

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 4 April 1985

THE SPEAKER (Mr Harman) took the Chair at 10.45 a.m., and read prayers.

SPEAKERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Portrait Gallery: Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER: Members, some time ago I became aware that we had in our possession photographs of all previous 22 Speakers since 1890. Although some of these photographs were in poor condition, advice received indicated that they could be satisfactorily restored. Having this in mind, it was decided that action should be taken to arrange for the photographs to be treated, enlarged and hung in the Speaker's corridor as a commemorative tribute to members who held the high office of Speaker of the Western Australian Legislative Assembly.

The Clerk Assistant of the Assembly was commissioned to plan the Speakers' Portrait Gallery. Mr Farrell was ably assisted by Mr Ray Penrose, lately retired from the Government Printer, and Mr Dennis Sharp of the Building Management Authority. The endeavours of these gentlemen, as you will see, deserve our highest commendation.

Shortly after 12.30 p.m. today an inauguration ceremony will take place in the Speaker's corridor. Several former Speakers will be present.

I wish to invite members to this ceremony and to view the gallery. For this reason I will leave the Chair at 12.30 p.m. and resume as normal at 2.15 p.m.

MINERALS: DIAMOND DISPUTE

As to Urgency Motion: Points of Order

Mr HASSELL: Mr Speaker, I have received a letter from you advising that you declined to bring forward to the House today a request, under Standing Order No. 48, for an urgency debate in relation to the Argyle dispute and the failure of the Government and the impotence of the Industrial Relations Commission in relation to the handling of that dispute, for the reason that the industrial matters relating to the Argyle diamond site are before the Industrial Relations Commission today for adjudication and therefore are *sub judice*.

Mr Speaker, I am aware that in making your ruling you have had regard to the Standing Orders and, I believe, to precedents in relation to the

matter; but I would draw your attention to the precise motion that was proposed to be debated in the urgency debate and ask for your further consideration of whether that motion offends the *sub judice* rule.

The motion does not seek to canvass the actual decision being adjudicated upon by the Industrial Relations Commission, but it seeks to canvass the incapacity of the commission to—

THE SPEAKER: Order! The member must inform me under what Standing Order he is basing his point of order. I have not made a ruling to the Parliament.

Mr HASSELL: No, but Mr Speaker, you have made a ruling by letter to me and I am asking for you to reconsider that ruling.

The point I am trying to make is that basically if too broad a construction is to be placed on the *sub judice* rule the impact of that construction is to prevent vast areas of matter under public debate and public consideration and which are constantly the subject of media representations and media debates, from being debated in this Parliament.

Mr Brian Burke: This is the first occasion on which the Speaker has rejected a move for an urgency motion of all the times you have asked permission for such motions.

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: If it is the second occasion it is not bad compared with the record of previous speakers.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked me to reconsider the request.

Several members interjected.

Mr HASSELL: I am making a point of order to you, Mr Speaker. It is a legitimate point of order and is a matter of considerable importance.

THE SPEAKER: Order! It is a point of view.

Mr HASSELL: Mr Speaker, I cannot ask you to reconsider the position you have taken without explaining to you, and to the House, why I am making that request. I am not trying to canvass anything but the direct point.

Several members interjected.

Mr Brian Burke: Why did you—

Mr HASSELL: I do not want to hear the Premier. I will not reply to his interjections and I do not want to be interrupted by them. I am trying to raise a point of order and surely I am allowed to do that without being interrupted by the Premier.

Mr Tonkin: It is not a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point is that it has to be a point of order.

Mr HASSELL: Mr Speaker, I am asking you to reconsider the decision you have made. I cannot very well ask you to do that unless I am able to put to you in the Parliament in the proper way the basis upon which I make the request. The simple basis upon which the request for reconsideration is made is whether it is right, as a matter of public policy, that in the Parliament, we should seek to put a very broad construction on the *sub judice* rule. We all accept the need for a *sub judice* rule. The matter on which we requested debate did not go to the issues under adjudication. The matter upon which we requested debate goes to the enforcement of previous orders and to the activity of the Government. It is on that basis that I request that you, Mr Speaker, seriously reconsider your decision. That is a very simple request. It is important. It is the sort of issue in line with what the Leader of the House said yesterday about the Westminster tradition. We are dealing with a matter of very great concern. The House of Commons considered this matter in relation to the debate of the thalidomide issues in Great Britain when those issues were before the courts. Historic rulings were made as a result of those issues being raised. Mr Speaker, that is the simple request that I make of you; that is, that you reconsider seriously the decision you have made in view of the importance of the issue.

Mr PARKER: Based on the very brief notification that we had telephoned through to us from the Opposition of the motion that is proposed to be moved by the Opposition, I point out that the motion goes to the very heart of what has been determined and decided upon and negotiated at this very moment before the Industrial Relations Commission.

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: Is the member disagreeing with the *sub judice* rule?

Mr Brian Burke: Why don't you move a motion to suspend Standing Orders?

Mr Hassell: Would you accept it?

Mr Brian Burke: You are competent to move such a motion.

Mr Hassell: I am asking whether you will consider a motion to suspend Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PARKER: If I might speak, the matters which are before the Industrial Relations Commission are matters of great sensitivity, like any other matter of this kind but, given the glare of publicity in which attempts to resolve this dispute

have been clothed and given the ability of the Industrial Relations Commission to try to get together the parties to the dispute and to try to resolve the matter, one has to look, as the Leader of the Opposition said, to the basis of the *sub judice* rule. The basis of the *sub judice* rule is that no matter which is before a court of record—the Industrial Relations Commission by section 12 of its Act is a court of record—should be in any sense prejudiced by virtue of debate in this Parliament. That is the reason for the *sub judice* rule. The reason it is there is the reason for a whole list of decisions that have been made by your predecessors, Mr Speaker, on the application of the *sub judice* rule. If it is the case that you have ruled, as I understand from the Leader of the Opposition's comments that you have, that this matter is *sub judice*, I fully endorse that point of view because the basis of that rule is to ensure that matters can proceed before courts of record without any prejudice in their ability to resolve or determine them in the various ways that the courts so determine, without the prejudice of debate in this Parliament.

There is no question but that this matter is before the commission and it is a matter of extreme sensitivity. To have a debate at this stage would prejudice its outcome and therefore I ask that this matter be ruled *sub judice*.

The SPEAKER: This debate has arisen because the Leader of the Opposition has asked me to reconsider a decision I conveyed to him in writing. I think it would be unfair of me to not read to the House, the letter from the Leader of the Opposition, so that all members know what is going on. I will shortly explain the reasons for my decision. This morning the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me in the following terms—

In accordance with Standing Orders 47 and 48 of the Legislative Assembly, I give notice that at the commencement of the sitting of the House today April 4, I wish to move "That the House do now adjourn" for the purpose of debating a matter of urgency, namely—

"THAT the Parliament expresses its alarm at the impotence of the Arbitration Commission and the Government in the face of Transport Workers Union militancy, which has seen the Union achieve its aims at the Argyle minesite by ignoring all formal legal orders and other requests for restraint."

Mr Speaker this is a matter of public importance and immediate urgency and in my view is properly brought forward within the

Standing Orders. Workers are returning from the Argyle project without any guarantee that their jobs will be available after the Easter break. We are now in the 34th day of a protracted industrial dispute which has seen the Transport Workers Union able to thumb its nose at all authority with the consequence that hundreds of jobs are at stake. As Parliament will now be breaking for Easter we feel that as a matter of urgency the Parliament should be able to debate the issue.

When I am confronted with requests to adjourn the House under Standing Orders Nos. 47 and 48, I must ask myself two questions: Firstly, and this is always a matter that the Speaker must consider when any motion is brought before the House, is the matter *sub judice*; and, secondly, in the particular circumstances, is the matter urgent? Before I reached the stage of considering that second question, I caused some inquiries to be made by the Clerk of the Assembly. It was established that the matters relating to the Argyle diamond mine site were coming before the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission at 10.30 this morning. These questions of *sub judice* are matters of judgment for the Speaker but in view of that hearing, the wording of the motion that would be discussed, and its reference to the arbitration commission, and, after considering the whole question of urgency, I replied to the Leader of the Opposition as follows—

Dear Mr Hassell,

I refer to your letter of to-day's date indicating your desire to move for the adjournment of the House under the provisions of Standing Order No. 48.

I have been advised that the industrial matters relating to the Argyle diamond mine site are before the Arbitration Commission to-day for adjudication and are "sub judice".

I do not intend to present your letter to the House.

I have given further consideration to the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition but I find nothing in the remarks he has made which could cause me to alter my decision.

RESERVES AND LAND REVESTMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [11.05 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is similar in intention to many other measures brought before the House each year to obtain the approval of Parliament to vary Class "A" reserves and in this case to close certain pedestrian accessways situated in various suburbs.

Class "A" Reserve No. 21406 situated at North Beach in the electoral district of Karrinyup and the electoral province of North Metropolitan is vested in the City of Stirling for the purpose of "public recreation". The reserve forms part of an area known as Star Swamp which has been the subject of a number of proposals for preservation of this important wetland and its surrounds. Cabinet recently approved the reservation of a 93 hectare area which includes Reserve No. 21406.

In order to put into effect Cabinet's proposal, it will be necessary to cancel formally Reserve No. 21406 before the subject land can be included in the proposed reserve which will be set apart for the purpose of "conservation of flora and fauna and recreation". This clause seeks that approval.

Millstream Chichester National Park Class "A" Reserve No. 38333, situated 50 kilometres south of Roebourne in the electoral district of Pilbara and the electoral province of North, is set apart for "national park" and vested under the Conservation and Land Management Act in the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority.

The reserve completely surrounds De Witt Location 188, a freehold enclave of 16.1874 hectares. Although Location 188 has no significant features, in 1983 the then National Parks Authority, while pursuing a policy of purchasing enclave blocks within national parks, acquired the land for inclusion in the park. This clause seeks to formalise the proposal.

Class "A" Reserve No. 37617, situated in the Shire of Wanneroo, the electoral district of Moore and the electoral province of Upper West, is vested in the Shire of Wanneroo for the purpose of "protection and preservation of Orchestra Shell cave". The cave within the reserve has been declared a protected area under the Aboriginal Heritage Act. The Shire of Wanneroo has requested excision of a small area for stormwater drainage and the WA Museum has agreed to the excision provided the Aboriginal site is not affected. The museum has also pointed out that the Aboriginal site has always been known as Orchestra Shell cave and in the interests of standardisation, has requested the reserve purpose be changed to "protection and preservation of Orchestra Shell cave". This clause seeks approval to the excision and the minor change to the description of the reserve purpose.

The latter part of this Bill seeks approval to the closure and revestment in the Crown of eight pedestrian accessways situated in various suburbs. These accessways were created from private freehold land subdivisions under section 20A of the Town Planning and Development Act. As a condition of subdivision they were vested in Her Majesty, but the passage of time has indicated that, in these particular instances—and I stress the word “particular”—these accessways have been found either not required for their purpose or otherwise caused problems in that they have seriously detracted from the social amenity and environment of the neighbourhood by misuse. Reports of damage to property, wanton vandalism, intrusion into family privacy, and antisocial behaviour have been submitted by adjoining residents to local authorities as supporting reasons for seeking closure of a number of these accessways.

In all cases the closure applications have been submitted by the relevant local government authority which passed resolutions for closure after giving adequate publicity to the intention and hearing objections or receiving petitions, both for and against, in some cases.

The need for this legislative measure arises from legal doubt being expressed by officers from the Crown Law Department that existing legislation under the Local Government Act is not available to effect closure of these types of accessways and there is no other statutory provision enabling their closure.

Ultimately, amendments to existing Statutes such as the Town Planning and Development Act and Part XII of the Local Government Act will be required to establish permanent legislative powers to deal with closures of this nature but, as a means of resolving these particular eight cases where closure is considered to be an immediate requirement, this measure has been introduced.

This is seen only as a short-term solution to the lack of specific legislative authority for closure of pedestrian accessways and, as previously stated, amendments to other existing Statutes will be required to provide permanent powers. This whole question is presently being examined by an interdepartmental working party.

It is proposed that machinery already established in part VIIA of the Land Act be used to enable disposal of the unwanted accessways to adjoining holders at valuations assessed by the Valuer General in a manner similar to that for public roads which are closed when of no further use. Reasonable time will be allowed for payment of land incorporated into an adjoining owner's title.

I commend the Bill to the House, which is not surprising seeing that I have just moved that it be read a second time.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Blaikie.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION AND RURAL ADJUSTMENT SCHEMES AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [11.10 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is fourfold—

to reconstitute the Rural Adjustment Authority as the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation of Western Australia;

to provide in the form of the new corporation a more suitable vehicle for the overall management of schemes of assistance to the rural sector;

to incorporate the provisions of the Rural Industries Assistance Act 1975-80 into the Rural Adjustment and Rural Reconstruction Schemes Act; and

to facilitate the transfer of existing loans to farmers made under the Government agency section of the Rural and Industries Bank Act to the corporation.

By far the most important of these aims is to create a corporation with the expertise, flexibility and powers necessary to meet the needs of the industry and the effective co-ordination of all forms of financial assistance existent or to be initiated.

With this in mind, the Bill allows for a corporation membership of five, two of whom shall have wide experience in rural industry or financial matters, or possess other special qualifications appropriate to the function of the corporation.

The chairman shall have wide experience in financial matters relevant to rural industry and if necessary may be appointed on a full-time basis to become chief executive officer as well as chairman. The remaining two members will be Government officers—one from Treasury and one from the Department of Agriculture.

The chairman's appointment will be for a period of five years while other members will hold office for three years. Any or all may be reappointed.

There is provision for the corporation to utilise accumulated funds in the various trust accounts under its administration and also power to borrow in order to finance schemes of assistance to the rural sector.

In these ways there will be created a rural finance body whose effectiveness will be noticeably enhanced and which will be in a position to marshal and employ available funds for the benefit of agriculture.

Incorporation into this Act of the Rural Industries Assistance Act is a matter of legislative housekeeping. There are no changes to the provisions of the latter Act.

The matter of consolidating all Government lending to farmers into one management is addressed in the Bill. The benefits of borrowers having to deal with only one lender are as obvious as they are considerable.

Other changes incorporated in the Bill are of a general nature. The more important of these are the formulation of the corporation's ability to hold property and to bring accounting and audit requirements into line with Government policy.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Old.

ACTS AMENDMENT (BETTING CONTROL) BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [11.13 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has one simple objective: To change the law to allow bookmakers to operate on-course from 12 noon on Anzac Day.

At present both on-course and off-course totalisators operate from 12 noon. However, the Betting Control Act and the Anzac Day Act when read together prevent bookmakers from taking bets before 1.00 p.m. on both local and Eastern States events. The Bill now before the House will amend the Betting Control Act to overcome this inequity.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bradshaw.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [11.16 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In 1983 legislation was enacted to provide that the definition of "lottery" shall not include trade promotion schemes for the disposal of property where the chance to participate in the scheme is either dependent on the purchase of goods or is given gratuitously. The Act, which amended the Criminal Code, Police Act and Lotteries (Control) Act, became operative on 22 November 1983.

It was intended that all trade promotion lotteries, irrespective of the type of premises on which they were conducted, be exempted from the definition of "lottery" in the Criminal Code. However, a recent opinion received from the Crown Law Department states that because the section of the Liquor Act which creates an offence for the conduct of lotteries on licensed premises was not amended in 1983, the common law must prevail.

The result of this interpretation of the current law is that trade promotion lotteries held on licensed premises could be illegal and the licensee subject to prosecution. It is difficult to argue that proprietors of licensed premises should be prevented from conducting trade promotion lotteries while any other business engaged in promoting the sale of goods or the use of services may do so legally.

This Bill will allow liquor licensees, if they wish, to conduct trade promotion lotteries on licensed premises.

Naturally enough, I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bradshaw.

LAND TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 28 March.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [11.20 a.m.]: This Bill proposes two things: Firstly, to reduce land tax next year and, secondly, to reduce the flat penalty applicable for the late payment of land tax. As an incident of that amendment, it also proposes to extend the period for the payment of land tax.

The legislation will be supported by the Opposition, but I point out that it is no more than a piece of window dressing and it does not really get to the heart of the current situation or the current problems. An examination of the Estimates of

Revenue for the six months to 31 December last year shows that land tax collections were \$38.8 million; to 31 December 1983, the comparable period in the preceding year, land tax collections were \$31 million.

It can be seen that, in that part of the current financial year where, in the main, land tax is collected, the increase in actual collections was of the order of over 25 per cent. That indicates to us that the problem of the over burden of land tax is in the current year and is not confined to the next financial year.

We do not yet know the outcome of the total land tax collections for 1984-85. We have no idea at this stage, nor has the Government, as to how much is likely to be collected next year.

All we know is that land tax collections are going up and up. It is an inadequate response for the Government to introduce a measure which provides a 10 per cent reduction for next year when the problem is a current one and when it is hurting business right now.

Mr Brian Burke: You did nothing for nine years, so you are pretty well-qualified to talk about it.

Mr HASSELL: We did not have the same system of collections.

Mr Brian Burke: You set the system in place. It was your tax.

Mr HASSELL: Let the Treasurer try today to be accurate, because the other day he accused me of having supported a Bill which was introduced eight years before I was a member of Parliament. Let him try to be accurate today when he is making assertions about who did what and when.

Mr Brian Burke: You set land tax rates when you were in Government and did nothing about it.

Mr Court: Hasn't he been the Treasurer for two years?

Mr HASSELL: He has been the Treasurer for over two years.

I am just making a very simple point, which is that the Government's collections of land tax in the first part of this financial year were up by more than 25 per cent over the collections in the previous corresponding period last financial year. That is a valid comparison.

However, let us take another comparison; that is, the Government's own estimates of what it will collect this year. In 1983-84—that is, last financial year—the Government estimated it would collect \$42.5 million from land tax. In fact it collected almost precisely what it estimated; that is, \$42.574 million, so that was an accurate estimate.

In the last Budget, in respect of the current financial year, the Government estimated it would collect \$51 million in land tax. In other words, at the beginning of the financial year—at the beginning of the budgetary period—the Government was estimating an increase in collections of over 20 per cent for the whole year.

We have now seen that, in practice, in respect of actual collections there has been an increase of over 25 per cent for the first half of the financial year. The Government's answer to that is to propose a reduction of 10 per cent, not this financial year but next financial year when it can be anticipated that there will be even bigger collections again.

Therefore, it can be seen that the Government is not doing anything to alleviate the fact that it is now collecting land tax which has increased by approximately five times its own estimate of the rate of inflation. That is occurring in a climate in which this Government is claiming to be concerned about business.

Mr Brian Burke: At least we did something. You had nine years and did nothing.

Mr HASSELL: The Treasurer has not done anything.

Mr Brian Burke: You have tremendous gall—

Mr HASSELL: The Treasurer is running off inaccurately at the mouth again. He should examine what was done over those nine years and he will find that he is inaccurate when he says that we did nothing.

More particularly, for how long does the Treasurer intend to ask the people of Western Australia to accept this feeble excuse that something did not happen years ago, when the Treasurer has had two years and two Budgets within which to make any changes?

The point is that here is the Treasurer presenting to Parliament a measure which he says will alleviate the problem and, when one looks at it, one sees his own measure fails his own test. There will be no alleviation of the problem with which the Bill is said to deal.

Mr Brian Burke: Well, if it is so bad, vote against it.

Mr HASSELL: The Treasurer is carrying on in a stupid way today.

Mr Brian Burke: I am sorry. Do you want me to stay in to clean the dusters afterwards?

Mr HASSELL: The Treasurer might be reminded that, if we were to vote against one of his financial measures, he would be the first to be calling a Press conference and gathering together as many media representatives as possible to at-

tack the Opposition for interfering with the Government's budgetary process. Let it be known that the Treasurer is now inviting the Opposition to oppose his tax measure.

Mr Brian Burke: I am saying that, if you don't like it, vote against it.

Mr HASSELL: The Treasurer is asking the Opposition to oppose his tax measure. I am just dealing with that tax measure. The Treasurer has recognised a problem exists in respect of land tax. I am not surprised about that. For the first half of the financial year, collections were up 25 per cent, and the Budget estimate is that they will be up by 20 per cent for the whole year. The Treasurer has acknowledged there is a problem and he has said, "I shall do something about it". He then introduces a measure which relates to next year and which will not touch the collections this year—it will not reduce them a jot. All that provision will affect is the increase in collections next year. That is an inadequate response to a problem the Treasurer acknowledges exists. If the Treasurer were out and about talking to the business people, he would ascertain how much they resent his land tax collections this year and his method of collecting land tax.

Mr Brian Burke: It is your method.

Mr HASSELL: It is the Treasurer's Bill. He is changing some of it. Why does he not change more if he does not think it is any good?

Mr Brian Burke: We have it under review, but we want to give some relief now. You had nine years.

Mr HASSELL: These problems did not exist then, or if they did we took action on them. Let the Treasurer try to be accurate in his silly statements. The fact is that the House is debating a Bill that he introduced a couple of weeks back. He is responsible for it and for what is not in it in terms of options available to him. He had the option available to him to do something about the problem that exists this financial year, but he has done nothing about it. He did not do anything this financial year and he will not do anything next financial year, because the relief he is offering relates only to the increase that will come up in the next financial year. It is an inadequate measure in its fundamental assumptions and it is inadequate in the approach it adopts in that way.

Mr Brian Burke: At least there is action. We had nine years of inaction from you.

Mr HASSELL: The Treasurer is right in this respect: His action, his Budget, will produce collections, if they are in accordance with his estimate—and it is understood they are running above his estimate—four times greater than his own esti-

mate of inflation. What he is saying to the Western Australian community on the subject of wages and other issues is that everyone should exercise restraint and should keep increases in charges to the rate of inflation while he is collecting from the community tax collections more than four times his own estimate of the rate of inflation.

That is why this measure is inadequate; that is why it does not deal with the problem at all; that is why it is merely window dressing and does not face up to the issue which has been raised from one end of the State to the other by small and large businesses, an issue caused by the continuation of a steep increase in tax collections.

The Treasurer asked a question in one of his earlier interjections about whether, during our term in office, people liked paying land tax. The answer is that people never like paying any taxes, but they will accept without complaint collections of taxation which are within a continuum and which are even within that respect. When those tax collections suddenly start to increase dramatically, people become very disturbed and unsettled.

We are talking about an increase in collections of land tax, but that is not the only area where we are seeing dramatic increases in the collection of taxes in the current financial year. Payroll tax collections have gone up by 12.8 per cent, although some of that may relate to increases in employment. Stamp duty collections have gone up by 29.6 per cent in the first six months of this financial year relative to the last financial year.

Mr Brian Burke: Building approvals have gone up by 60 per cent. Don't we charge stamp duty for new houses?

Mr HASSELL: Does the Treasurer not know that people do not have to pay stamp duty on new houses?

Mr Brian Burke: Then, on the instruments associated with them.

Mr HASSELL: The Treasurer is sadly inaccurate. I have no doubt that some of the increases in payroll tax are due to new employment, and I have no doubt that some of the increases in stamp duty collections are due to increasing numbers of transactions.

In the first six months of the current financial year, the increase in total collections of State taxes, when compared with the first six months of the last financial year, was over 27 per cent. The collections for the first six months of the last financial year amounted to \$276.8 million and it increased in the first six months of the current financial year to \$352 million.

These sorts of figures illustrate that the Government's fiddling with land tax in this Bill does not represent a genuine attempt to deal with the current problem and will not solve any problem at all. In fact, when we take into account the increases that are likely to occur in the next financial year, these reductions will undoubtedly not be noticed by anyone; they will not impact in a way that will make them be noticed.

The second thing the Bill does is to reduce the penalty for late payment of the tax, from 10 per cent to five per cent of the amount of tax payable. There have been some very unsatisfactory stories about in the current financial year concerning the impact of the application of the penalties. A number of people have come to me and other members of the Opposition expressing concern about the harsh application of penalties.

It has been pointed out to us that when they had been only one or two days late in the payment of their tax, they were hit with a 10 per cent penalty. The Confederation of Western Australian Industry has expressed concern because of the way in which the penalties were being applied. In specific cases presented to us, the penalties, if we extrapolate to an annual rate, amounted to thousands of per cent.

Mr Brian Burke: Didn't you have the same penalties in place?

Mr HASSELL: Yes, but they were not administered in the same way. The Government applied them very harshly for the first time this year.

Mr Brian Burke: You are saying that you were prepared to have penalties there but not apply them?

Mr HASSELL: There is always the question of administration in relation to penalties for taxes, as the Treasurer would know. This applies to income tax, sales tax and PAYE deductions. There has always been an exercise of discretion by the taxing authorities when they have collected penalties on late payment of taxes. There has never been an automatic application of the full penalty, as there has been by the Treasurer's department this year.

In one case a fellow came to me and explained how his company paid its accounts religiously and regularly at the end of every month. Because the land tax had come in in such a way that the account did not become due for payment so as to coincide with the end of the month, his company was a few days late in paying. As a result it received a bill for \$600 in extra taxes because it was a few days late. That represents thousands of per cent per annum as an interest rate.

The administration of the tax Act in the past year has been harsh and oppressive and the Treasurer's proposed solution is not satisfactory if the Act continues to be administered in the same way. The Government does not intend to apply the usual discretions and allow the commissioner to take into account the normal bona fide explanations that people give for the late payment of tax—it matters in amount, but it matters not in principle if a five or 10 per cent penalty is applied, if it is applied as rigorously as the Government has done in the past year.

If a person has a taxation bill for \$10 000 and pays it a day late and pays a five per cent penalty on that \$10 000 as a result of payment being one day late, that person will still have paid hundreds and hundreds of per cent per annum interest on the tax that he has paid late.

A better system in this case would be to restructure the penalty system to provide for a per annum rate of penalty. That rate may be quite high, for instance, 20 per cent. I think that is the order of rate used in the Income Tax Assessment Act and other State legislation. It is a very high percentage because obviously the Government wants to discourage taxpayers from holding back on their taxes, using the assumption that the late payment is cheaper than paying interest elsewhere. What is wrong with this assumption is that the penalty remains a penalty. The Treasurer should review the structure of the penalty rather than simply review the rate because it has not worked in practice. The situation could arise where a person is a year late and only pays five per cent penalty and gets away with it, whereas a person who is a day late and pays five per cent is harshly treated. The only way to even out that situation is to perhaps have a reasonable fixed penalty, if need be, for late payments, and a percentage rate in relation to the non-payment.

That area of the Bill warrants the Treasurer's reconsideration, if not on this occasion at least on another occasion, and in the meantime I urge the Treasurer to have his department resume the former practices that were applied in relation to the collection of State taxes, which is to exercise the usual discretions which are applied by every tax authority in relation to late payments.

The third aspect of the Bill is that the period for the payment of tax is extended from 30 days to 45 days, and that is a reasonable measure; in fact, it is a good measure. It has our full support, without question. The Treasurer needs to look at the figures and the full extent of the collections of land tax which are likely to be made in the current financial year because they are running way above budget, so the problem is not a 20 per cent prob-

lem but a problem significantly greater than 20 per cent, if that is the case.

The Opposition will support the Bill. It is a taxing measure and it has not been our practice to oppose the Government's taxing measures even when we disagree with them very strongly. Obviously we will not oppose a Bill which gives a measure of relief in the next financial year from a charge of taxation which would otherwise be made, but I do not think the Treasurer is entitled to claim credit for having done something about the land tax problem when the problem exists starkly, sharply and dramatically in the current financial year and the measure before us does nothing about it. The problem, of course, will continue into the next financial year and nothing will be done about it. The reduction will apply to other increases that might have been made.

With those clear reservations about the effectiveness of the measure, I indicate that the Opposition will not oppose its passage through the House.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [11.45 a.m.]: I have in the past commented on virtually every occasion on land tax Bills and it would not be appropriate if I let this opportunity pass without again making some comments. These provisions are an almost typical example of the proverbial criticism "too little too late".

Mr Brian Burke: Could I just interrupt you to ask you something? You may be prepared to address it. In the second reading speech I indicated that we could not complete the review in time, so we are trying to do something to put in place—

Mr MENSAROS: Listen to me. I will come to that.

Mr Brian Burke: The Leader of the Opposition didn't acknowledge it. I do not think he was here for the second reading.

Mr MENSAROS: I say that because undoubtedly, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it is factual; it only gives back or returns to the taxpayer a varying percentage of the windfall gain which the Government will make on land tax because of the increased values which have accrued on property during the last few years. According to the estimates this windfall might be only a 20 per cent increase, but according to the actual figures it will probably be 30 per cent or more, so therefore the Government will be a beneficiary of this windfall profit to the tune of 20 per cent, if the estimates are correct, but, much more likely, to the tune of 25 or 30 per cent.

The Treasurer said that he mentioned in the second reading speech—no doubt it was also mentioned in news releases because of newspaper articles on this matter—that this is an interim

measure which will be followed by some sort of reform of the tax.

The Treasurer also said by way of interjection on the Leader of the Opposition's comments that his excuse for not doing this before now was because we were in Government for nine years and did not institute this type of reform. This, of course, is a recurring comment by any comparatively newly-elected Government, and I do not think it merits a reply; but if it does, I simply tell the Treasurer that if this is the principle upon which he governs, let us immediately abolish the Western Australian Development Corporation because we have not done anything about it for nine years. I do not think that principle really stands up.

Mr Brian Burke: I did not raise it initially. The Leader of the Opposition was raising a criticism.

Mr MENSAROS: The Treasurer raised it by interjection.

Mr Brian Burke: I responded to the criticism.

Mr MENSAROS: The Treasurer says there will be far-reaching reforms and I would like to use this opportunity to remind him what sort of reforms could be made.

Land tax is one of the most discriminatory taxes existing in the arsenal of taxes in this State. It is a wealth tax which applies to land, but it is really a tax on the personal wealth of the taxpayer because he happens to own land. If a person could own an equivalent amount of capital in cash assets, jewellery, or shares, he would not pay anything at all. If he is in business he does not pay in this way and so far he does not even pay to the Commonwealth.

Mr Brian Burke: Unless it is a capital gains tax. You are right.

Mr MENSAROS: We do not have a capital gains tax. It is an incentive for business because many people cannot just reap the profit during the ongoing exercise of their business activities. They really reap the profit only when they are able to sell the business and can use the capital gain profits for future years or repay the capital they borrowed to keep the business afloat. That is my first comment: It is a wealth tax which discriminates against land as opposed to other assets.

That discrimination goes further in that it discriminates against the more prosperous taxpayer because the tax is levied on a progressive scale. For that reason it is not taxing the land, as I have often said, but taxing the individual landowner. If the same land were in the possession or property of someone who has more land it would attract a

higher percentage of land tax than if it were in the possession of someone who owned only that land.

Mr Brian Burke: You mean more valuable land, not more land?

Mr MENSAROS: I said more land. If one has only one parcel of land and the value of that land is in the minimum category, one pays the minimum rate.

Mr Brian Burke: But if you have two parcels in the minimum category—

Mr MENSAROS: Yes. I think we understand each other. If a person has more land or a parcel of land of greater value it amounts to the same thing. He pays a penalty on the scale. Therefore the owner is taxed and not the land because if the land were taxed it would attract the same rate of tax after every transfer and change of ownership and occupancy. The land attracts local government rates which do not change according to ownership. Those rates are a burden on the land itself.

The other discrimination which could be the subject of reform is that land tax presently is against private enterprise, because developers have to pay land tax. Those who are producing land in the interest of the community—and I think every Government is very keen that the required amount of residential land should be made available—are in a different situation from members of the public who are owner-occupiers and who will not pay land tax when they live on the property. Developers are discriminated against by comparison with the Urban Lands Council, the State Housing Commission and other Government or semi-Government agencies which are not subject to land tax but are in direct competition with private enterprise in the land development process.

As long as this Government is in power I imagine the mythical Western Australian Development Corporation which is a jack-of-all-trades and understands everything and is an adviser in all fields, will start a business in land development which will not be subject to land tax either.

Mr Brian Burke: You normally argue more intelligently than that, and you do not refer to things as "mythical"; you do yourself a disservice.

Mr MENSAROS: I do not mind the Treasurer's interjections. He usually complains about the Opposition's arguments when his own arguments are weak.

This discrimination should be looked at because there are some taxes in force today as they were during the nine years of the previous Government and the three years of the Government before that which do not discriminate in this way; for instance, payroll tax. It is an equally bad tax but it is

payable by Government instrumentalities and departments in the same way as it is by private enterprise, despite the fact that it could be claimed the money is going from one pocket to the other. I think that is right because it does not directly affect private enterprise's ability to compete with those arms of Government through its paying payroll tax and the Government bodies being exempt. That having been acknowledged, the same principle should apply to land tax.

One could be asked what sort of solutions one might offer. The other day the Leader of the House attacked me because he claimed I did not understand the right of dissent in some way. That seemed strange to me but he thought it was because my origins are somewhere in the middle of Europe. I know very well the meaning of dissent; had I not, I would not be here today. I emphasise that I personally believe—it may not be Liberal Party policy—that land tax should be abolished.

It has served its purpose. If one looks at its history one sees it was introduced purely to get land developed and onto the market for residential purposes because land in what are now suburbs was under the control of large landowners.

Mr Brian Burke: The Government firmly believes all taxes should be abolished. That is easy to say. What will you substitute for it or cut out?

Mr MENSAROS: Those land-holders were not prepared to subdivide their land and make it available for residential purposes. As a result land tax was introduced as a disincentive to keep the land. That need has disappeared, therefore the original justification for land tax has disappeared. It remains only as a revenue-raising device.

The Treasurer has argued by way of interjection that we cannot get rid of land tax because it is a revenue-raising matter, although one could digress to argue—and I will not do so now—that the only way is to reduce Government services.

Mr Brian Burke: We are trying very hard to do that.

Mr MENSAROS: That is the difference between large and small Government and the two sides of the House.

The second preference is that land tax should not be a wealth tax but should be imposed at a flat rate, possibly in several ways—on non-residential land only; on all land, including residential land; or, at a flat rate as a wealth tax on all assets, if that is constitutionally possible. If any Government were to choose the third solution the revenue required would probably be raised by a fraction of a percentage of the value of assets.

Mr Brian Burke: Can I get this straight: When you say "all assets" let us say you are speaking of property assets, so we would have a tax on all property across the community?

Mr MENSAROS: I have practised law in countries which imposed a wealth tax on all assets—not only land—of individuals. It was always criticised because it was not levied on the income but on the wealth itself, although that wealth may not have produced income. However, because it was a revenue-raising exercise the percentage levied was very small at the time, in my recollection.

Mr Brian Burke: I understand. I wanted to get it to a practical application.

Mr MENSAROS: That is one of the ways of doing it. If land tax were retained as it is at present and touched the same properties as it now does—in other words, the owner-occupier and rural properties would not be liable—one could calculate a flat rate to raise the same amount of revenue. I asked the Treasurer a question about this about a year ago. At the time he said the figure would be 2.3 per cent. That may or may not have altered since because values have gone up, as has the collection. It may be the flat rate percentage to be levied now would be the same as that given in the answer. I appreciated the answer although it does not need much research to work it out. It can be calculated from the number of land tax payers and the aggregate value of land which is subject to land tax.

Having said that, I again express my opposition to land tax as it presently exists.

I want now to touch briefly on the 10 per cent interest rate for late payment as dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition. I will consider it from another aspect. I cannot find, in the Land Tax Assessment Act, any provision allowing for a 10 per cent penalty being imposed more than once on anyone who has submitted their land tax a day after the period allowed for payment. It could happen—I stand to be corrected by the Treasurer who might know better—that a taxpayer who has not paid his tax in the period allowed may decide not to pay it until the end of that year. He may decide because he is being penalised at a rate of 10 per cent for paying it a day later, that there are better ways for him to employ his money and so decide to pay it at the end of the year. Maybe the State Taxation Department could sue him for the outstanding amount. However, I do not think that would get the money into the department any quicker.

From a practical point of view I think this is an annoying and childish provision. I have personally

been subjected to a penalty of 10 per cent for being two days late with my payment. I appealed against the assessment but, as it turned out, I was wrong because, as I owned a strata titled property, I was not entitled, as the management of the strata title would have been entitled, to argue against the value of the property. I could not argue against a valuation on behalf of one property involved in a strata titled property.

If the penalty rate is applied strictly, as it has been, apparently—it has been imposed only in the second year of this Government's term of office—taxpayers might receive advice to withhold their payment until the end of the year and employ their money in better ways. They will still have to pay only a 10 per cent penalty whereas, if their money were invested wisely, they could obtain interest rates of about 16 per cent.

For that reason, consideration should be given to charging a penalty on a monthly basis. Interest rates on Bankcard are charged at a monthly rate of 1.5 per cent being the monthly part of the total yearly interest rate of 18 per cent on outstanding amounts. The banks do not charge the full 18 per cent on the overdue payments for the first month.

As was stated by the Leader of the Opposition, we do not oppose this Bill, but we have voiced our concerns about it.

MR COURT (Nedlands) [12.03 p.m.]: I was interested to hear the comments of my learned colleague, the member for Floreat, on this issue of land tax. I wish to make a brief contribution to this debate. I have received many complaints from people, both within my electorate and from other parts of town, about land tax assessments which they have received this year. There have been massive increases in certain areas. I suppose the most vocal groups have been those from my electorate and from people living within the area of the Perth City Council. There have been large increases in land valuations with subsequent increases in land tax assessments.

The member for Floreat has highlighted the very real problems which exist with land tax in its current form. If it has outlived its purpose in its current form we should get rid of it. However, that would be complicated and would involve some pretty tough decisions. The Treasurer should understand that we realise that a review of the Land Tax Assessment Act would be a demanding job. Several attempts have been undertaken in the past which have highlighted some very real problems associated with land tax. The Treasurer was very quick to introduce another very complicated form of tax, the financial institutions duty. I do not think he can keep using the arguments that

these forms of taxes are under review. Changes will have to be made and it is important, particularly in this case, that those changes be made quickly.

There is no doubt that the Treasurer is embarrassed with the amount of land tax collections this year. In the Budget which he introduced into this House, there will be massive increases in land tax collections. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Government had budgeted to collect \$51 million this year. However, current estimates are that the Government will collect around \$60 million from land tax.

The Bill before us is what I would call a "reactive" measure because of some of the very harsh criticism being made against the Premier. He has received many complaints, in his capacity as Treasurer, about assessments this year. No doubt he has spoken to many deputations made to him about this problem and has received mail as I have received mail in my electorate. Many people have written to me expressing their concerns and the positions that they have been put into. It strikes me as being a little funny that the Budget allowed for a collection of \$51 million, but the Government could well collect \$60 million. That is too great a discrepancy. It is too large a windfall without anyone knowing about it. I think that the Treasurer and his staff should be in a position to have more accurate assessments of what the collections are likely to be, just as I think the Minister for Health, at question time the other day, could have given us more accurate costs for the introduction of the 38-hour week for nurses. He could not give us an answer.

Mr Hodge: I gave an approximate answer. I said I was not able to give a precise answer.

Mr COURT: I think there should be precise figures.

Mr Hodge: That shows your ignorance and lack of experience.

Mr COURT: It does not. It is normal commercial practice, when one is making such important economic decisions, to know what the costs will be, not only for this year, but for the next few years.

Mr Hodge: Did you not listen? I explained that there were so many intangibles that I could not predict a precise amount. However, I gave the best estimate.

Mr COURT: It is an economic decision which involves many costs. I think we have a right to know what the costs will be, both this year and further down the track.

Mr Hodge: As soon as we know, we will let you know.

Mr COURT: But the decision has been made.

Mr Hodge: How can you force people to tell you which nurses will have accommodation, which people will buy and eat meals, and which people are going to park at hospitals? Those are the intangibles.

Mr COURT: The Minister could still make a more accurate assessment. Other similar groups have gone onto new systems.

Mr Hodge: The same system does not exist in Western Australia. This is a unique situation.

Mr COURT: I do not want to get bogged down on health matters because we are debating land tax.

It seems strange that there will be such a discrepancy in land tax collections this year. Last year the estimates and receipts were very much as were budgeted for, but this year there will be a big increase.

The Treasurer, in his second reading speech, said that it was estimated that the proposed concessions would benefit over 100 land taxpayers and would cost about \$7 million; \$6 million for land tax, and \$1 million for the improvement tax. Those figures are for the next financial year, 1985-86, because, as the Leader of the Opposition said, figures do not change in that year. I am concerned because that \$7 million is 10 per cent of the total amount, which means that the Government's collections next year will be approximately \$70 million from land tax. People will not have their problems solved next year because of a 10 per cent cut. There will be another increase next year and they will be paying high rates of land tax again.

Mr Brian Burke: You have some obligation to be reasonably fair about this. The review may well result in the most dramatic change in the Act that has ever been effected in this State. You cannot presume that the review will not result in any change, as you are doing.

Mr COURT: I understand that, and I appreciate it. At the beginning of my speech I said that the review would be a difficult process and that I fully understood that. What the Treasurer is saying is that if there are to be major changes, and this takes into account the 1985 and 1986 financial years, it may not be necessary.

Mr Brian Burke: We had to introduce this measure because assessments date from June this year and we could not carry out a review in time. The review may be something along the lines the member for Floreat spoke of.

Mr COURT: The point I am making, and I am sure the Treasurer agrees, is that next year with a

10 per cent cut there will be an increase in land tax collections.

Mr Brian Burke: That is not certain. You are talking about the 10 per cent being 10 per cent of next year. The 10 per cent is part of the \$6 million you were talking about next year. There may not be the same escalation and the \$6 million may be 12 per cent of next year's collection.

Mr COURT: It will be interesting to see what the assessments will be next year.

Mr Brian Burke: It was the central city area this time.

Mr COURT: The massive discrepancy in the Budget figures this year is a little hard to understand. However, there will be a burden placed on those concerned next year and that burden has already been placed on them this year.

The Leader of the Opposition made a very good point: When we are all asking for restraint one need only look at the income and expenditure estimates for the first six months of this year to realise how frightening it is when one sees the massive increases in the different taxes being collected. When the Government is asking the community, particularly the business community, to show restraint in what they are charging, it must realise that severe economic problems are imminent. These problems have already commenced and one particular problem about which we have read a great deal lately concerns the devaluation of the Australian dollar. We are being told that the reason for the devaluation of the Australian dollar is that overseas countries do not like the way the Australian Governments are spending—they do not like the Australian economy or the management of our economy.

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: If Government members had bothered to read *The Australian* this morning they would have seen—

Mr Brian Burke: I did, and it mentioned the current account deficits.

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: Perhaps the Treasurer will tell the House the reason that there has been a dramatic decline in the Western Australian economy in the last few months.

Mr Parker: Firstly, it is good for Western Australia, and secondly, the current account deficit problem is because we are importing more goods than we need. The floating of the dollar was a decision made by the Commonwealth Government and there is a mechanism within it to correct that situation.

Mr COURT: This week in *The Australian Financial Review* and *The Australian* the point the Minister for Minerals and Energy has made was highlighted. The other point that was highlighted related to excessive Government spending.

Mr Parker: You have only to look at the United States dollar to see if there is any truth in that. The United States is spending more every day and its deficit is strengthening.

Mr COURT: If the Minister wants to talk about the United States deficit he will have to talk in percentages.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is a long way from talking about land tax.

Mr COURT: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. Coming back to the question of land tax the concern I expressed initially is that the situation is hard financially for a number of businesses and individuals this year, and the Treasurer is aware of it.

One case to which I will refer concerns a doctor who is paying land tax on a house which he uses as his surgery. The increases he has had in regard to charges on that property, not only land tax, but also council, sewerage, and water rates, have been so great that he has had no alternative but to dispense with the services of a part-time assistant. This is where the accumulated effect of increases in taxes and charges hurts the businessman. It will be difficult for changes to be made to land tax, but this measure is a bandaid approach and the Treasurer should realise that.

I will briefly comment on the penalties. I think the Treasurer would admit that the penalties have been administered harshly this year and a lot of people have been caught out as a result of payments they made shortly after they were due. The comments made by the Leader of the Opposition are valid in this regard.

The part of the Bill which extends the payment of land tax from 30 days to 45 days from receipt of the account is, I believe, a practical measure, particularly when it is becoming more and more difficult for people to pay tax, and often they have to make financial arrangements to meet land tax and other taxes.

I urge the Treasurer to consider the question of land tax because major changes are required. I hope he will keep an open mind if there is to be a considerable increase in the land tax take next year, and that if that is the case a short-term measure is required. It will need to be a measure along the lines that the total increase is in part equal to inflation instead of being four or five times greater than inflation as has been experienced this year.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balga—Treasurer) [12.18 p.m.]: I want to briefly reply to the points made by Opposition speakers and in so doing to demonstrate clearly to the House that the fundamental premise on which all the arguments the Opposition uses is based, is simply a premise that thrusts back into the Opposition's face its own protestations about Government expenditure and about the need to curb Government extravagance.

The figures I will relay to the House will not be of much interest in the public arena but they demonstrate conclusively that a succession of Liberal Governments that governed this State were big-taxing and big-spending Governments which laid the foundations, not only for the sorts of problems we are now experiencing in respect of land tax, but also for the problems people have in attempting to address the size of Government expenditure.

Let me inform the House of the following facts: If one looks at the rate of growth of Government revenue as a proportion of the State's GDP in the two years of the Labor Government's term in office—that is, 1983-84 and 1984-85—one will see the total Government revenue as a proportion of GDP has declined at an average annual rate of 0.3 per cent. Look at the nine previous years when the Court and O'Connor Governments were in office. In those years Government revenue *per capita* increased as a proportion of GDP *per capita* at an average annual rate of 2.4 per cent. That is the first measure to consider when one looks at the underlying problems that affect the tax we are addressing today. Land tax and the increases in that tax rose dramatically in the nine years the Liberal Government was in office.

Mr Hassell: Did you extend that to Argyle?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We did not make that sort of mistake.

Mr Hassell: That is the revenue you quoted in advance.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will get onto the subject of taxation revenue shortly. We are talking about Government revenue. If we included Argyle in the Government revenue it would make the figures look better for the Government—as the Leader of the Opposition now realises—because the Government revenue has decreased as a proportion of GDP by 0.3 per cent during our term in office and during the period of the previous Government it increased by 2.4 per cent.

I now compare the expenditure performances of the respective Governments. During the nine years of the Court and O'Connor Governments, real Government recurrent expenditure increased by an average of 6.9 per cent each year. In 1983-84, real Government expenditure under the present

Labor Government increased by 3.8 per cent, slightly more than half the average increase of the previous nine years. In 1984-85, real Government expenditure is estimated to increase by less than two per cent compared with the 6.9 per cent annual average increase of the previous Government. So in terms of expenditure the present Government is more restrictive and prudent than were its predecessors. The Opposition cannot argue with those statistics. It cannot say that Government expenditure is somehow or other not related to taxes or other revenues that are raised.

If we look at Government revenues as a proportion of GDP, we see that the performance of the present Government easily outstrips that of its predecessors. As I said, real Government expenditure under our predecessors increased by 6.9 per cent as compared with an increase of 3.8 per cent in our first year of office and two per cent in our second year of office. If we look at the Consolidated Revenue Fund, we see that real expenditure as a proportion of real GDP has fallen by 1.3 per cent over the first two years of the present Government. In the nine years of the Court and O'Connor Governments real CRF expenditure as a proportion of real GDP increased by 23.6 per cent. So in terms of revenue-raising across the board, and in terms of expenditure, the present Government's performance easily outstrips its predecessor's.

If we move more precisely to an examination of the CRF, we see once again that as a proportion of GDP the present Government's performance in terms of CRF expenditure easily outstrips that of its predecessors. These are the underlying premises on which the Opposition so often raises its point about Government expenditure. The truth is that statistics show that the previous Governments, by comparison with the present Government, were big spending, big-taxing, profligate Governments. It cannot be denied that the premises on which the arguments used by the Opposition were based come down very heavily in favour of the present Government.

I turn now to the other side of the ledger, leaving to one side expenditure and revenue. Accepting that the statistics show that the performance of the present Government is better than its predecessor's in those areas, if we look at the underlying recovery we can find the explanation so blithely dismissed by the Leader of the Opposition for the increase in absolute terms in revenue raised. It should be remembered that the revenue raised, as a proportion of GDP, is falling. But we should also consider the underlying premises on the positive side of the equation and consider this: real GDP during the years of the O'Connor/Court

Governments increased at an average annual rate of 2.1 per cent; that is, there was an average net real increase of 2.1 per cent in the gross domestic product. In 1983-84, under the present Government, that increase in real GDP was 5.3 per cent. The increase in real GDP was more than twice as high under this Government than under our predecessors. In 1984-85 it is predicted that real GDP will increase in the order of four-plus per cent. Thus the present Government has been more prudent and more restricted in its profligate tendencies than its predecessors, not only in revenue and expenditure terms, but also in more precise CRF expenditure terms.

In the two years of the present Government, figures show that the economy has expanded to a remarkably greater extent than under its predecessors. The statistics show that the previous Government was much bigger in its spending and taxing policies. It was certainly not as successful either in making sure that the economic base of the State expanded, so that even if rates of tax fell, as they did in respect of payroll tax, the amount of revenue could be equal to or surpass that previously raised. That is what this Government has achieved.

I want to answer one or two specific points. The Leader of the Opposition conveniently ignored the fact that we undertook the most far-ranging review of the land tax system ever undertaken by any Government. We have underlined that commitment by saying that that review, mainly because of the private sector's wanting to make submissions, cannot be concluded in time to give relief as from the end of this financial year, so we will provide immediate relief. The immediate relief will be a 10 per cent reduction in land tax payable, and in metropolitan region improvement tax payable. The relief will also extend to a reduction in penalties in terms of percentage and an extension of time to pay.

The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Nedlands dismiss that as being a bandaid approach. What do they want us to do? We could easily have done what they had a proclivity to do; that was, simply to say that we would review the matter and do something about it next year. But we did not do that; we immediately provided relief at the expense of the public purse only to be greeted worthlessly with this charge that it is bandaid relief. The truth is that we could not complete the review in time. The member for Nedlands acknowledged that it would be almost impossible to complete the review in time. So we have provided immediate relief for which we have been roundly criticised by the Opposition.

Mr Court: Can you tell us when that review will be completed?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We hope to complete the review so that we can put in place the new structure from the end of the next tax period. The 10 per cent reduction applies to the 1985-86 year because we cannot complete the review by 30 June. The review will be completed to apply from 30 June 1986 so that there will not be the gap in which we return to those levels of collections the member for Nedlands talked about. For that we have been roundly criticised. With the Opposition's forbearance I will finish quickly on this matter.

I make one or two other general points. First, if members look through the revenue-raising efforts of this Government, they will see that we have set the pace throughout the country in containing taxes and charges as they affect business and families. Other States have inquired of the present State Government in Western Australia about the way in which we have been able to contain taxes and charges. The Opposition cannot gainsay the fact that for the first time in this State's history the general rate of payroll tax was reduced by this State Government so that we now have a situation in which the payroll tax rate in New South Wales and Victoria is six per cent and in this State 4.75 per cent. The Opposition cannot gainsay the fact that in terms of exemptions this Government's performance in the last Budget was the most startling to have been turned in by any State Government. It cannot gainsay the fact that generally the business community knows that the last Budget was not a pre-election Budget but one twice removed from an election. The present State Government grasped the nettle and decided to introduce tax reforms and tax reductions that were roundly welcomed by the business community. The Opposition also cannot gainsay the fact that, unlike any of our predecessors, we have attempted to curb our expenditure in ways that the Opposition was never courageous enough even to contemplate.

Opposition members should read this morning's paper. They should read about the reorganisation of the Public Works Department. It has been moaning about the reorganisation. It should give some credit to the Government for the fact that over five years taxpayers of this State will be saved more than \$50 million. The Opposition cannot have it every way. It is politically convenient to criticise while at the same time paying no tribute to the savings made. We have made hard decisions and restrained expenditure. The statistics bear that out. We have done it in a way that no pre-

vious Government in this State has ever contemplated.

I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Sitting suspended from 12.32 to 2.15 p.m.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balga—Treasurer) [2.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [2.18 p.m.]: It would not be proper if I did not take this opportunity to briefly respond to the Treasurer's remarks, particularly those made at the beginning of his reply to the second reading debate, which I can only describe as interesting economic gymnastics. I can imagine the Treasurer going to his Under Treasurer and asking him to supply a set of statistics which would prove that the Labor Government is a better Government than its predecessors, and that under this Government the economy has flourished and people are better off than they were previously. I can further imagine that the Under Treasurer, having given the task to a young graduate of economics employed in the Treasury, came up with this reply.

This type of comparison cannot be called in any pragmatic economic language anything but an economic somersault because the gross domestic product—referring to the State and not the nation—is the statistical figure being computed and arrived at much later. Even if the figures are correct—I did not have the time to check them and I credit the Treasurer with having quoted correct figures—it would not be a proper comparison to measure the economic growth by comparing both sides of the Consolidated Revenue Budget; that is both the revenue and the expenditure with the gross domestic product figure as it relates to the same period. The best proof for this is if I were to ask the Treasurer if, during his two years' experience of framing Budgets, he had framed a Budget by calling on the GDP figures and planning the revenue and the expenditure sides of the Budget according to the GDP figures. I will bet

the answer would be "No". He has never talked about this and neither have his predecessors.

These are simply statistics which seem to prove that there is better management under this Government than there was under the previous Government. However, this question is decided by a survey, both personal and institutional, of the economic happenings.

I do not think anyone would say that in the nine years of the Court and O'Connor Governments—no matter what figures were quoted—there was no development, people did not have better conditions in terms of raising their standard of living, and they were not satisfied, particularly during the first years of that Government.

Quoting these figures does not give a proper picture if the Treasurer's aim—and he said it was his aim—is to show which Government has framed its Budget better and dealt with the economy in the best interests of the people.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balga—Treasurer) [2.21 p.m.]: I thank the member for Floreat for his further contribution to this debate and take the opportunity to gently remind him that whether or not Treasurers frame Budgets on the basis of past or predicted expansion in the GDP, the truth that is objectively assessable clearly shows that in the nine years of the Court and O'Connor Governments the average expansion in the GDP in this State was something slightly in excess of two per cent.

In the first year of the present Government's period in office the expansion in the gross domestic product, as calculated on the same basis as in the previous nine years, was in excess of five per cent. One cannot argue about that; that is simply the truth.

What one can argue about is the coincidence of favourable factors or influences, some of which one might maintain are outside the control or credit of the present Government. One might argue these have caused this expansion in the gross domestic product.

So one cannot argue with the fact there has been a dramatic recovery in terms of the real GDP in the first year in particular, and in the second year too of the present Government's period in office. The predicted expansion of the real GDP in the second year of the present Government's period in office is in excess of four per cent. However, taking the good with the bad during the previous nine years, the equivalent real GDP expansion is slightly in excess of 2.1 per cent per annum. There is simply no argument about the fact that during the present Government's two

years in office the economy has recovered and there has been a much more significant expansion in the GDP than there was during the previous nine years.

That is simply a fact of life. What one may argue about if one likes is whether the Government should rightly take the credit for what has come to pass. One cannot deny the fact that the GDP has expanded. What I said during the second reading reply to this debate was that in all of those years from which members opposite draw strength for their arguments about the need to restrict government, the statistics clearly show that when in Government the present Opposition did not practise what it now preaches. In terms of Government revenue as a proportion of the GDP, its performance was woeful compared with the performance of the present Government in terms of Government expenditure.

In terms of recurrent expenditure, taking a much more precise look at the way in which Governments spend money in the areas most directly within their control, the performance during the nine years of the Court and O'Connor Governments indicates a worse return than the performance in the first two years of the present Government.

Marrying those two things together, all I was attempting to illustrate was if, in terms of revenue and expenditure, we can be charged with being profligate, the Opposition was much more guilty of that charge. We must look to an expansion in the economy for an increase in the taxation about which members opposite complain.

Although the Leader of the Opposition takes a nice point about the new home approvals, or new houses not attracting stamp duty, the truth is that there has been a dramatic recovery in the building industry. Stamp duties have risen dramatically, even though this Government abolished some stamp duties.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not attempting to address the member for Darling Range because I do not want to waste my time on a warm afternoon.

Mr Williams: Come on!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Why do members not listen? They may learn something interesting. There has been a dramatic improvement in the building industry; approvals have escalated dramatically. That should be a cause for some satisfaction in the Opposition ranks, because every house which is started means jobs are created, so members opposite should not complain about the upturn in the building industry. It is helping their

fellow Western Australians to find jobs and to earn incomes.

At the same time, as a matter of course, because more homes are being approved or built—

Mr Spriggs interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am happy to tell the member about anything which might lift his understanding of the situation, but I fear it would take too long to make a dent in that veil. I am happy to go through all those points.

Let me repeat that even with lower rates of taxation, if the economy improves, one may collect more revenue. As I said to the member for Mt. Lawley, when he launched off after his maiden speech with the diatribe about the amount of money being collected, if 30 people pay \$10 a year tax, the result is revenue of \$300. If 60 people pay \$5 tax one has the same result. Everyone is better off paying less tax. The Opposition may think something is seriously amiss because one is collecting the same revenue, but that is a natural corollary of the economic recovery and the Opposition should be pleased about that.

Payroll tax collections are increased when more people have jobs. If anyone is paying payroll tax for the member interjecting, it is under false pretences; one must be gainfully employed. Payroll tax collections increase when the number of jobless falls. That should afford some quiet joy to the people on the other side of the House, because there has been a significant reduction in unemployment during the period of the present Government's term in office.

Mr Williams: Payroll tax increases and wages increase payroll tax. Do you not understand that?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: My understanding is there has been an increase of 2.6 per cent awarded in wages. There had not been an increase for 12 months prior to that, had there?

Mr Williams: You should answer that, you are the Treasurer.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The answer is "no", but I thought the member might know that.

The point is that if the economy is to recover and expand, there will be a natural growth in receipts. As far as this measure is concerned, we have announced previously that we intend to review land tax generally. This measure is a preliminary one, because the review, as has been acknowledged by the Opposition, cannot realistically be completed in time to give relief before the next land tax period is upon us. On that basis, the Government should be applauded for taking action.

Underlying the whole matter—members opposite should not run away from this—is the fact that, in nine years of successive conservative Governments, the Liberal Party lost the support of business, because it proved to be a big spender and a big taxpayer.

How many times have members heard the criticism that Liberal Governments are more socialist or are bigger spenders than Labor Governments? Such comments are abroad all the time in the business community. Right across the range of taxes and charges we have outperformed and have lessened the burden on families to a far greater extent than has a succession of lacklustre and unimaginative conservative Governments.

Here is another example: Observing a problem, the Government has acted swiftly to introduce a review, and it has done so in the best manner possible by drafting this Bill as an interim measure which will provide a 10 per cent reduction in land tax as well as in metropolitan region improvement tax, which together will cost approximately \$7 million. It also provides an extension of time within which people must pay land tax.

We have acted quickly to ensure that a full-scale review of the land tax system takes place. During the period in which that review is proceeding, this temporary relief will be provided. The review will make startling changes to the land tax system.

Mr Spriggs interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Darling Range can rattle on; but he had nine years to do something about the matter. What was he doing for those nine years? Was he sitting on his hands? A problem such as this does not sneak up on one in 18 months. Complaints about land tax have been made for years and years and what did a succession of Liberal Governments do about them? They did nothing.

If this is a bandaid measure, it is clear the Liberal Party when in Government did not even put Mercurochrome on the problem; but members opposite have the gall to criticise the action this Government is taking after nine years during which they were stultified and incapable of acting. Therefore, it is a bit raw to encounter this sort of criticism from people who were prepared interminably to do nothing about a problem on which we have acted within 18 months or so. It is clear that the credibility of the critic depends on the critic's own performance. In this case it has been woeful and that is borne out by looking at the nine years of inactivity during which the Liberal Party was in office.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY ACT (REVIVAL OF SECTION 76) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 28 March.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [2.33 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this measure. It has been introduced to correct an anomalous situation which we predicted would arise when the legislation was first introduced and which we sought to have rectified at a later stage when the Government conceded that it should not be taxing charities as it was. All of that is behind us and the legislation seeks to facilitate the final sorting out of the problem. We support the Bill accordingly.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balga—Treasurer) [2.34 p.m.]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Brian Burke (Treasurer), and passed.

RACE MEETINGS (TWO-UP GAMING) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 3 April.

MR BRADSHAW (Murray-Wellington) [2.39 p.m.]: I support the Bill. At this stage my party has not had the opportunity to consider the Bill as a whole, therefore there will be a free vote on this side of the House.

The Government has for some reason decided to rush this Bill through at the last moment after having had two years in which to prepare it. Nevertheless I do support the Bill.

Mr Brian Burke: Whenever we do anything you say it should have happened a long time before, but a long time before you were in a position to do something about it, but didn't.

Mr BRADSHAW: I was not here then. Nevertheless the main point is that I support the measure.

The legislation is here as a result of recommendations by the Mossenson inquiry into gambling in WA. The legalising of two-up in the areas outlined in the Bill will merely legalise a practice that has taken place for many years among the racing fraternity in towns such as Leonora and Carnarvon. The game does not seem to be played to a great extent in less remote areas.

The Bill should not be a cause of worry to people who do not want to see the State encumbered with other forms of legalised gambling, because the Bill is limiting to a large extent in that it allows the game of two-up in these outer areas to be conducted only after race meetings. The clubs concerned do not hold more than three or four meetings a year; unlike the race clubs closer to Perth, they do not hold meetings weekly or monthly. We will not see a lot of legalised two-up being forced on the people of WA.

One effect of this measure is that it will help tourism. Two-up has been our national gambling game for many years, although it has been limited because it was illegal. Now that its playing is to be legalised in a few more areas, it will provide something of an added tourist attraction in those areas. The game has been legalised for a couple of years in Kalgoorlie and it has always attracted a lot of tourists to the town. Many people have heard about it and have gone along to see what it was all about. Now that some additional country racing and trotting clubs more than 200 kilometres from the casino site in Perth will be able to conduct two-up games after their meetings, an additional tourist attraction will be provided.

An interesting point about the 200-kilometre limit from the casino is that it is an indication that the Government is prepared to go out of its way to try to prop up the casino in any way it can. I have reservations about the 200-kilometre boundary.

Mr Read: How would this prop up the casino?

Mr BRADSHAW: The Government seems frightened that if two-up could legally be played closer to Perth, perhaps at places such as Bunbury, Collie and Pinjarra, people would be prepared to go there rather than to the casino, because these outer area race clubs would provide a better atmosphere in which to play the game. People are more interested in attending two-up games held at country race tracks out in the open rather than in the posh surroundings of a casino.

Collie is a traditional mining town where the people have been playing two-up for years, even though it has been illegal.

Mr Gordon Hill: They don't play it there.

Mr BRADSHAW: I have been led to believe that two-up does take place in Collie.

Mr Gordon Hill: I lived in Collie for 17 years and I never saw the game played.

Mr BRADSHAW: The member must have gone around with his eyes closed.

The 200-kilometre radius within which the game cannot be played is a little unfair. The racing and trotting clubs within the 200-kilometre area are not impressed with the fact that their fellow clubs outside the area are to be allowed to conduct two-up games after race meetings while they are to be excluded in order to prop up the casino. The clubs that will be able to conduct two-up games will benefit.

They do not usually conduct their meetings until the afternoon, so they will have from their last race until midnight in which to play the game. The Bill provides that two-up can be played only on the day of the meeting, so I interpret that to mean until midnight on that day. The Busselton Trotting Club, like most trotting clubs, conducts its meetings of a night, and as they would probably finish around 11 o'clock, it would have only an hour in which to conduct a game of two-up. That limited time will make it hardly worth its while to go to the effort of organising a game.

Mr Williams: They could start at one minute past midnight on the day of the meeting.

Mr BRADSHAW: No, because the two-up can be played only after the race meeting has concluded.

No-one will be forced to play in these two-up games and no club will be forced to conduct the game. I know some people will be attracted by the sense of adventure of playing two-up and by the thought of perhaps picking up a few dollars, although there is probably more chance that they would lose a few dollars. Australians are born gamblers, so probably a few people will go to the games and leave with their pockets a little empty. But the two-up will be played on a limited scale because it is to be restricted to a few areas where the clubs hold only three or four meetings a year. This will not be detrimental to the people of WA.

The Bill does not indicate whether alcohol will be permitted at these two-up games. The games conducted in the traditional way do not usually allow for alcohol to be present, and as these games are to be played in the traditional way it is obvious that alcohol should not be available for sale. Alcohol tends to weaken a person's willpower and encourage excessive gambling.

The Bill provides that people who are affected by alcohol or drugs will be banned from participating in these two-up games. That is easier said than done, because it is at times very hard to decide whether a person is affected. I suppose that if a person is abusive or unable to control his speech or his walking, he will be considered to be under the influence of alcohol. I might add that some people can act quite sociably although affected by alcohol, so it will be difficult to determine whether a person is affected.

The Bill does not specify what percentage of takings will go to the clubs conducting the two-up, although this might be mentioned in the regulations. There is a traditional amount which goes to the organisers of the game, but I do not know whether the Government intends to follow that tradition.

The Bill indicates that only racing and trotting clubs will be able to conduct two-up games. The clubs will not be able to bring in someone else to conduct the games for them for a percentage of the earnings.

It is following the right vein that the game should be run by these clubs so they gain a bit from it because many of the country racing and trotting clubs are under severe financial pressures and if this revenue can go towards them it certainly will benefit them.

As a party we have not decided whether we support the legislation. It will be a free vote from our side. However, I support the Bill. It is a step in the right direction to legalise something that has in the past been conducted illegally.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [2.51 p.m.]: Very briefly, I indicate that I will not oppose this legislation but I am not very enamoured of it. Once again this House is legislating to create differences within our community. There are enough disadvantages in the country without this Parliament legislating to increase them—always under the assumption, of course, that the right to play two-up is an advantage.

However, I indicated during the course of the debate on the Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Bill that I opposed the legislation on the ground that it would make a distinction within the State. It would be legal to carry out certain things in the metropolitan areas, but people living in the bush would not be able to carry out the same type of gambling without breaking the law. We should not legislate towards distinction within this State. This Bill operates in that vein. I cannot see any reason whatsoever if it is reasonable to play two-up after a racing or trotting meeting at Albany that it should not be equally legal to do so at

Pinjarra, Collie, or Bunbury. I fail to see the distinction. For that reason I am opposed to the concept although I will not oppose the legislation itself.

MR PEARCE (Armadale—Minister for Education) [2.53 p.m.]: It is a great pleasure for me to say I am thankful to the House for its support of this legislation. I might say the support was given grudgingly in quarters but, nevertheless, a vote is a vote, as they say in politics, and we will be pleased to see the legislation passed.

The Premier suggested that I might mention to the House that this is yet another example of the Government being prepared to take on controversial issues in a fair way on behalf of the community.

Mr Stephens: On behalf of the privileged sections of the community.

Mr PEARCE: We are prepared to face up to these sorts of issues whereas in the past, over many years, even when the member for Stirling was Minister, if I might remind the member for Stirling, nothing was done; it once happened in the days when he sat as a member of the majority of the House and not as one of the coterie of two, that people virtually tolerated the playing of two-up almost anywhere across the State and periodically in a fit of morality the police would raid odd citizens.

Mr Stephens: Be fair. I wasn't Minister for Police.

Mr PEARCE: I did not say that the member was Minister for Police, but he was part of a Government that tolerated these things and at the same time adopted the pious attitude of prosecuting people who were rounded up for two-up at country race meetings; when people went to these socially-acceptable games they would never know whether they would end up winning, losing or in the chocky. We are prepared to take a step in accordance with community attitudes on this matter and I think that is something that deserves the support not only of members of this House, but of the people of WA.

With regard to the 200-kilometre limit being measured from the casino, the sole purpose being so that my Bill would be in line with the Casino Control Act and the casino agreement Act, members will remember in the discussions involved on those Acts bans were placed on certain games being played within certain limits of the casino, and obviously if we drew the lines in this legislation from anywhere other than the casino the two Acts would find themselves in conflict, or the lines would cross in a way which would lead to grey areas about which there could be legal dis-

putes. We have legislated in a way to clean that up.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Burkett) in the Chair; Mr Pearce (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Playing certain "two-up" games not to be unlawful—

Mr STEPHENS: The member for Murray-Wellington pointed out during the second reading debate that as the Bill stands it disadvantages trotting clubs which hold meetings in the evening, the meeting may finish around 10.30 p.m. or 11.00 p.m. and the club proprietors have only an hour in which to conduct the game of two-up; that rather restricts the time and probably restricts any incentive for them to organise two-up even if people were so inclined. This provision is definitely a further restriction on these clubs and we should do something to eliminate it.

Accordingly I move an amendment—

Page 2—To insert after the word "day" in line 11 the words "or any extension granted by the Minister".

The clause will then read as follows—

during the course of the day or any extension granted by the Minister on which a race meeting is held on that racecourse or track under the management of that club;

Members will realise that under subclause (3)(b)(iv) the Minister has the power to add any conditions to the permit that he grants, so if this amendment is agreed to, where a club asks for an extension, say, over three or four hours on the same day, it will be perfectly competent and realistic for a Minister to grant that extension; but, as the Bill stands, he does not have that power. If the amendment is accepted it will give the Minister the power to note any permit accordingly.

I commend my amendment to the Chamber.

Mr BRADSHAW: I certainly support this amendment. As I said during the second reading debate, it is wrong that trotting clubs finishing at 11 o'clock at night have only an hour in which to set up and conduct a game of two-up. I certainly cannot see that the game would be conducted until 2.00 or 3.00 o'clock in the morning for those who wished to participate in it. Obviously, it will not be supported by the people who

wish to play two-up and the clubs will not ask for that extension by the Minister anyway. This amendment is a step in the right direction to clear up the anomaly which gives an advantage to racing clubs and a disadvantage to trotting clubs.

Mr PEARCE: The Government does not accept this amendment. It is not our intention to have two-up meetings competitive with race meetings in betting terms. The sort of arrangement we have made here is so that the two-up meetings will be adjuncts of the race meetings and not in potential competition with them. Although it may be that race meetings may then go later and the two-up games will be shorter it is a necessary corollary of the circumstances. The member may say it is giving the Minister a greater discretion to deal with individual cases, but the rules should be clearly known to everybody and be the same for everybody. That is particularly desirable when one is dealing with gambling, even a form such as two-up. For those reasons the Government will not support the amendment.

Mr BRADSHAW: I disagree with the Minister. I feel he is not being sensible about this amendment. His attitude will certainly not give the trotting clubs any joy. They will not run a two-up game for an hour; it is too short a time. By the time they finish a meeting and get set up the hour will be gone.

I cannot see anything wrong with giving the Minister discretion to allow a two-up game to go until 2.00 a.m. or 3.00 a.m. If one visits most casinos one sees they do not knock off at midnight. The illegal casinos which used to operate in Perth were open until the last person left, which might be 5.00 or 6.00 a.m. I cannot see anything wrong with the Minister having discretion to allow the clubs to go to whatever time will suit the needs of the clubs and the community.

Mr STEPHENS: I cannot agree with the Minister's reasoning. If he is afraid that we are giving the Minister too much discretionary power we could make a further amendment to the effect that it be for a period of three hours from commencement on the day, notwithstanding that that time could go into another day. That would take away the Minister's objection. I am surprised he should object to too much ministerial power being given when in many instances the power given to the Minister in legislation coming before the Chamber is far greater than is proposed in this amendment.

It will create further inconsistencies and disadvantages for certain sections of the community. It is unlikely that a club would start a two-up game if it could conduct it for only an hour. Alternatively, the club would start and not finish

at the appointed time and leave itself open to prosecution. We should ensure that legislation which leaves this Chamber reasonably accommodates the situation. The amendment I have moved would overcome the problem and be a realistic way of creating the same conditions for trotting clubs as for race clubs which hold meetings during daylight hours. Perhaps the Minister, having had time to think about it, might care to change his mind.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

MR PEARCE (Armadale—Minister for Education) [3.06 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR CRANE (Moore) [3.07 p.m.]: I would like to outline my opposition to this Bill. I am extremely concerned at the acceleration of gambling in this State which will lead to debauchery, and this concern has been expressed to me by a number of people in my electorate. I wonder where we are going. It was suggested a while ago that if it is good enough for us to allow one race club to operate from 6.00 p.m. to midnight perhaps the others should be able to go to 3.00 or 4.00 a.m.

It is about time we pulled ourselves into gear. The next thing we know a Bill will be brought to the House which will encourage debauchery and buggery, and I do not think we as a Parliament should support such legislation.

Mr Brian Burke: Which Bill is that?

Mr CRANE: It has not been brought in yet, but the way we are going it would seem extremely likely it will be before us.

On behalf of those electors who oppose this Bill and on my behalf I oppose any easing of the constraints in some areas within which we should live as a responsible society. I have remarked on many occasions about seeing teenagers and younger—14-year-olds—wandering up and down the street outside Pinocchio's night club in the early hours of the morning when I have been on my way home from Parliament. If people have a job to do they should be in bed preparing themselves for the day's work. I oppose this type of legislation and I want my opposition recorded.

Question put.

The **ACTING SPEAKER** (Mrs Henderson): I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr Crane: Divide!

The **ACTING SPEAKER**: I understand that more than one voice is required to be raised in opposition in order for a division to be called. I will put the question again because I do not believe I heard more than one voice.

Question put.

The **ACTING SPEAKER**: I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr Crane: Divide!

The **ACTING SPEAKER**: I heard only one voice. The question is passed.

Mr Crane: I heard two voices.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS: ADOPTION OF RULES

Council's Resolution: Motion to Concur

Debate resumed from 21 March.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [3.09 p.m.]: The rules we are debating have been made by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations, the Ombudsman. Despite the fact that I have great personal respect for the present commissioner, as I had for the previous commissioner, because I had the privilege of working with him for six years in the Department of Industrial Development where he prepared and assisted in negotiating State agreements, I think the rules are the inevitable consequence of his office being established.

No law has ever been more true than Parkinson's law. I recall the first debate on this issue about 17 years ago when the then Leader of the Opposition, John Tonkin, moved for the establishment of the position of Parliamentary Commissioner. I was one of those who opposed the motion and said, during my speech, that if parliamentarians, of which we seem to have a disproportionately high number when compared with most communities, did their jobs properly, there would be no necessity to have a Parliamentary Commissioner despite the fact that some other countries had one. I also said, if I remember correctly—I have not read the *Hansard*—that, once the office was established, it would grow and there would be a necessity, in later years, to appoint an assistant commissioner and more staff. I

said that would happen according to Parkinson's law as it happens with every bureaucracy.

I am in favour of small government generally. I firmly believe that is and should be the mainstay of the policies of conservative parties.

The institution was introduced as soon as John Tonkin became Premier, after having previously unsuccessfully moved for its introduction. The institution is now about 14 years old. I wonder whether anyone can honestly say that, during that time, it has achieved any of the good results which its supporters expected. I ask that question honestly because all three bearers of the office, Oliver Dixon, Mr Evans and the present Parliamentary Commissioner, Mr Eric Freeman, were the best people for the job. They did their job very well and they introduced innovations. Nevertheless, I still ask the question: Did anything drastically change as a result of the establishment of the office, even under the best possible office-bearers? Can we really say that Public Service departments have changed their attitudes to people and that taxpayers have received tremendous benefits since the time of the establishment of the office? Have Ministers of the Crown found it easier to administer their respective portfolios because there was a Parliamentary Commissioner?

We have observed that the office has grown and because of that growth additional rules are now required to give power to additional persons within the office of commissioner. I wonder whether, in a generation or two, a later-day Burke Government will hire a consultant to cull the then hundreds of employees and officers in the Parliamentary Com-

missioner's office as he did with the Public Works Department.

It does not give me any satisfaction to point out that, about 17 years ago, I said that this would happen. I should say today, "I told you so". It would need a very courageous Premier or Government which, in some future time, would try to do away with this office and encourage the Public Service departments and members of Parliament to do the same job with the same efficiency.

MR GRILL (Esperance-Dundas—Minister for Transport) [3.14 p.m.]: We seem to be a little out of kilter in relation to the procedure on this matter. I spoke on the motion on 21 March and, by so doing, closed debate. However, I do not want to take that sort of trifling point with the member for Floreat.

Leave to Continue Speech

I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later date.

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

[Questions taken.]

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [3.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 16 April at 2.15 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.00 p.m.

[illegible]

- (h) The area subjected to fuel reduction burning including areas burnt for regeneration.

Year	Area (ha.)
1974-75	900
1975-76	5 251
1976-77	1 280
1977-78	4 396
1978-79	14 032
1979-80	13 324
1980-81	8 102
1981-82	497
1982-83	502
1983-84	2 365
1984-85	223

- (i) As for (h).

- (2) Maps showing logging, fire damage and fuel reduction burning are tabled.
- (3) Under the Conservation and Land Management Act no commercial logging is permitted in national parks.
- (4) It is the policy of the Government that the Shannon Basin will be managed as for a national park.
- (5) Answered by (3) and (4).

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 586).

MR J. J. O'CONNOR: CHARGE

Withdrawal: Solicitor General's Advice

2981. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Did the Solicitor General advise the Attorney General . . . "That criminal proceedings should not have been taken" against the Secretary of the Transport Workers' Union, Mr J. J. O'Connor?
- (2) If not, will he advise the Minister for Industrial Relations to now write to all those groups he circulated with that advice ensuring that both sides of the O'Connor case and the facts are presented for examination?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Solicitor General's advice to the Attorney General in the O'Connor case was tabled in the Parliament by the Attorney General on 28 February, 1985. Part of that advice was as follows—

"Initial decision to prosecute:

I must say that had it been for the Attorney General rather than the Police to decide whether a complaint should have been laid in the first place, I would have advised against instituting proceedings. In essence, my reasons for that advice

would have been that, despite the existence of a prima facie case, the use of the criminal law in the totality of these circumstances was unnecessary and inappropriate."

This opinion is consistent with the advice previously circulated by the Minister for Industrial Relations and I see no need for further action by him.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Emanuel Family: Purchase

2984. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

- (1) Are the Emanuel pastoral leases being purchased by either Exim or the Western Australian Development Corporation, or both?
- (2) If so—
- (a) which one;
- (b) what is the cost of the purchase?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) Negotiations for the acquisition of pastoral leases from the Emanuel Group are still in progress, and the final details are not yet available.

WATER RESOURCES: DAM

Wandering

2990. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) When will the Wandering No. 1 dam be lined?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of this work?
- (3) Is it intended to line Wandering No. 2 dam as it has been found to leak excessively and now receives the water from No. 1 dam for distribution by reticulation to the town?
- (4) Will he have the proposal for an alternative water supply put forward by the Shire of Wandering considered immediately?
- (5) Is it a fact that the shire's alternative supply of water, catchment and storage has the potential to guarantee Wandering township a restriction-free supply in a normal year?
- (6) If he will not agree to have the shire proposal considered, will he please explain why?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) A contract has been let for the lining of Wandering No. 1 dam with a completion date of May 20.
- (2) \$53 000.
- (3) The Water Authority of Western Australia is being requested to consider lining the No. 2 dam in its next Capital Works Programme.
- (4) This proposal was examined and was fully discussed by the Chief Engineer, Operations South with the Shire of Wandering on April 1, 1985. It is understood that the Shire is now in agreement with the Department's proposals.
- (5) and (6) There is no evidence or data available to confirm that the Shire's scheme has the potential to guarantee an adequate supply to the town. However, the Public Works Department will monitor this proposed source during this winter. It is also emphasised that the Shire's scheme is not as cost effective as that adopted by the Department for meeting the town's existing requirements.

WATER RESOURCES: UNDERGROUND

Dwellingup: Bore Dismantling

2992. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is he aware the Water Authority or Public Works Department is dismantling the water bore adjacent to the Dwellingup town oval?
- (2) Why is the dismantling taking place?
- (3) Will the Government now allow the shire or private company or persons to equip the bore to supply adequate water for the oval reticulation?
- (4) If "No" to (3), what alternative is he prepared to agree to now?
- (5) Is he aware of his commitment to let the Dwellingup primary school parents and citizens association know by February this year, his answer to its request for the use of a Dwellingup town bore to supply water for reticulation to the school oval?
- (6) When and what consideration is he to give to the parents and citizens association's request?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes, and the work has now been completed.
- (2) The bore and its equipment were in a dilapidated state and the bore would

need re-drilling if it was required to be utilised as a reliable source. The removal of the equipment which was no longer serviceable was undertaken to leave the area in a neat state which would facilitate any future re-development.

- (3) to (6) Investigations into alternative sources which take account of the community's need for water for recreation purposes are almost finalised and a decision will be made before the end of April.

TABLED PAPERS

Transmission: Parliament House

2994. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Would he please explain in detail the way Ministers transmit gazetted regulations and other papers to be tabled to Parliament House, in particular—
 - (a) is this transmission process centralised on the Government side, meaning that all Ministers send the documents to one central office, which in turn sends them to Parliament House; or
 - (b) are Ministers individually responsible for conveying their respective documents to be tabled in Parliament House?
- (2) (a) In either case (1) (a) or (1) (b), are documents sent in duplicate to one office or person in Parliament House and, if so, which is this office, or who is the person; or
- (b) are these documents sent separately to each House of Parliament, and, if so, to which office at each House?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) I am advised that the procedure for the tabling of subsidiary legislation, i.e. regulations, rules, by-laws and orders, is as follows:
 - (i) After the subsidiary legislation is published in the *Government Gazette* staff of the Crown Law Department arrange the preparation of extracts and cover sheets for the instruments that require tabling.
 - (ii) The Crown Law Department forwards by hand, under separate cover to the Clerk of the

Legislative Council and the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly the extracts to be tabled, together with covering memos.

(iii) The Crown Law Department forwards memos to—

- (a) the Minister who has the administration of the legislation; and
- (b) the Minister in the other House responsible for tabling the legislation,

advising them that the extracts have been forwarded to Parliament House for tabling, on behalf of the Minister.

- (2) (a) The extracts for tabling in the Legislative Assembly are sealed in an envelope addressed to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, together with a covering memo.

Similarly, the extracts for tabling in the Legislative Council are sealed in an envelope addressed to the Clerk of the Legislative Council, together with a covering memo.

- (b) The envelopes containing the extracts are then hand delivered by Crown Law Department staff to the Commissionaires at the front of Parliament House.

COURTS: DEFENDANTS

Costs: Upgrading

2995. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Arising out of an application at the Wanneroo Police Station for a firearm licence by Alessandro Leone on 3 March 1983, and the applicant having been charged with wilfully misleading a member of the Police Force, after the charge was finally dismissed and Leone had incurred substantial legal costs did the Attorney General say that the case highlighted the need to upgrade the scale of costs awarded under the Official Prosecutions (Defendants' Costs) Act?

- (2) Does the Government propose to upgrade the scale of fees under the Act this year?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) The scale of costs which applies under the Act is under review.

CRIME: MICKLEBERG CASE

Review: Report

2996. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

Is the Attorney General going to release the report, and if so when, of the investigation on the review of what is known as the "Mickleberg Case"?

Mr GRILL replied:

The Government has sought the assistance of international experts to enable it to assess an allegation that a fingerprint, which was part of the evidence against Raymond Mickleberg, was forged.

It is hoped to have the reports of those experts by the end of April, and further action, if any, will depend on the nature of the reports.

PAWNBROKERS ACT: AMENDMENTS

Law Reform Commission Report

2997. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

Will the Government heed the recommendations by the Law Reform Commission pertaining to amendments to the Pawnbrokers' Act?

Mr GRILL replied:

The Commission's final report on the Pawnbrokers Act (Project No. 81) is expected this year, and will be considered in the usual way.

3005. *Postponed.*

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Short-term Money Market: Safeguards

3006. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

What safeguards will be used to ensure that the Western Australian Development Corporation pays a "market rate" of interest to the Treasury for its surplus short-term cash resources?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Treasury will continue to monitor interest rates and market conditions to ensure that interest rates offered by WADC are in line with the market.

3007. *Postponed.*

**INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN
AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION**

Trading Position

3008. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

What was the Western Australian Development Corporation's profit/loss trading position as at 31 December 1984?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The provisions governing the reporting requirements of Western Australian Development Corporation are set out in the Western Australian Development Corporation Act 1983.

As the member will recall, the Corporation was constituted to operate on the same commercial basis as other corporations and has annual reporting obligations as provided under section 24 of the Western Australian Development Corporation Act and further, largely at the insistence of the Opposition, has requirements under the relevant provisions of the Companies (Western Australia) Code. However, there are no provisions in either Statute that require the Corporation to report to the Government and publish the half-yearly financial results relating to its activities.

It is also important to understand that this is ultimately a matter for decision by the Board of Directors and further, that the Government is not in a position to direct the Corporation to provide or publish such information.

Nevertheless, it is understood that arrangements for interim reporting are under consideration by the Board.

**INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN
AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION**

Short-term Money Market: Interest Rate

3010. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

In the event that the Treasury is not satisfied with the rate of interest the Western Australian Development Corporation is offering for its surplus cash funds can it place these surpluses elsewhere in the market place, as approved under the Public Moneys Act?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Yes, subject to the approval of the Treasurer.

3011. *Postponed.*

**INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN
AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION**

Assets and Liabilities

3012. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

(1) What was the Western Australian Development Corporation's position at 31 December 1984, in respect to—

- (a) reserve funds;
- (b) current assets;
- (c) non-current assets;
- (d) fixed assets;
- (e) intangible assets;
- (f) current liabilities;
- (g) non-current liabilities?

(2) What guarantees have been provided by the Government to Western Australian Development Corporation?

(3) What guarantees had Western Australian Development Corporation provided to third parties?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) to (3) See reply to question 3008.

3013. *Postponed.*

SUPERANNUATION BOARD

Investment: Parry Corporation Halls Head

3014. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

Is the Superannuation Board happy with its investment in Halls Head and the ar-

rangements under which this investment was made?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Superannuation Board unanimously approved of the investment in the Halls Head project on 11 January 1983.

The Halls Head investment is considered by the Superannuation Board to be a good investment and along with its other investments is reviewed on a regular basis.

**PRICE WATERHOUSE:
SUPERANNUATION BOARD**

Parry Corporation Halls Head Tax Structure

3015. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

- (1) Was the Government aware that the accounting firm of Price Waterhouse which it commissioned to report on the Superannuation Board's operations also put together the tax structure for the sale of the half interest in Halls Head for the Parry Corporation?
- (2) If "Yes", why did not the Government use another firm?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government was not aware of any such involvement when the report was commissioned.

**PRICE WATERHOUSE:
SUPERANNUATION BOARD**

Report: Publication

3016. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

- (1) Did the Government provide a copy of Price Waterhouse's report on the Superannuation Board to *The West Australian* newspaper before it was tabled in Parliament?
- (2) If "No", how did *The West Australian* have access to certain contents of the report?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes, it is not unusual for reports to be made public prior to tabling. A copy of this report was also made available to the Leader of the Opposition before it was tabled.
- (2) Not applicable.

FLAGS: WESTERN AUSTRALIAN

Provision: Voluntary Organisations

3017. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the Government make Western Australian flags available for organisations such as Returned Services League Clubs?
- (2) If so, how does such a club apply for one?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) No funds were specifically earmarked in the Budget for this purpose but at least one request of this type has been received and the organisation making the request has been informed that the matter will be considered in the '85-86 Budget process.

TRAFFIC NOISE

Interdepartmental Committee: Report

3018. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What action has the Government taken on the recommendations of the interdepartmental committee report on traffic noise?
- (2) If none, does the Government intend to combat traffic noise pollution to protect the well being of Western Australians affected by traffic noise?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) This committee was established in response to a deputation which I led to the then Minister for Health on the question of traffic noise. An interdepartmental committee on traffic noise was subsequently established. After three years of deliberations, the committee confirmed that traffic noise did constitute a serious form of noise pollution in the community and the recommendations were passed to the then Minister for Health in 1981.

Since 1981, the recommendations of the committee have been circulated for comment, but no positive actions have been taken.

I have reviewed the committee's recommendations and a submission for Cabinet's consideration is being prepared.

- (2) Not applicable.

HEALTH: NURSES

Re-employment

3020. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has an investigation been undertaken to find out how registered nurses not working in the hospital system can be attracted back?
- (2) Has an investigation been carried out to find out why nurses are leaving the profession?
- (3) In fact, does he know why nurses are leaving the profession?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) A questionnaire has been sent to some 700 nurses who have registered with the Nurses Board of WA for 1985, but who state that despite efforts to obtain work, they have been unable to do so. The results are currently being analysed.
- (2) The questionnaire does ask the reasons for leaving the previous position, work preference and what work conditions would encourage re-employment.
- (3) It is planned to conduct a similar survey of nurses registered with the Board who are not working and not seeking work. This could elicit reasons for leaving the profession. No follow-up is currently planned of nurses who have left the profession and not kept up their registration. This is due to operational difficulties—we have no addresses or contact points.

Exit Interviews of several of the major teaching hospitals are another source of information.

3027. *Postponed.*

MINISTER FOR MINERALS AND ENERGY

Office: Relocation

3030. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

I refer him to question 2321 of 27 February 1985, and ask what was the cost of relocating the office of the Minister for Minerals and Energy from the Superannuation Building to the City Mutual Building?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Actual building costs to date are approximately \$86 750.

SPORT AND RECREATION: GOLF

Clubs: Associate Membership

3033. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

Is he able to inform me—

- (a) if a male member of a golf club chooses to become a male associate member would such a member forego voting and office rights;
- (b) can such a member in (a) be now excluded from full competition privileges;
- (c) does a female associate member of a golf club have full competition privileges or does she now need to become a full member;
- (d) is there a simple solution to the above, or does a club now have to consider more carefully its categories of membership that perhaps eliminates these eventualities;
- (e) what membership categories must a golf club now offer under the Act and what, if any, restrictions can be rightfully applied;
- (f) is it possible to have full membership and associate membership of any golf club;
- (g) can a golf club hold male or female only competitions; and
- (h) is a full member entitled to play in all competitions run by a club regardless of sex?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) to (h) This matter is covered by the Federal Sex Discrimination Act. The Act is being administered by the Human Rights Commission in Perth.

Inquiries should be addressed to that office.

HORTICULTURE: AVOCADOS

Imports: Queensland

3034. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Adverting to question without notice 910 of 27 March, relevant to import of avocados from Queensland, what type of insecticide is used and what is the form of treatment?
- (2) Is the treatment considered completely effective?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), has the treatment been used as a quarantine measure in other

States, and if so, have any of those States experienced outbreaks of Queensland fruit fly?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Fruit immersed for one minute in an emulsion of dimethoate maintained at a concentration of 400 parts per million.
- (2) The interstate Fresh Fruit Disinfestation Sub-committee of Plant Health Committee has endorsed the results of tests which showed that the treatment provides better than 99.75 per cent mortality of artificially injected eggs and larvae. There is an additional safeguard in that fruit fly do not develop in avocados picked in condition suitable for interstate marketing.
- (3) (a) Yes.
(b) It would not be possible to determine the relationship between dimethoate treatment of avocados and the sources and means of fruit fly dispersal.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT: HONORARY ROYAL COMMISSION

Overseas Trip: Cost

3035. Mr CRANE, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he advise what the estimated cost will be of sending the Western Australian Honorary Royal Commission inquiring into Conservation and Land Management to visit New Zealand, California, Canada and Britain, on an estimated three weeks trip?
- (2) Is it intended that the trip will be extended beyond the three-weeks period?
- (3) In view of the fact that the Conservation and Land Management Bill passed through Parliament last December, and is now an Act of Parliament, what is the purpose of sending the Honorary Royal Commission anyway?
- (4) What benefit will this visit be to the State?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Approximately \$20 000.
- (2) Not on Commission activities.
- (3) and (4) To enable the Commission to fulfil its Terms of Reference and to report in accordance with the agreements

reached in debate on the Bill in the Legislative Council in December 1984.

AGRICULTURE: RURAL SECTOR HARDSHIP

Select Committee: Reconstitution

3036. Mr CRANE, to the Premier:

In view of the fact that such moneys can be expended on an Honorary Royal Commission which may be of doubtful benefit to Western Australia, and in view of the fact that the rural industry appears to be in such a serious state of financial collapse, will he consider reconstituting the Select Committee which investigated rural hardship in 1983-84 with a view to—

- (a) sending the committee and its Research Officer to Canberra to present its report to the Prime Minister, the Federal Treasurer, and Federal Minister for Primary Industry, with a view to easing the tariff and tax burden facing the industry;
- (b) investigating the feasibility of the Land Bank which was reported in the *Sunday Times* of last Sunday as operating quite successfully in West Germany, with a view if necessary of travelling to West Germany and investigating at first hand and reporting to Parliament?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) There will be a conference on 9 April, in Perth, on farm costs, taxes and tariffs. This conference will be attended by rural and allied industry representatives. The resolutions of this conference will be presented to me for incorporation into the State Government's submission to the Tax Summit. Results of the examination of the conclusion of the Hardship Committee's report will also be taken into account. No decision on reconstituting this Committee will be taken before the conference.
- (b) The Select Committee appointed to inquire into rural hardship reported that it had examined the issue of land banks in some depth. The Committee recommended, in its final report, that it was "not prepared to recommend further action concerning the land bank concept".

The land bank concept was put forward by witnesses appearing before the committee as a means of providing a suitable way of assisting farmers in hardship out of the industry. The Select Committee believed that the "farm build-up and rehabilitation provisions under the Rural Adjustment Scheme should help achieve the necessary results".

The Select Committee in its report also noted a submission from Mr B. K. Anderson which proposed a "farmer bank". Essentially this scheme requires farmers paying a levy on income to the bank and for those funds to be re-loaned to producers. This appears to be the scheme referred to in the *Sunday Times*. The Select Committee reported that because such a scheme would involve "a commitment from the farming sector" it was in no position to evaluate it.

A variation of a land bank type scheme is being examined by the Department of Agriculture. However, the appropriateness of this scheme in alleviating rural hardship is not yet known.

WATER RESOURCES: YANCHEP-TWO ROCKS

Water Authority: Takeover

3037. Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) When is it proposed that the new water authority, the Water Authority of Western Australia, will take over the water supply at Yanchep and Two Rocks?
- (2) As the residents of Yanchep and Two Rocks presently pay an annual fee of \$94 for 600 kilolitres of water, what formula will be used for calculating their water usage in the future?
- (3) Is it envisaged there will be an increase in the amount they will have to pay?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) 1 July, 1985.
- (2) Charges will be identical to all Country Water Supplies south of 26 degrees Parallel South latitude. Currently these are as follows:

Rates—

\$78 for land with an area not less than 2 500 m².

Consumption—

1st 400 kilolitres at 25c per kilolitre

Next 400 kilolitres at 42c per kilolitre

Next 400 kilolitres at 72c per kilolitre

Next 800 kilolitres at 101c per kilolitre

Over 2 000 kilolitres at 131c per kilolitre.

- (3) Yes. But the amount of the increase will depend upon the quantity of water used.

3038 and 3039. *Postponed.*

HOMOSEXUAL COUNSELLING SERVICE

Government Grant

3040. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister assisting the Minister Co-ordinating Social and Economic Development:

- (1) Will he confirm that a Government grant has been made to the Homosexual Counselling Service?
- (2) What was the purpose of this grant?
- (3) What was the amount of this grant?
- (4) What was the basis of the grant to this organisation?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Not in any portfolios for which I am responsible.
- (2) to (4) Not applicable.

3041. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Staff: Replacements

3042. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Referring to my question 2457 of 5 March 1985, concerning staff replacement in Government instrumentalities, why is it taking a month to answer a question about statistical figures which would be maintained for effective administration?
- (2) When can I expect an answer to my question?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Member's view of the type of statistical information that "would be maintained for effective administration" does not necessarily reflect the true situation.

As the member will appreciate, considerable resources have already been diverted to determine and collate the information he is seeking.

An answer will be forwarded to him as soon as the information is available.

3043 and 3044. *Postponed.*

FISHERIES: FISH LADDER

Ord River Dam

3045. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Has any progress been achieved in designing and constructing a "fish ladder" from the Ord River below the diversion dam to Lake Argyle?
- (2) Is he aware that these estuarine "fish ladders" are very successful in Queensland?
- (3) If no recent action has been taken will he have his department examine alternative schemes for estuarine fish to migrate to and from Lake Argyle?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) No, from experiments undertaken in Western Australia and Queensland it appears that barramundi are generally not attracted to use a fish pass device. I will pass to the member an extract from a departmental publication on this subject.
- (2) The Department is unaware of fish ladder success in Queensland relating to barramundi.
- (3) The question of fish passes has been examined by the Department. While there is no easy solution the matter is being kept under consideration.

FISHERIES: LICENCES

Cockburn Sound

3046. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) How many fishermen are currently licensed to operate in Cockburn Sound?
- (2) How many of those fishermen are entitled to use sunken tangle nets to catch crabs?
- (3) How many inspectors does the department currently have monitoring the activities of professional fishermen in Cockburn Sound?

- (4) Is the crab population in Cockburn Sound being monitored and if so, how often, and by whom?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Cockburn Sound is not a restricted entry area. However, currently approximately 29 fishing units operate in the Sound.
- (2) Approximately 14 professional fishermen use tangle nets in Cockburn Sound, but as set out in (1) it is not a restricted area.
- (3) and (4) The activities of professional fishermen in Cockburn Sound are not monitored as a research project, but production statistics are available from the standard fishermen's returns. Inspection oversight is provided by the department's Fremantle office, which has three staff, and departmental patrol vessels within their general inspection duties for the Fremantle area.

PRISON: CANNING VALE

Control Towers: Manning

3047. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Prisons:

On what basis are the control towers at the medium security prison at Canning Vale currently manned?

Mr GRILL replied:

The control towers are manned seven days per week, from 7 am until 11 pm on weekends and public holidays, and from 3 pm to 11 pm on weekdays.

BILLS: COPIES

Members

3048. Mr MacKINNON, to the Speaker:

- (1) Why is it that members of Parliament are limited to three copies of each piece of legislation presented to the Parliament?
- (2) Who determines the level of fees to be charged for these Bills?

The SPEAKER replied:

- (1) The number of copies of Bills supplied without charge to Members is based on the number of Bills provided by the Government Printer to Parliament and the demand experienced over a period of many years. It has never been intended that the supply for the Parliament could

also meet the needs of the general public. These needs are met by the sale of Bills from the Parliamentary Publications section of the Government Printing Office.

- (2) The Government Printer.

ROTTNEST ISLAND

Market Research

3049. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Since its election has the Government commissioned any public opinion service or market research on public attitudes to Rottnest Island?
- (2) If so, which agency carried out the work?
- (3) When was the work completed?
- (4) What was the nature of the work completed?
- (5) How much did the work cost?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Rottnest Island Management Plan Group.
- (3) 28 August-1 October, 1984.
- (4) A Rottnest Island Visitor Survey.
- (5) Included in the cost of the Rottnest Island Draft Management Plan.

HEALTH: OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE COMMISSION

Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention

3050. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Will the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention be represented on the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Commission?

- (2) If not, why not?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The appointments of Mr. Chesson, Mr. Phillips and Dr. Gillett were made in accordance with the requirements of Section 6(2) (d) (iii) of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act and were mutually acceptable to all parties.

CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Members

3051. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) Who are the members of the charitable collections advisory committee?
- (2) On what date were each of the members of this committee appointed?
- (3) On what dates do the current members' appointments expire?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1)	(2)	(3)
Hon. R. F. Cloughton	7/2/84	30/6/85
S. Drake-Brockman	1/7/81	30/6/85
R. Griffiths	24/7/84	30/6/87
C. Deverall	24/7/84	30/6/87
M. P. Ryan	7/2/84	30/6/85

HOUSING: FIRST HOME BUYERS ASSISTANCE FUND

Credit Unions: Borrowers

3052. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Are funds from the First Home Buyers Assistance Fund as provided under the Real Estate and Business Agents Act available to borrowers of funds from credit unions?

Mr TONKIN replied:

No.

3053. *Postponed.*

CREDIT LEGISLATION

Advertising Campaign

3054. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) With reference to question 2612 of 12 March, can the Minister please advise me what is the form that the educational and promotional programme that has been launched to coincide with the introduction of new Western Australian credit laws will take?
- (2) Can the Minister provide me with an estimate of the total cost of the campaign?

- (3) What is the estimated total cost of that campaign contributed by—
 (a) Government; and
 (b) by industry?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The programme includes the publication of educational brochures, various newspaper articles, seminars and talks, radio and television programmes and advertisements.
 (2) and (3) It is not practicable to attempt an estimate of the total cost because a substantial part of the programme is part of the on-going consumer education programme of the Department of Consumer Affairs. Additionally, the cost of newspaper advertisements which are being published by the finance industry as part of the programme have not been made known to the Department.

HEALTH: ALCOHOL

Support Programme: Government Assistance

3055. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Which agencies are in receipt of Government grants from the non-Government support programme administered by the Alcohol and Drug Authority?
 (2) What is the amount of each grant paid to each agency?
 (3) Do each of those agencies have an agreement with the Government for the funds they receive?
 (4) Has that agreement been signed by each of the agencies?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2)

	\$
Alcohol and Drug Foundation—Australia (WA Industry Programme)	64 400
Alcohol Advisory Council of Western Australia	20 000
Alcoholic Recovery and Rehabilitation of Mandurah Inc	16 197
Cyrenian House	73 200
Daughters of Charity	29 300
Drug Research and Rehabilitation Association	85 100
Eastern Goldfields Halfway House	24 700
Hollyoake Institute	111 500
Jesus People Incorporated	43 200
Rosella House, Geraldton	21 872
Salvation Army	140 700
St Patrick's Care Centre	11 300
Wesley Central Mission	28 100

It should be noted that these grants will be varied in the light of the recent National Wage Case.

- (3) Each of the agencies has an agreement with the Alcohol and Drug Authority.
 (4) Yes.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Service: Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe

3056. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Westrail bus service between Ravensthorpe and Hopetoun to be discontinued?
 (2) If "Yes", on what date is the service to be withdrawn?
 (3) What alternative arrangements have been made for transporting passengers from Hopetoun to Ravensthorpe?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I understand Westrail is currently examining a proposal which as from July 2 1985 would involve a passenger bus feeder service between Ravensthorpe and Hopetoun subcontracted to a private operator and connecting with the Esperance service.

PORNOGRAPHY: TITLES

Publication

3057. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) What is the reason behind the publication of the list of titles restricted under the Indecent Publications and Articles Act 1902-1983 in the *Government Gazette*?
 (2) When was Dr Richard Kirkham appointed Chairman of the Publications Advisory Committee?
 (3) What are the guidelines for—
 (a) banning a publication;
 (b) classifying it as restricted?
 (4) Have these guidelines changed at all since the present Government took office?
 (5) If so, when?
 (6) Will he table a set of these publications for examination?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Section 10(3) of the Indecent Publications and Articles Act requires that

any determination by the Minister to restrict a publication shall be published in the *Government Gazette*.

(2) June 21, 1983.

(3) (a) Material which depicts child pornography, bestiality, the promotion or encouragement of terrorism, abuse of hard drugs and sexual violence is refused classification.

(b) Material which depicts sexually explicit activity or fetishes involving consenting adults is classified as restricted.

(4) Yes. This was a result of a resolution taken at a joint meeting of Federal and State Ministers to adopt uniform guidelines nationwide.

(5) February 1984.

(6) No, however, should the Leader of the Opposition—or any other Member—wish to peruse these publications, I will be happy to arrange for a visit to the Censorship Office where they may be inspected.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: JETTY

Coode Street: Upgrading

3058. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Has the Co-ordinator General of Transport been able to arrange as yet a meeting between the South Perth City Council, the Metropolitan Transport Trust and the Department of Marine and Harbours?

(2) If so, with what result?

(3) If not, when is it expected that the meeting will take place?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) to (3) The Member has not been specific as to the nature of the meeting, however in the true character of clairvoyancy I presume the Member's question relates to the Como Jetty. If that is the case I can advise that the Department of Marine and Harbours has been undertaking preliminary work and a meeting is expected to be arranged shortly after Easter.

ROAD CLOSURES

Traffic Flow

3059. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it envisaged that recent road closures in the City of South Perth will increase the flow of traffic on Canning Highway and the Mitchell Freeway?

(2) If so, to what extent is it anticipated traffic flow will be increased?

(3) What are the short and long term plans for Canning Highway and the Mitchell Freeway in respect of facilitating the flow of the additional traffic which must inevitably result from the increasing population in south of the river suburbs?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) and (2) It is not anticipated that the current changes arising out of the South Perth road rationalisation scheme will have a significant effect on either Canning Highway or the Freeway.

(3) There are no plans for major improvements to the Freeway or its interchanges with existing roads. The Metropolitan Region Scheme does allow for the further southern extension of the Freeway and for the widening of Canning Highway in South Perth.

Some peak period congestion is inevitable on the major road system, however the traffic situation is under constant review and minor improvements to the road system can be considered as appropriate.

Proposals for car pooling being developed between officers of the P.C.C. and C.G.T. should also give scope to reduce congestion during the critical periods.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOLS

South Perth Electorate

3060. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Education:

What renovations or extensions, if any, are either currently being undertaken or are proposed in respect of the following schools—

(a) Primary—

(i) South Perth;

(ii) Kensington;

(iii) Como;

- (iv) Koonawarra;
- (v) Manning;

- (b) Secondary—
Como-Collier?

Mr PEARCE replied:

Capital Works

- (a) (i) —
- (ii) —
- (iii) —
- (iv) Library/Resource Centre and
Administration Upgrade.
- (v) Library/Resource Centre.
- (b) Art/Craft, Business Education and
Science facilities.

Repairs and Renovations

- (a) (i) re-seal bitumen—completed
1985
internal R & R (1985/86)
- (ii) —
- (iii) re-seal bitumen—completed
1985
external and internal R & R in
progress
- (iv) external and internal R & R
—completed 1985
- (v) —
- (b) —

ROADS: BRIDGE

Narrows: Plans

3061. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the current position in respect of planning for the possible widening of the Narrows Bridge?
- (2) Is duplication of the bridge regarded as a possible option, and if so, is consideration being given to this?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The only work currently being done relates to an assessment of the structural implications of widening the Narrows Bridge. A consultant has been retained to undertake this work which is likely to be completed in the latter part of this year.
- (2) Duplication is not considered to be necessary and no work is being done on such an option.

ROAD CLOSURES

Traffic Flow

3062. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that recent road closures in the City of South Perth have increased the flow of traffic at the Angelo/Coode Streets intersection and that this has occurred since the Main Roads Department investigated the matter earlier this year?
- (2) In view of the above, and as parents are currently driving their children to school rather than allowing them to cross at this intersection, will he again investigate the request of the South Perth City Council that a walk phase be installed at this location?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) I am aware that a number of changes are currently being made to the South Perth road system and that these will result in altered traffic flows.
- (2) The effects at the Angelo/Coode Streets intersection will be monitored by the Main Roads Department to determine what, if any, changes are necessary.

3063. *Postponed.*

LIQUOR ACT

Amendment: Introduction

3064. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Does the Minister intend to introduce any legislation this year to amend the Liquor Act?
- (2) If so, what is or are the change(s) intended?
- (3) Does the Minister intend to change section 42 of the Liquor Act in any way?
- (4) Did the Western Australian Limited Licence Clubs Association in December 1984 ask for a copy of the report of the Licensing Court of Western Australia for the year ended 30 June 1984?
- (5) Is there such a report?
- (6) If so, did the Western Australian Limited Licence Clubs Association receive such a report?
- (7) If not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (7) The Report of the Honorary Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Liquor Laws in Western Australia is still under review.

HEALTH: DISABLED PERSONS

Programme Aids Scheme

3065. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has funding been re-established for programme aids for disabled people since he suspended the programme last year?
- (2) If so, how much has been allocated?
- (3) If not, does he intend to establish programme aids for disabled people in the future?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The Aids for Disabled Persons Programme is a Commonwealth programme administered by my Department on behalf of the Commonwealth. Last year the programme was temporarily suspended because the funds provided by the Commonwealth were expended before the end of the financial year. As a result of my personal representations, additional funding was subsequently approved by the Commonwealth.
- (2) The Commonwealth Government has allocated \$1 060 000 to Western Australia for 1984-85.
- (3) Not applicable.

DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET: FACILITIES

Use: Australian Labor Party

3066. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Why is it that a recent invitation to a Labor Party Decision Makers Luncheon, at a cost of \$25 per head payable to the Labor Party, invites a reply to "the Senior Protocol Officer, Department of Premier and Cabinet"?
- (2) Are the facilities of the Premier's Department, provided at the expense of the taxpayers, now for the use of Labor Party luncheons?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The decision makers luncheons provide for the attendance of representatives

from all business and other areas of management.

As Government has decided to run future such luncheons, it is considered only reasonable for the Protocol Section of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to attend to the arrangements.

- (2) No.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: PREMIER

Interstate Travel: Charter Flight

3067. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Did he travel to the Eastern States on Monday on a charter flight?
- (2) If so, what company provided the flight?
- (3) What was the total cost?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Ministers Barry Hodge, Peter Dowding and an Officer accompanied me to Canberra. The charter flight enabled the Ministers and myself to be present at Cabinet during the day.
- (2) Skywest Airlines.
- (3) \$2 400.00.

The \$600.00 cost per person equates favourably with first class airfare to Canberra.

MEMBERS FOR BUNBURY AND MITCHELL

Press Releases: Mr Baden Pratt

3068. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

Has Mr Baden Pratt, Government employed media officer, been involved in the drafting or preparation of Press releases or the organisation of media contact in the past four weeks on behalf of—

- (a) the Member for Bunbury;
- (b) the Member for Mitchell?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

See reply to question 2976 of 2 April 1985.

MINISTER FOR TOURISM

Interstate Travel: Charter Flight

3069. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Did the Hon. Des Dans, MLC, return from the Eastern States to Western Australia on a charter flight last week-end, or on Monday morning?

(2) If so, what was the cost?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

3070. *Postponed.*

TOURISM COMMISSION

Price Waterhouse Report: Distribution

3071. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

When will members of the staff of the Tourism Commission be provided with copies of the Price Waterhouse report?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Copies of the study are available within the Commission and will be provided to staff as requested.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Promotions: Radio Stations

3072. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Since it was established, how much has the Tourism Commission paid to radio stations—

- (a) 6KY;
- (b) 6PR;
- (c) 6PM;
- (d) 6IX;
- (e) 96FM?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) 6KY—\$4 375.
- (b) 6PR—\$139 000.
- (c) 6PM—Nil.
- (d) 6IX—Nil.
- (e) 96FM—Nil.

TOURISM: HOLIDAY WA CENTRE

Norseman

3073. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) When will the Tourism Commission establish its Holiday WA Centre at Norseman?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of the centre?

(3) Where in Norseman will the centre be located?

(4) How many staff of the Tourism Commission will work at the centre?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) Establishment of the Norseman Holiday WA Centre is scheduled to proceed as part of the 1985-86 Capital Works Programme.

(2) \$300 000.

(3) Adjacent to the Department of Agriculture checkpoint.

(4) Yet to be determined.

TOURISM: HOLIDAY WA CENTRE

Kununurra

3074. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

(1) Will the Tourism Commission establish a Holiday WA Centre in Kununurra, based on similar lines to the centre to be established in Norseman?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) and (2) The Commission, in association with regional interests, is examining the possibility of establishing a major reception and information centre in Kununurra, to service the increasing visitor traffic through the Kimberleys.

ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD

Minister for Tourism: Resignation

3075. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

(1) Has the Minister for Tourism stepped down from his position as a member of the Rottneest Island Board?

(2) What are the reasons for this decision?

(3) What is the position of the membership of the Member for Rockingham on the Board?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) The Minister for Tourism has never been a member of the Rottneest Island Board.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) The member for Rockingham is not a member of the Rottneest Island Board.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

Bunbury-Perth: Speed Limits

3076. Mr P. J. SMITH, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the maximum speed at present on the Bunbury-Perth railway line for—
 - (a) alumina trains—loaded;
 - (b) alumina trains—unloaded?
- (2) Assuming that the planned upgrading of the Bunbury-Perth rail is upgraded, what will be the maximum speed of—
 - (a) aluminium trains—loaded;
 - (b) aluminium trains—unloaded?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) (a) 40 kph;
(b) 70 kph.
- (2) (a) 70 kph;
(b) 80 kph.

MINERALS: DIAMONDS

Northern Mining Corporation NL: Acquisition

3077. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) What was the total payment by the Government or its agencies to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of the valuation and acquisition of the interest in the Argyle Diamond Mine?
- (2) What total payments have been made to date by the Western Australian Development Corporation to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of its role as auditors of Western Australian Development Corporation?
- (3) What total payments have been made by the Western Australian Diamond Trust to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of its role as auditors of Western Australian Diamond Trust?
- (4) What total payment has been made to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company by Formulab in respect of its proposal and business plan for Formulab which was required as a condition of the Government's \$400 000 investment in Formulab?

- (5) What total payment has been made to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of its reports on the Western Australian Tourism Commission, and what, if any, payment liability remains?
- (6) What total payment has been made to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of its report with Rothwells Limited on the State Government Insurance Office and the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust?
- (7) What total payment has been made to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of its report on the operations of the State Superannuation Board?
- (8) What total payment has been made to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of its report to the Government on the use of computers by local government?
- (9) What total payment has been made to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of the preparation of the book and the holding of country seminars arising from its report on the use of computers by local government?

- (10) What liability remains to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of the item mentioned in the preceding question?
- (11) What total payment has been made or will become due to Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company in respect of its involvement with and the appointment of one of its personnel to the Technology Development Authority?
- (12) Would the Government itemise the different assignments which Messrs Price Waterhouse and Company have carried out for the Government and its statutory authorities since it came to power in 1983?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (12) As the member will appreciate, diversion of considerable resources will be necessary to reply to his questions. In line with the policy of the previous Government, I am not prepared to divert these considerable resources unless the member can more precisely define his area of concern.

HEALTH: OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE COMMISSION

Members

3078. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Who are the members of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Commission?

Mr PARKER replied:

Dr B. McGuirk—Chairman

Mr P. Shaw—Executive Director
Department of Occupational Health
Safety and Welfare

Mr R. George—Director
Office of Industrial Relations

Three nominated for appointment by the
TLC:

Mr R. Reid

Ms S. Mayman

Mr J. McGinty

Three nominated for appointment by the
Confederation of W.A. Industry:

Mr B. McCarthy

Mr J. Spatcher

Mr R. Hannaford

Three nominated for appointment after
consultation between Minister, TLC and
CWAI:

Mr B. Chesson

Mr M. Phillips

Dr R. Gillett

CRIME: CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Reintroduction

3079. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

In view of the 70 per cent popular support for reintroducing capital punishment as reported in opinion polls, is it Government policy to adhere to the Australian Labor Party delegates or to heed the public opinion of the whole community and reintroduce capital punishment?

Mr GRILL replied:

In 1984 Parliament enacted the Acts Amendment (Abolition of Capital Punishment) Act, which had the effect of replacing the death penalty with the alternative mandatory sentences of strict security life imprisonment, life imprison-

ment, or in the case of a child under the age of 18, detention in strict custody until the Governor's pleasure is known. It is not proposed to introduce legislation to reinstate the death penalty.

SEWERAGE: STORM-WATER

Aggregate Volume

3080. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What is the estimated aggregate volume of storm-water being discharged into the Metropolitan Water Authority's sewer?
- (2) How does this compare with the aggregate volume of capacity of the affected sewer and the respective treatment plants?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Throughout the wet months of last year an average of 5 000 cubic metres per day of stormwater infiltrated the metropolitan sewerage system. In some clay soil areas, local wet weather sewer flows reached daily peaks of 250 per cent-400 per cent of the dry weather flow as recorded at pumping stations.
- (2) Because the problem is distributed unevenly, it is not possible to provide any precise answer. However, in badly affected areas the peak infiltration flow can represent a relatively high proportion of total flow. For example last winter it reached 45 per cent of plant capacity at the Westfield Wastewater Treatment Plant.

WATER RESOURCES: DAM

Pemberton

3081. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What is the estimated capital cost of the announced new dam proposed to be built to supply water to the Pemberton Warren Trout Hatchery?
- (2) Where were the plans, specifications and documentations done for the dam, i.e., within the Public Works Department's engineering division or by outside engineers?
- (3) Is the construction going to be done by contract or day labour?
- (4) If by contract, who is going to do the supervision?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) \$375 000.
- (2) In the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department.
- (3) By contract.
- (4) Water Authority of Western Australia.

WATER RESOURCES: UNDERGROUND

Monitoring

3082. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

According to the routine monitoring of the ground water table levels in and around the metropolitan area, could it be said that the 1984 peak levels and the 1983-84 average levels have returned to the normal averages which preceded the five-year long drought period in the 1970s?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Metropolitan groundwater is continuing to recover from the low levels brought about by the drought of the mid to late seventies. For the information of the House I table a graph which shows water table levels taken at nine representative sites in the metropolitan area.

WAR MEMORIAL: BUCKLAND HILL

Resiting: Cost

3083. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What was the total cost of the re-siting of the obelisk at the Buckland Hill Service Reservoir, not including the cost of roofing the reservoir itself?
- (2) What is the cost of landscaping, and who is going to bear the cost—the Metropolitan Water Authority or the Mosman Park Town Council?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) \$82 000.
- (2) Estimated cost to the Metropolitan Water Authority of landscaping is \$43 000. This is in addition to the landscaping work around Buckland Hill by the Mosman Park Town Council.

ACTS AMENDMENT (ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION) BILL

Responsibility

3084. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for the Environment:

Adverting to his second reading speech on the Acts Amendment (Environmental Legislation) Bill 1985 would he please explain—

- (a) what are the environmental; and
- (b) what are the other components, of the air and noise control responsibilities/functions of the occupational health division of the Health Department?

Mr DAVIES replied:

Air pollution and noise relate either to the environment, in which case any member of the community may be affected, or to the worker in the workplace.

Air pollution control is generally regarded as a wholly environmental function since waste gases from industry are normally discharged into the atmosphere through chimneys, vents or extractor fans. However, the worker may be exposed to noise levels, by virtue of his employment, which may impair his hearing over a period of time.

Environmental noise is primarily a matter of nuisance—traffic and aircraft noise, excessively noisy equipment, industrial noise as it affects people outside the factory fence, and entertainment and domestic noise.

The Government therefore proposes to relocate the Clean Air Section into the Environment Portfolio, however the Noise Control Section will be split between the Environment Portfolio, in respect of environmental noise control, and the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Commission in respect of hearing conservation.

ENVIRONMENT: COOPERS MILL

Restoration: Cost

3085. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) What was the final cost of the restoration of and additions to Cooper's Mill on Cullenup Island, Yunderup, including the ancillary works of extending

water supply, building toilet facilities, paths, a jetty and reinforcement of river banks?

- (2) How was this cost divided between the Peel Inlet Management Authority, the Shire of Murray, the Public Works Department and Commonwealth Employment Programme allocations?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) The final cost of the restoration and additions to Cooper's Mill on Culleenup Island, Yunderup, including the work of extending the water supply, building toilet facilities, paths, seating, tree planting, jetty and reinforcement of the river banks was \$74 422.27.

- (2) This cost was divided as follows—

	\$
Peel Inlet Management Authority:	
Materials and equipment hire	5 750.76
Administration, supervision and labour	6 000.00
Shire of Murray:	14 376.00
Public Works Department	—
Wage Pause Programme:	48 295.51
	<hr/>
	74 422.27

PLANNING: APPEALS

Levy

3086. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Planning:

By what number is the Government expected to reduce appeals against town planning decisions to the Minister by introducing the \$40.00 levy for such appeals?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The fee is to assist in meeting administrative costs of the appeal system and is not expected to result in any significant reduction in the number of appeals lodged.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: JURIE

Breakwaters: Construction

3087. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) By what means is the construction of the rubble mound breakwaters at Jurien boat harbour being done—
(a) by contract, or

(b) by day labour force?

- (2) If by contract, who is the contractor and what is the contract price?

- (3) If by day labour—

(a) by which department is the labour force being employed;

(b) under what professional supervision; and

(c) what is the estimated cost of the total construction?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) By contract.

- (2) W.A. Limestone Co. and Italia Limestone Co. The contract award amount based on the tendered schedule of rates was \$997 510.00.

- (3) Not applicable.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

TAXES AND CHARGES: TAX SUMMIT

Submission: Publication

980. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

I point out to the Premier that yesterday the Deputy Premier, in the Premier's absence, disclosed that the Government had made a submission to the Economic Planning Advisory Council about the tax summit. He also said that the submission would be made public by EPAC. Will the Premier table or send me a copy of the submission before we sit again?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I will certainly consider the request made by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition is probably aware that a white paper will be produced as an amalgamational collation of the different submissions from different Governments, organisations, and groups, and that white paper is shortly to be released. I have not discussed this matter with the Deputy Premier whose department prepared the submission in the first place before forwarding it to my department. I will do so and, if it is considered appropriate, the Leader of the Opposition will be sent a copy before we meet again.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

State Position

981. Mr D. L. SMITH, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a Press release by the member for Vasse of 17 March 1985, which in its lead paragraph said—

"Because of the State Government's actions, the dairy industry has been sold down the drain and was totally used up in one of the worst forms of political actions akin to Judaism ever seen in Western Australia," said Shadow Minister for South-West Development, Barry Blaikie.

- (2) Will the Minister for Agriculture please tell the House what action he has taken or proposes to take to present the position of the State Government and the dairy industry position to the Commonwealth Government?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The member for Vasse has chosen to raise his own racial and religious prejudices in a debate on milk. Why would any member want to denigrate Jews and the religion of the Jews in this fashion? Only the member for Vasse could explain how Judaism—defined in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, new edition 1982 as the "religion of the Jews or Jews collectively"—is akin to one of the worst forms of political actions. I am abhorred by the member for Vasse's attempt to denigrate Jews and the Jewish religion in his comments on the milk industry. The member for Vasse's comments on the milk industry are blatantly political.

The Government has consulted the WA dairy industry about milk marketing arrangements over many months.

At the recent PIA dairy industry section meeting at Bunbury, the president, David Partridge, praised me and the State Government's support for the WA industry.

It is apparent that the member for Vasse has failed to consult with, or understand the problems of the dairy industry. He has failed to make any constructive or positive suggestions on the problem of the dairy industry.

The Government and the industry are still committed to the Victorian/ADIC

plan which was rejected by the Commonwealth.

The State Government's position is clearly understood by the other State and the Federal Governments. However, I am concerned at the damage the Federal milk marketing scheme will do to WA industry.

A meeting with representatives of producers, processors, the Dairy Industry Authority and the Department of Agriculture was held last Monday. At this meeting all sections of the Western Australian dairy industry and the State Government were united in their opposition to the Federal Government's new dairy marketing plan. The new plan is a disaster for dairy farmers in WA.

Under the Federal scheme, WA dairymen would not only have to pay out millions of dollars in levies to subsidise the grossly overproducing Victorian industry, but could have to contend with Eastern States milk being sold in WA.

An interstate milk war could see many WA dairymen go to the wall. There are grave concerns in the industry that under the Federal plan the continuous supply of fresh milk to WA consumers may be at risk.

I have advised the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (John Kerin) of the State Government's and the dairy industry's total opposition to the Commonwealth milk marketing plan. The Premier has also telexed the Prime Minister advising him of the State Government's concern over the Government's proposal. I have requested that Mr Kerin and my department prepare a study on the social and economic impact of the Federal milk marketing plan in the south-west of Western Australia.

To minimise the effect of any interstate milk war, contingency plans will be drawn up quickly. Also the health aspects of interstate milk trade will be investigated. The quality control requirements imposed on milk producers and processors in the Eastern States will be checked to see whether they comply with Western Australian requirements. There is no way the State Government will allow an inferior product to be marketed in WA.

The industry representatives who attended the meeting were very disappointed that the Federal Government, which purports to support consensus decision making, did not agree to the position agreed to by all State Governments: that is, the Victorian ADIC scheme.

Mr MacKinnon: Is this an answer to a question, or is it a speech?

Mr EVANS: It is a detailed reply.

It is grimly ironic that WA, a State which has restructured its own dairy industry, should be caught up in a national dairy industry restructuring plan. If no action is taken and the current marketing arrangements for dairy products break down, WA will be exposed to fierce competition from the Eastern States.

TOURISM: HOLIDAY WA CENTRE

Merlin Building: Letting Agent

982. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware that the letting agent for the office now occupied by the WA Tourism Commission in the Merlin Centre is the Richard Ellis Group?
- (2) Is he aware that the cost of renting that space is \$200 a square metre in rent and \$80 a square metre in outgoings?
- (3) Is the Premier also aware that the Richard Ellis Group is headed in Western Australia by Mr Warren Tucker, a member of the WA Tourism Commission?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) I was not aware of those facts, but I should remind the member that in regard to taking any space in the Merlin Centre the present Government honoured an undertaking by the previous Government.

Mr MacKinnon: We never undertook to take any space in the retail section.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We got that for nothing.

Mr MacKinnon: For 12 months.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes, for 12 months but we got it for nothing because when we found out what we had been committed to by the previous Government we drove a hard bargain.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am trying to answer the question.

This Government was committed to take space in the Merlin Centre by the previous Government. As I understand it—I am relying on my memory—the Government refused to immediately honour the undertaking, but when it received certain assurances from the proprietors it honoured that undertaking.

The only reason the present Government is taking any space in the Merlin Centre is that the previous Government committed it to do so. The Government would not have taken retail space had it not been committed to take other space in the centre.

Mr MacKinnon: In other words, the Government decided to take space for the Holiday WA Centre, not the WA Tourism Commission.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Government decided to take space to honour the previous Government's undertaking.

Mr MacKinnon: You said the Tourism Commission at the Merlin is there because of the Government's instruction and not the commission's decision.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I understand that the matter was attended to by the appointed commissioners.

Mr MacKinnon: For the renting of that office space?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is part of the arrangement to which the Government was committed.

The previous Government committed the present Government to take space in the Merlin Centre. The Government was not content to take space on the basis of the previous Government's arrangement and it drove a hard bargain which included retail space, as well as the lower rents that were being asked for, and as well as the significantly worthwhile return for the rent of that space.

Had we not been bound by an undertaking of the previous Government we would not be in the Merlin Centre.

ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Joint Unions Advisory Council

983. Mr BURKETT, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

What benefits have flowed from the establishment of the joint unions advisory council within the State Energy Commission?

Mr PARKER replied:

In February 1984, a joint unions advisory council was established and its charter was signed last month. Without such a charter the value of the council would be limited. The council has become a forum for discussion of issues that are of interest to State Energy Commission employees across the board. It is felt that this is the appropriate structure to deal with issues such as industrial democracy, social welfare, equal opportunity, and occupational health and safety. It is recognised that industrial democracy means different things to different people and the SEC workers are being encouraged to discuss what benefits should be sought, rather than having a rigid definition of industrial democracy foisted on them. All the unions involved have expressed their optimism regarding the future of this council. Potential disputes have been averted since the unions have been able to air their grievances to the council.

TECHNOLOGY: COMPUTERS

Government Departments

984. Mr CLARKO, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the State Tender Board called a tender for the supply of computing and information technology for the Education Department, Health Department of Western Australia, and the Police Department, for a three year period.
- (2) If the answer to question (1) is "Yes", would the Health Department's initial and conversion costs be an estimated \$20 million?
- (3) Is it a viable alternative to upgrade the existing machines in the Health Department at an estimated cost of \$1 million?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) I did receive some notice of this question. Unfortunately, as the member for Karrinyup would realise, it falls

largely within the province of the Deputy Premier and Minister for Technology to whom the Department of Industrial Development is responsible. He left to go to Kalgoorlie at about 6.30 this morning. I have been unable to speak to him about it. It might also be of interest for the member to know that the Tender Board falls within the responsibility of the Minister for Budget Management. On that basis, although I did initiate some inquiries, I have not had time to get the details.

Mr Clarko: Should I address the question to Mr Berinson?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Either to Mr Berinson or the Deputy Premier.

Mr Thompson: In other words, you don't know.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I suggest the member for Karrinyup address his question to the Deputy Premier and take no notice of the member for Kalamunda. He will get an answer as soon as possible.

WORKS: PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Architectural Division: Reform

985. Mrs BEGGS, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Minister seen a report in today's *The West Australian* regarding savings of taxpayers' monies from reform to the Public Works Department's architectural division?
- (2) If he has seen it, would he care to comment?

Mr McIVER replied:

I thank the member for ample notice of the question.

- (1) Yes. I have taken note of the report on page 3 of today's *The West Australian*.
- (2) The report is accurate in its summary of staff movements, accounting for a saving of some \$48 million in salaries. Total savings will reach over \$61 million over 5 years. I do, however, reject the assertion of the Civil Service Association that the restructuring was mishandled. It was handled with due concern for the welfare of all staff and continued harmony in the workplace.

AGRICULTURE: RURAL SECTOR HARDSHIP

Loans

986. Mr OLD, to the Premier:

Some notice of my question has been given. In view of the advice of the Minister for Agriculture that \$2.8 million was to be made available for loans to farmers of \$40 000 to \$60 000 in necessitous cases, will the Premier advise—

- (1) Is the \$2.8 million the balance of the \$5 million made available to relieve hardship last year?
- (2) As there will no doubt be a flood of applications, will the Premier advise whether he is prepared to make further funds available immediately the present funds are allocated?
- (3) Will any moves be made by Government to ensure that the loans, when granted, will be made available to the farmer and not used by lending institutions to reduce existing debts?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The question of additional funding will be considered if and when the \$2.8 million is fully utilised.
- (3) It is normal policy of the Rural Adjustment Authority to ensure that carry on loans are not used to reduce existing debts.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: STIRLING CITY COUNCIL

Chinese Restaurant Rezoning: Queen's Counsel Opinion

987. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Is it a fact that the City of Stirling gave the Minister a copy of a Queen's Counsel opinion which found that the Minister had abused his statutory power in directing the City of Stirling to rezone residential land in Nollamara as an Australian Labor Party Chinese restaurant?
- (2) To enable the City of Stirling to be adequately informed of the relevant facts in order properly to consider the Minister's request that it rezone the land for an ALP Chinese restaurant, will the Minister forward a copy of Mr D. K.

Malcolm's opinion to the City of Stirling?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) I will give consideration to that request. I understand that the City of Stirling sought from my office today a copy of the legal opinion which the Government sought through the Crown Law Department on the legality of the action which I undertook. I have indicated to the House the legal course of action which the Government has followed. It has been in accordance with a legal opinion I had from Mr Malcolm, QC. However, this kind of exchange of legal opinions is a slightly unusual process, as I understand it, because I did not seek from the City of Stirling a copy of Mr Viner's opinion. I might tell members of the House that I had a copy of it before the council met to consider Mr Viner's opinion. I have read his opinion and I do not think much of it. However, it has not normally been the case that parties to potential legal action exchange legal opinions beforehand to try to assess the kinds of legal options open to each side. So when the request from the City of Stirling came to my office today I said that it was not to be complied with on the basis that the matter was likely to land before the courts and as far as I know it is not the normal thing to provide the other party to a potential court action with the legal advice available. It seemed a very unusual request to me.

However, if the City of Stirling wants to persist with the request for a copy of Mr Malcolm's opinion, I will confer with officers of the Crown Law Department and if they see no objection to that opinion being made available, I will accede to the request. If I thought that giving the City of Stirling a copy of the opinion would lead to a resolution of this vexed question, which is holding up millions of dollars of development in the area, I would do so. If the City of Stirling wanted to reassure itself about the legality of my action, I would be only too happy to make that opinion available.

Mr Court interjected.

Mr PEARCE: All that is required is for the City of Stirling to fulfill its legal obligations. If I were the member for

Nedlands I would take more notice of what is going on at the Nedlands Park Hotel than of developments on the Wanneroo Road. Many of his constituents want to know what he is doing about that situation.

Mr Clarko: It is completely corrupt, what you are doing.

Mr PEARCE: It is quite legal.

Mr Clarko: It is corrupt and you are blackmailing the City of Stirling. It has never happened before.

Mr PEARCE: The member for Karrinyup is quite right; never before in the history of this State has a legally-made requirement by the Minister for Planning to a local government authority not been complied with. I have been Minister for Planning for four or five months and in that short time I have dealt with some hundred requirements of local government authorities to make amendments to their schemes. Not one of them has acted as the City of Stirling has.

Mr Clarko interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Henderson): Order! The member for Karrinyup will come to order.

Mr PEARCE: I shall not be drawn by the member for Karrinyup into that kind of thing but I am acting precisely in accordance with decisions made before I became Minister for Planning and in accordance with the legal powers I have.

Mr Clarko: It is a rort.

Mr PEARCE: I will go one step further; I am prepared to discuss with the Mayor of the City of Stirling, Mr Tyzack, the purpose for which the City of Stirling is seeking to have this opinion. If it is on the ground that it wishes to see in all honesty and sincerity precisely what the legal situation is in order to make an honest decision, that is one thing. If on the other hand, it simply wants to know the details of the legal advice we have received and the action we shall take in order to be better prepared to contest a court case against the Government, obviously we shall not make that information available under those circumstances.

Although the City of Stirling may have felt it was making Mr Viner's opinion available for my information, I cannot help but believe that its purpose in mak-

ing it widely available was in order to publicise the libels it contained against me in particular in a way which could give those libels some credibility.

Mr Viner may find himself paying for those libels through other political processes.

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY: JOHN CURTIN FOUNDATION

Donors: Government Employment

988. Mr D. L. SMITH, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Leader of the House seen a report in today's edition of *The West Australian* which contained claims by the member for Dale that people who made cash donations to the ALP's John Curtin Foundation were being guaranteed jobs with the State Government?
- (2) Is he able to comment on the veracity of those allegations?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) I thank the member for Mitchell for adequate notice of the question. Yes, I have seen the report referred to. However, I am advised that in accordance with the Opposition's general attitude towards these sorts of allegations no evidence was proffered.

I hasten to add that it is highly unlikely that any evidence will be forthcoming because the allegations have all the accuracy of a third-hand betting tip.

The member for Dale said that he has been told that most of the regular contributors to the Curtin Foundation are or have been employed by the State Government. He does not say who told him that, who has been employed, or what evidence he has that they have been guaranteed employment. When the member for Dale made those allegations he knew he could not prove them.

When the member for Gascoyne made a series of vile allegation two weeks ago about the Western Australian tourism commissioners, he also knew he could not prove them.

Several members interjected.

Mr TONKIN: Where is the hard evidence?

Mr Laurance: It will come forward.

Before the accusations are made, the evidence should be there. One does not make an accusation like that and then wait for weeks to prove it.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Henderson): Order!

Mr TONKIN: This Opposition realises it faces an election in less than 12 months and it has no leadership, policies, programmes, or spirit. In the absence of any qualities which might make a thinking voter change his mind and vote Liberal, the Opposition has decided to throw as much mud as possible in the hope some of it will stick.

ROTTNEST ISLAND: DEVELOPMENT

Submissions: Extension of Time

989. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

In view of the fact that—

- (a) there was a clerical error with regard to the closing date for submissions on the Rottneest Island management planning group report; and
 - (b) there was a shortage of copies of the report so that people had only just received some;
- will the Minister extend the date for receiving submissions a further four weeks?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (a) and (b) I thank the member for some notice of this question. I believe only a few copies of the report had the insertion showing the June closing date instead of 31 May. I do not think that is relevant to whether or not the time allowed is sufficient for people to assess the report and make a comment. In this case it is believed that two months, or eight weeks, is sufficient time.

Mr Stephens: You are not overlooking the fact there was a shortage of copies and some people could not get them?

Mr DAVIES: This shortage has been remedied by the statement I am about to make. An advertisement was placed in the Press regarding the closing date.

It is now only 4 April, as I understand it, give or take a day or two. This means that there are still almost eight full

weeks during which time comments can be received. I do not think anyone is being seriously handicapped either by the mistake in regard to the date or the initial shortage of copies. It is still eight weeks to 31 May. It was intended to have an eight-week public comment period. We are constantly being asked to hurry that environmental process and the department is trying to do just that.

Eight weeks has been assessed as a reasonable time. I have just pointed out that eight weeks still remain. The shortage of copies initially has been corrected, and unless any real reason why the date should be extended can be shown, the period of eight weeks is sufficient.

WATER RESOURCES: WATER AUTHORITY

Annual Report: Award

990. Mr TROY, to the Minister for Water Resources:

In winning the Royal Australian Institute of Public Administration's inaugural W. S. Lonnie Award for producing the best annual report for 1983-84 of any Government department or instrumentality, was the Metropolitan Water Authority mindful of a growing need and requirement for Government bodies to report on efficiency, accountability, and performance measurement? If so, could the Minister elaborate more fully on the background to the Water Authority's successful achievement?

Mr TONKIN replied:

I was delighted to see this happen. The award was given to the Metropolitan Water Authority for producing the best report and, indeed, it is an excellent report. I am told that, since that announcement, the authority has been deluged with requests for copies of the report. The other day I was a little disappointed, because after I was asked to present the award on behalf of the Premier, I received a phone call from the office of the Minister for Local Government to the effect that that Minister had bagged the opportunity to do so. So the Minister for Local Government was the one who presented the award, although I would have been delighted to do so.

In any case, the MWA is to be congratulated on the quality of this report. I point out how well the MWA is operating and what a remarkable transformation has taken place in this organisation in the last two years.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Short-term Money Market: Commencement of Operations

991. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Western Australian Development Corporation commenced handling the investment of the Treasury short-term cash surpluses?
- (2) If not, when will it be taking over that function?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) I am sorry that I cannot answer the question by saying "Yes" or "No". I know that either plans are well advanced or that the corporation is handling the investment of some of the funds; but I do not know whether the day has been reached when it has assumed that responsibility.

DEFENCE: MARITIME

Vulnerability: North-west

992. Mrs BUCHANAN, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of recent reports in *The West Australian* by the Chief of Naval Staff and the State Opposition that warn of the vulnerability of Australia's offshore resources and territories, particularly in the north-west of the State?
- (2) Does he agree with those warnings?
- (3) If so, what is being done to rectify the situation?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes, I am aware of the recent Press reports about the lack of defence in the north-west. In fact, the Deputy Premier and Minister for Defence Liaison (Mr Bryce) met Vice-Admiral Leach last Tuesday, at which time they discussed the potential security problems which might face the rich resource pro-

jects in the north-west region. They agreed that more needed to be done to protect these vital national assets. -

I might just say that our concern for the defence of the north-west has been a longstanding one. I wish I could say the same for members opposite, who seem to have undergone a refreshing change and are only now taking an interest in the capability of Australia's defence forces to defend the more remote regions of the State.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The only thing we did not lose when the Liberal Party was in office was the post office. We lost everything else. In the Opposition's case, it becomes a question of charity. We appointed a Minister for Defence Liaison and we have, assisted by the Federal Government, consistently drawn attention to these difficulties. What did the Opposition do?

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Tell us what the Opposition did.

Mr Clarko interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Karrinyup is the unexpurgated version of the battle of the bulge!

Mr Thompson: You did not know where the north-west was—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What did the member for Kalamunda do when he was in Government to solve any of these defence problems? The member for Kalamunda has gone suddenly quiet. What did he do? What did the member for Karrinyup do? The member for Karrinyup has been consistently antidefence in all the time he has been here. If that is not the case, what has he done?

Mr Clarko: I have been trying to defend you all the time, but it is too much of a battle!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What has the member for Karrinyup done? He has done nothing. I have given him opportunity after opportunity and what has he done? The only thing the Liberal Government managed to do was to run the *Voyager* into the *Melbourne*.

We all remember the long list of promises—usually dragged out in the week

before a State election—about patrol boat bases at Port Hedland, submarines at Cockburn Sound, \$50 million to be spent on an air base at Derby, none of which was ever heard of again after the election was safely over. That was the case until a Labor Government was elected. Until Labor was elected, all of those hot air promises in which the member for Karrinyup specialises were just that.

When Labor was elected there was a transformation—in the same way as they called upon John Curtin during the darkest hours of World War II to save the country and in the same way as Bob Menzies agreed to draw a line just beneath Brisbane!

Good God, why are the members opposite so touchy on defence? I would have thought they would applaud the Government. Not only are we the only Government to seriously put forward a national service scheme, but also we have done more about defence in the two years we have been in office than members opposite did in 22 years. The land was laid bare in open invitation to people when members opposite were in Government. Listen to what we have done.

Mr Thompson: What about the MX missile?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I would like to shoot one at the member!

I am pleased to say that this Government has, in co-operation with our Federal colleagues, achieved more in improving our western defences in two years, despite a climate of financial stringency, than the Opposition managed to achieve in nine years.

Our defence could not have rapidly deteriorated to such an alarming degree as the Opposition claims in the two years we have been in Government. What were members opposite doing for nine years? What was the member for Murray-Wellington doing for nine years? Would he list the things he was doing? He was doing nothing, and while he was doing nothing down at Harvey, all the Opposition members who were then in Government were doing nothing up here. But we were not.

We expect the destroyer-escort *Swan* to be based at HMAS *Stirling* by the end of the year. A submarine escape training

facility is virtually certain to be located at *Stirling* too.

In the north-west, a number of initiatives have been taken. A regional co-ordination centre is being established at Broome in a \$3.6 million expansion of coastal surveillance activity for the north-west coast.

The Minister for Defence announced in January that a regional surveillance army unit, similar to NORFORCE, will be developed in the Pilbara in the next five years.

What happened in the nine years members opposite were in Government? Absolutely nothing was done. Members opposite should be ashamed of themselves. They were let off the hook in a period of abnormally long peace by paying the penalty of being so lax about defence.

The RAAF air base at Derby will have \$9.5 million spent on it this year, a large increase on previous expenditure under former Governments.

Of course, the State Government will not be satisfied with only these achievements, notable though they are. We have repeatedly reminded the Federal Government of its 1976 White Paper commitment to establish a patrol boat base at Port Hedland, where the Navy currently has a "right of first refusal" on facilities at Finucane Island.

I am hopeful that the defence capability review being conducted by Mr Paul Dibb for the Minister for Defence will add further support to the shift that is already occurring in the structure of our nation's defence resources, which recognise that the north-west is much more likely to be the source of any security or military problems and that it does not make sense, therefore, to concentrate most of our forces in the south-east corner of the nation.

If it has not been this Government, who has it been who has pushed so hard for submarines to be built here? We have pushed in a way that has made that a possibility. And who has been responsible for the encouraging commitments that have been made in respect of phasing in part of the submarine fleet? It was not members opposite. They did nothing in 9 years. We could have had an invasionary force of one million in the

north-west and they would not have known.

MINERALS: DIAMONDS

Dispute: Mr Tom Butler

993. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

I preface my question by indicating that it is interesting that the Premier talks about the HMAS *Stirling* base that was established by a previous Liberal Government. My question is as follows—

What action if any has the Premier's adviser on industrial relations, Mr Tom Butler, taken to assist to resolve the Argyle industrial dispute between the TWU and the AWU? I remind the Premier that Mr Butler, the President of the ALP, is paid by the taxpayers.

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I am pleased to be able to announce to the House—and I hope it will be greeted in the generous manner for which the Opposition is noted for greeting these things, that the Argyle dispute appears to have been settled.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know what we are going to do to get the Opposition—

Mr MacKinnon: Has it been settled or does it appear to have been settled?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am informed that it has been settled.

Mr MacKinnon: You said it appears to have been settled. It either is settled or it is not settled.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am informed that it has been settled.

Mr MacKinnon: You are not sure that it has been settled?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will grasp at straws—

Mr MacKinnon: No, he won't.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: He can check for himself and form his own opinions about whether it is settled or not. We would prefer to settle it and we understand it has been settled. I have not spoken with the Minister for Industrial Relations because I have been preoccupied with Parliament. I know that members of the Op-

position would prefer it not to be settled; I realise that. I simply say that contrary to the way in which the previous Government turned the knife in every industrial dispute that it could put the knife into, the present Government prefers—

Mr MacKinnon: To run away from them, to give in to the bully boys!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Henderson): Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Who can deny that Mr Collier brought down his decision last Thursday and within a week of that decision being brought down the matter has been settled? I thought the Opposition would have been pleased to hear that.

Mr Clarko: Thirty-four days!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Within a day or two of the commissioner bringing down his recommendation the Government was represented at a conference called before the commissioner, and it put forward a point of view which has resulted a day or two later in the dispute being resolved.

That may be something that deprives members of the Opposition of some political warmth, but I am sure that the people of this State understand that the confrontationist and deliberately provocative actions of the previous Government when it sought to exacerbate industrial disputes served nobody any good, and that has been demonstrated by the fact that in many days lost through industrial disruption the present Government's record is far better during a period of wage restraint than it was during the time for which the previous Government was responsible.

Mr Butler is now working with the Minister for Industrial Relations as part of his staff. I understand it is so, but not having any notice of the question, I cannot detail that he has been involved in assisting the Minister with advice. If the member puts the question on the Notice Paper I will give him a detailed response in regard to all the occasions on which Mr Butler has tendered advice and all of the aspects of this matter to which that advice related.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES:
DEPARTMENTS

Changes: Burke Government

994. Mr BRIAN BURKE (Premier):

In response to question 2807 of 20 March 1985 I promised to advise the member for Floreat in writing of an answer to a question he asked. I also

indicated during debate on a subsequent matter that I would provide the information in the House at the same time.

I seek leave to table this copy of my letter to the member together with the notes that are attached to it.

Leave granted.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 587.)
