costs of the department. That is what it is all about. Government members are saying that they will put more inspectors on. We will see. Come election time in 2013, we will see whether the fish take has been reduced as a result of these new taxes. I can tell you now, Mr Speaker, it will not. The fish take will not have been reduced as a result of these measures, but the amount in the coffers of the state will be increased incredibly.

**DR K.D. HAMES (Dawesville — Minister for Health) [7.23 pm]:** There is little time left to me to speak, and I thank the member for Cockburn for taking less than the time that was proposed for him to speak. The comments of the Leader of the Opposition promoting the environmental credentials of the Labor Party in dealing with the reduction in demersal fish stocks are true. There is no doubt that the action the former government was planning to take was a very strong attempt to reduce the fishing of demersal fish, but it was, by any measure, draconian, and it would have affected so many more people than this fishing licence could possibly affect. The member for Cockburn mounted an argument that a \$30 licence is excessive and will lead to the decimation of the fishing and tackle industry, and the member for Mandurah also stated that the short closure of the fishery leading up to December was draconian. The problem is that the general public do not know what the Labor Party was proposing. It was proposing a three-month total closure of fishing for demersal fish in the west coast fishery in a way that would have totally decimated the fishing industry, the tackle industry, the boat manufacturing industry and boat retailers. It would have stopped fishing at the best time of the year; the only time people can reasonably get out and fish, and the only time when people have the holidays to have a break and fish. It would have totally closed all those areas for fishing to the majority of fishers in Western Australia.

The problem this government has is that the public did not know that that was what the Labor Party was proposing, otherwise it would have been up in arms. We copped enough criticism for the closure until early December. The consequences of that closure for three months during the summer period would have been draconian. We opposed that because we support small businesses and those people that the opposition is complaining on behalf of in saying that they cannot afford a \$15 or \$30 licence. They would not have been able to fish at all as they can now, the best time of the year for fishing. From the government's point of view, it is a shame that it did not have the opportunity, during the lead-up to the election, to make people aware of what the former government was actually going to do.

As has been stated many times, the government wants to preserve the fish stock for our grandchildren, and action had to be taken. We had to look at a combination of measures to address that. The initial measure was one of a \$150 demersal fishing licence. As the member for Murray–Wellington said, there was a fair bit of consternation from some of us about that fee. This is the alternative to the \$150 fee that would have been imposed. A number of actions have been taken, but members have focused all the attention on this \$30 licensing fee; that is only a small part of the total measures that have had to be taken to address our fish stocks.

For a start, there will be a big reduction in bag limits. That is a critical component of reducing the catch. We have now all got global positioning systems, we have all got fish finders, and we all know where to find them. The trouble is that a very small percentage of fishermen—the best fishermen—are the ones who tend to go to the best spots and catch the majority of fish, particularly dhufish and other demersal species. We needed a measure that, firstly, reduced the total catch, so that they were not able to take as many, and, secondly, a licence fee that allowed us to clearly demarcate the people who actually went out fishing. We looked at things such as the closure of fishing zones and stopping people going fishing; the trouble with those is that the best place to catch dhufish around Mandurah is to go out through the Cut, go south west for about 45 minutes to an hour to the spot where all the bombies are. Only the good fishermen know the exact GPS locations, and that is the best spot to catch black-arse cod, dhufish, and such like. If a no-fishing zone is established around there, fishing inspectors will have to be out there 24 hours a day. The reality is that it is an hour out by boat south west of the Cut, where boats can be seen coming for miles. Where will the boundaries be marked? They can be marked on a map that

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

shows where the GPS location is and the fishers are inside until they see the fishing inspector coming, and then they are outside when he gets there! We have to protect these fish. Demersal fish, particularly dhufish, do not have a high degree of mobility.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** They have enough trouble catching the member, let alone catching people who are now south of the Cut!

There is the whole west coast to police. I support having areas set aside as sanctuary zones; I think that is good and it is something we will support and introduce in the future. However, that is one aspect of trying to control the catch of those demersal species. One of the critical areas is reducing the catches in the boats.

I have to say the member for Collie–Preston's contribution and some of the things he brought up were a bit of a dog's breakfast. He kept going on about the young kids going out fishing, particularly angling. The \$30 licence fee covers people going out in a boat into, normally, estuaries, the ocean or, perhaps, a river. The member talked in particular about young kids going down to the river to fish. That has absolutely nothing to do with this licence—absolutely nothing! The area that the member for Collie–Preston talked about is included in the original licence—namely, the South West freshwater angling licence. That has been in existence for years.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** You put another one in, why didn't you take one out?

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** There is no addition —

**Mr M.P. Murray:** What is the difference between fishing for herring and fishing for red-fin perch?

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I will get to that because that is the other dog's breakfast part of the member for Collie–Preston's argument. Let me deal with one bit at a time. The first bit is that the member said that there is something in these regulations that fines kids for fishing in creeks. That is not true. That licence requirement existed for years under the previous government and under our former government. Kids, adults —

**Mr M.P. Murray:** Not for under-16s.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Yes; it was the same licence.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** Never been enforced.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I do not care whether it has been enforced. Perhaps, like the member, people for a long time did not get caught, but that has been the licence requirement for years.

The member asked: why should kids have to pay for a licence to fish in a creek, when kids catching herring from the shore do not need a licence? Is the member suggesting that because kids fishing in a creek require a licence, and did so throughout the time of the previous government, that we should introduce a licence for the kids fishing off the rocks? I was one of the strongest opponents of extending the fishing licence to people fishing from the shoreline because I feel that young kids in particular, but also pensioners, especially in my electorate and the member for Mandurah's electorate, fish off the rocks in the Cut so we should not bring that in.

Remember that licences in other states—we talked about Victoria's fishing licence being \$22 and a New South Wales licence being \$30—are for everyone who is fishing, including people fishing from the shore. Those states have more than 500 000 people who pay that licence fee to fish wherever they fish, whereas our licence is limited to those people who go out on boats, which is about 50 000 people—about 10 per cent of the number of people who have to pay for a licence in Victoria and New South Wales.

Let us talk about the costs for people to go fishing. Members opposite talk about costs, and I understand there are all those other costs, but who brought in the skipper's ticket? It is not that I disagree, I agree with the skipper's ticket and I have one myself; I think it is a good concept. However, that is another cost —

**Mr M.P. Murray:** A once-off.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I thought people had to renew their skipper's ticket every year, but anyway, it is another cost for people to get their skipper's ticket —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan** interjected.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I know it was the previous government's skipper's ticket and I agree with it. I think it was a good move. However, it is an additional cost.

**Extract from Hansard**  
[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 17 March 2010]  
p794a-819a

Mr Eric Ripper; Acting Speaker; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Kim Hames

---

I do not know how often the member for Collie–Preston goes fishing, but between the two of us we would be the most prominent fishers in this Parliament. I am a regular fisherman from the top to the bottom of the state.

**Mr M. McGowan:** When do you ever do any work?

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** This is during long weekends and holidays. I have the honour of being patron of the Perth Game Fishing Club, so I have to go fishing with those guys as well.

**Mr M. McGowan:** You just go fishing all day!

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I wish I could! Anyone who owns a boat chucks \$50 into the rubbish bin every week. The costs of running a boat are enormous. The big costs do not include the \$30 licence fee. If one goes out sea fishing for dhufish or the like, it costs \$100 a trip. The standard round trip for going out fishing for three to five hours is \$100 in whatever size boat. It is perhaps less in a little tinnie, but they cannot go out into the ocean. That is what it costs most people who go out to the ocean to fish, where the bigger fish are. It may cost less to go and catch herring and whiting in the creeks and close to the shore, but there is also the cost of bait, sinkers and the gear that is used. Tackle shops are fishers' equivalent of going to church! Going to a tackle shop is like being visited by Father Christmas! There is all that gear, and I can tell members that none of it is cheap—no offence to the member for Scarborough! In that context, \$30 over a year—\$15 for pensioners—is not a huge amount of money. The average person would spend \$30 on a carton of beer for a decent fishing trip. There are a large number of costs associated with fishing, and \$30 is not a large amount. The licences will provide a list of all the people who are fishing, provide extra money for inspectors—the member for Collie–Preston needs to watch out!—and ensure that the government has a better handle on the numbers of people who are going out there and catching the fish that need protection from the state.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (23)

Ms L.L. Baker  
Ms J.M. Freeman  
Mr J.N. Hyde  
Mr W.J. Johnston  
Mr J.C. Kobelke  
Mr F.M. Logan

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan  
Mr M. McGowan  
Mrs C.A. Martin  
Mr M.P. Murray  
Mr P. Papalia  
Mr J.R. Quigley

Ms M.M. Quirk  
Mr E.S. Ripper  
Mrs M.H. Roberts  
Ms R. Saffioti  
Mr T.G. Stephens  
Mr C.J. Tallentire

Mr P.C. Tinley  
Mr A.J. Waddell  
Mr P.B. Watson  
Mr M.P. Whitely  
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Noes (30)

Mr P. Abetz  
Mr F.A. Alban  
Mr C.J. Barnett  
Mr I.C. Blayney  
Mr J.J.M. Bowler  
Mr I.M. Britza  
Mr T.R. Buswell  
Ms A.S. Carles

Mr G.M. Castrilli  
Dr E. Constable  
Mr M.J. Cowper  
Mr J.H.D. Day  
Mr J.M. Francis  
Dr K.D. Hames  
Mrs L.M. Harvey  
Mr A.P. Jacob

Dr G.G. Jacobs  
Mr R.F. Johnson  
Mr A. Krsticevic  
Mr W.R. Marmion  
Mr P.T. Miles  
Ms A.R. Mitchell  
Dr M.D. Nahan  
Mr C.C. Porter

Mr D.T. Redman  
Mr A.J. Simpson  
Mr M.W. Sutherland  
Mr T.K. Waldron  
Dr J.M. Woollard  
Mr J.E. McGrath (*Teller*)

---

Pairs

Mr B.S. Wyatt  
Mr R.H. Cook

Mr V.A. Catania  
Mr B.J. Grylls

Question thus negatived.