

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 4 July 1985

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Barnett) took the Chair at 10.00 a.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (16): ASSENT

Messages from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Acts Amendment and Repeal (Water Authorities) Bill.
2. Health Amendment Bill.
3. Rural Reconstruction and Rural Adjustment Schemes Amendment Bill.
4. Land Tax Assessment Amendment Bill.
5. Bunbury Railway Lands Bill.
6. Strata Titles Bill.
7. Local Government Amendment Bill.
8. Reserves and Land Revestment Bill.
9. Perpetual Trustees W.A. Ltd., Amendment Bill.
10. Supply Bill.
11. Acts Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill.
12. Acts Amendment (Environmental Legislation) Bill.
13. Industrial Relations Amendment Bill.
14. Commercial Tenancy (Retail Shops) Agreements Bill.
15. Dampier Port Authority Bill.
16. Workers' Compensation and Assistance Amendment Bill.

MINERALS: ASBESTOS

Departmental Records: Ministerial Statement

MR PARKER (Fremantle—Minister for Minerals and Energy) [10.07 a.m.]: Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

MR PARKER: I thank the House for its courtesy.

I have to advise the House that information has recently been brought to my attention regarding Mines Department records of asbestos mining and milling operations at Wittenoom during the period 1946-1966.

I regret that Parliament was incorrectly advised in 1979 that all Mines Department files pertaining to the health risks of asbestos mining at Wittenoom had been destroyed.

In response to recent requests from the Asbestos Diseases Society, the Mines Department initiated a thorough search of its files held in Perth and at

district offices in Kalgoorlie and Karratha. This has shown that although a number of files have indeed been destroyed pursuant to standard practice in these matters, a lot of file material is still preserved relating to the health of workers employed at Wittenoom from 1946 until the mine closed in 1966. This material is being made available to solicitors representing the Asbestos Diseases Society, individuals who contracted asbestos-related diseases after working at Wittenoom, and Midalco Pty. Ltd. as the successor to Australian Blue Asbestos Pty. Ltd.

I now wish to correct answers given to parliamentary questions in 1979 and to enlarge on an answer given in 1978. On Wednesday, 9 August 1978, Question 1070 was asked by Mr Harman, the member for Maylands, of the Minister for Mines. It read—

When did the Mines Department first become aware of dangers of asbestos mining and milling and cancers of the lungs?

The answer given was—

It was known in the 1930s that asbestos was harmful to health and this would have been within the knowledge of the Mines Medical Officer.

This answer is accurate as far as it goes, but it should be added that the first specific reference on Mines Department files to the dangers of asbestos inhalation is dated 27 January 1948.

On Wednesday, 2 May 1979, question 644, again by the member for Maylands to the Minister for Mines, read as follows—

Adverting to Question 1070 of 1978, will he advise the earliest date that the Department of Mines advised the company operating at Wittenoom of the health risks of asbestos mining?

The answer given was—

... The files pertaining to this action have been destroyed in accordance with normal destruction procedures for closed files.

This statement was incorrect; the response should have been—

The major dust problem at Wittenoom was first pointed out by an inspector of mines following a visit to the mine and mill in 1946, although at that time silicosis would have been perceived as the health hazard. The specific danger of asbestosis was recognised in 1948.

Question 747 was asked on Thursday, 10 May 1979, once again by the member for Maylands of the Minister for Mines. It read—

When was the earliest date that the Mines Department inspectors informed the department of the health hazards of mining and milling of asbestos at Wittenoom?

The answer given was—

See answer to question 644.

The corrected response to question 644, given above, answers question 747.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [10.11 a.m.]: I thank the Minister for some advance notice of his statement. There is very little to be said about the matter except to remind the House that the question of whether files in a large department are in existence or have been destroyed is such a technical matter that it obviously cannot be known to any Minister. Information on such matters is provided by the officers of the department. I take it that the facts included in the statement made by the Minister were based on recent advice from departmental officers in the same way as I am quite sure my respective answers to parliamentary questions were also based on advice I received at that time.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: I call the Minister for Education.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Point of Order

Mr THOMPSON: I have just this moment been provided with a sheet which sets out the proposed order in which business will be taken today. Mr Deputy Speaker, you will recall that before you gave the call to the Minister for Education, with regard to those matters which I understand have been arranged behind the Chair, I was in the process of making a request that you give me an opportunity to give notice of a motion.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: In fact, as I see the day's business proceeding and with my knowledge of the next motion to be moved, notices of motions will be called for throughout the day. In any event I will ensure that the member has the opportunity to put his notice of motion before the end of the day's sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Standing Orders Suspension

MR PEARCE (Armadale—Minister for Education) [10.14 a.m.]: I move, without notice—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the

“North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill” to be introduced without notice, to pass through all its remaining stages on the day it is introduced, and to enable Messages from the Legislative Council relating to that Bill to be dealt with on the day they are received;

And further—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Leader of the Opposition to move the following motion without notice—

This House of the Parliament of Western Australia expresses to the Federal Government its firm opposition to proposals for new forms of taxation as detrimental, if introduced, to the interests of the people of Western Australia, and believing that real tax reform requires tax reduction, calls on the Federal Government to produce, in association with the States, a “white paper” on Federal and State expenditure and borrowings to lead to a plan to reduce and eliminate deficits.

Question put.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: To be passed, this motion requires the concurrence of an absolute majority. I have counted the House; and, there being no dissentient voice, I declare the question carried.

Question thus passed.

NORTH WEST GAS DEVELOPMENT (WOODSIDE) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Parker (Minister for Minerals and Energy), and read a first time.

Second Reading

MR PARKER (Fremantle—Minister for Minerals and Energy) [10.20 a.m.]: Before I commence I advise the House that representatives of the North-West Shelf joint venturers are present this morning in the Speaker's Gallery.

I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to ratify a variation agreement between the State and the joint venturers to the north-west gas development (Woodside) agreement to provide for a division of the project into two venturers, the Domgas venture relating to domestic gas sold to SECWA and the LNG venture relating to LNG for export to

Japan; and to recognise two separate Domgas and LNG joint venture groups for the subsequent introduction of Mitsui and Mitsubishi—MIMI—into the LNG venture.

Members will note that Mitsui and Mitsubishi are not parties to the variation agreement and that both the Domgas and LNG joint ventures are made up of identical participation. As I will describe later, however, Mitsui and Mitsubishi will enter the project by way of assignment after the Act the subject of this Bill is proclaimed.

Yesterday I provided MIMI with a letter signifying my approval to their entry to the LNG project.

It is now appropriate for me to describe the events leading to the proposed restructuring of the project and the Bill before the House.

A memorandum of intent was signed by Japanese buyers to purchase LNG in July 1981. Since that time negotiations have been proceeding to finalise a gas sales and purchase agreement for liquefied natural gas.

In December 1983, Woodside announced a proposed ownership restructuring to provide for six equal partners in the LNG venture which would include ownership of the resource, offshore facilities and the LNG plant. The ownership of the domestic gas venture would remain unchanged. Mitsui and Mitsubishi were approached to participate in the project as the additional sixth participant to have a one-sixth interest in the LNG venture.

In June 1984, Mitsui and Mitsubishi announced that they had decided to participate in a one-sixth interest in the LNG venture on a 50/50 basis, subject to the satisfactory conclusion of negotiations with Woodside.

During 1984, extensive negotiations took place with the joint venturers, not only on the splitting of the project into two but also in regard to a whole plethora of other matters, including most importantly the change of the plant design from the previously approved water-cooled, steam turbine plant—the so called WLNG scheme—to the air-cooled, gas turbine plant—the YLNG scheme—and the agreement to the non-extraction of liquefied petroleum gas at Karratha. This latter conversion resulted in LPG being available in the Domgas stream, providing the opportunity for a major new industry, currently being pursued at Kwinana.

In January 1985, State Government approval was given, subject to the acceptance of certain broad principles, to the negotiation of an amendment agreement to the north west gas development (Woodside) agreement to recognise two sep-

arate joint venture groups, each with separate responsibility for the Domgas and LNG ventures.

On 10 May this year, the eight Japanese utility companies initialled a contract with the LNG joint venture participants for the sale of LNG to Japan over a 19-year period commencing October 1989 with provision for a further one-year extension subject to availability of reserves. Production of LNG is scheduled to commence at a rate of about two million tonnes a year, increasing to the full production level of about six million tonnes by 1995.

The eight Japanese electricity and gas utility companies involved in the LNG contract are as follows—

The Tokyo Electric Power Company, Incorporated;
Chubu Electric Power Company, Incorporated;
The Kansai Electric Power Company, Incorporated;
The Chugoku Electric Power Company, Incorporated;
The Kyushu Electric Power Company, Incorporated;
Tokyo Gas Co. Ltd.;
Osaka Gas Co. Ltd.; and,
Toho Gas Co. Ltd.

Previous to this—in March 1985—after discussions between the joint venture participants, State and Commonwealth Government representatives and SECWA, certain modifications to the SECWA contract arrangements between SECWA and the joint venturers were agreed in principle and royalty understandings with the Commonwealth were agreed upon.

These understandings were based on binding sales agreements for the export of LNG to the Japanese buyers being signed by mid-1985, such agreements to provide for delivery of LNG by October 1989.

The Western Australian Government also agreed to an extension of the term set out in the schedule to the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Act 1979 to the year 2025.

It is anticipated that all the necessary final documentation—and this is extensive—will soon be concluded and the LNG venture will then be given the formal go-ahead.

The Domgas and LNG ventures will be the responsibility of a different grouping of ownership interests with, as I have mentioned, Mitsui and Mitsubishi to be a participant only in the LNG venture and some of the existing joint venturers to

have different percentage interests in the two ventures.

The Domgas venture is made up of the following participation—

Woodside Petroleum Development Pty. Ltd.	Woodside Group	%	50
Woodside Oil Ltd.			
Mid-Eastern Oil Ltd.			
California Asiatic Oil Company			16.66
BP Developments Australia Ltd.			16.66
Shell Development (Australia) Proprietary Limited			8.33
BHP Petroleum Pty. Ltd.			8.33

Following assignments under the State agreement as amended by the Bill before the House it is proposed that the LNG venture will be owned in six equal shares by the companies involved in the Domgas venture plus Mitsui and Mitsubishi. This LNG venture will therefore comprise the following participation—

Woodside Petroleum Development Pty Ltd	Woodside Group	%	16.66
Woodside Oil Ltd.			
Mid-Eastern Oil Ltd.			
California Asiatic Oil Company			16.66
BP Developments Australia Ltd.			16.66
Shell Development (Australia) Proprietary Limited			16.66
BHP Petroleum Pty. Ltd.			16.66
Japan Australia LNG—MIMI—Pty. Ltd.			16.66

Woodside Offshore Petroleum Pty. Ltd. will be the operator for both the Domgas and LNG ventures.

Members of the House will also recall that during 1985 BHP and Shell Australia made a successful takeover bid for Woodside Petroleum Development Pty. Ltd. and, as a result, increased their combined shareholding from 42.7 per cent to over 79 per cent thereby gaining a controlling interest in that company's interest in the North-West Shelf project.

I turn now to the specific provisions of the variation agreement scheduled to the Bill before the House which are mostly contained in clause 4 of the document.

In the existing agreement, the term "joint venturers" is defined in the last few lines of the first paragraph of the schedule. Clause 4(1) of the variation agreement deletes these words to allow a wider definition of joint venturers to be included in the definitions clause of the variation agreement.

The variation agreement provides in clause 4(2) for additions and variations to the definitions contained in clause 1 of the principal agreement to accommodate the creation of a Domgas venture and an LNG venture and two separate joint venture groups to operate these ventures.

A requirement for information on proposed marketing arrangements for liquefied petroleum gas is added to clause 7(4) of the principal agreement by clause 4(3) of the variation agreement.

Under clause 4(4) of the variation agreement, a new clause 10A is added which specifies the need for additional proposals to define how proposals already approved and new proposals relate to common property, Domgas property and LNG property, in terms of the ownership structure and rights and obligations of the Domgas joint venturers and LNG joint venturers for the purposes of the Domgas and LNG ventures.

In respect of port matters, clause 13(12) of the principal agreement is replaced through clause 4(5) of the variation agreement. The new clause specifies that the joint venturers, in connection with their use of the port, shall pay charges pursuant to legislation applicable to the port authority which is currently proposed to be the Dampier Port Authority. Members will be aware that a Dampier Port Authority Bill was passed earlier this year.

Clause 19 of the principal agreement is amended by clause 4(6) of the variation agreement to allow leases to be granted to the Domgas and LNG joint venturers or both of them as the case may require.

Clause 4(7) of the variation agreement relates to assignment and provides a new clause 26. The clause follows the usual form for ratified agreements but it is divided into two parts to recognise the separate Domgas and LNG joint venturers.

The clause permits Domgas joint venturers to assign to each other as of right or to third parties subject to the consent of the Minister responsible for the Act and to the assumption by the other party of the relevant obligations. Similar assignment provisions also apply to the LNG joint venturers.

For each assignment a deed of covenant is required to comply with provisions and obligations etc. of the joint venture group and specifying proportionate percentages of each—Domgas or LNG—joint venturer in the appropriate venture immediately prior to and on completion of the assignment.

In the case of the Domgas joint venture any assignment shall not take effect—except as otherwise provided—until there is an assignment of a corresponding right in the relevant gas sale agreement with SECWA and the assignee has executed the deed of covenant required by the gas sale agreement to comply with, observe and perform that agreement.

Provision is made in clause 4(8) of the variation agreement to replace the existing determination clause 30 with a new clause 30 to recognise the two ventures.

The significant point to note is that new clause 30(6) states that a determination to the extent that it relates to the Domgas venture shall not prejudice the rights and obligations of the State and the LNG joint venturers in relation to the LNG venture and vice versa in case of a determination of the LNG venture.

The effect of cessation or determination of the agreement is dealt with in clause 4(9) of the variation. Clause 31 of the principal agreement is split to recognise the Domgas venture and the LNG venture and the basic provisions of the existing clause 31 are maintained.

The new clauses 31(1)(a) and 31(1A)(a) amend the existing clause to recognise the Domgas venture and the LNG venture. New clauses 31(2) and 31(3) have been made to apply only to the cessation of the agreement in its entirety in relation to property rights reverting to the State and the removal of fixed and movable equipment with the State's option to purchase such items.

The new clauses 31(4), (4A), (5), and (5A) deal with determination of only one venture and specify except as otherwise determined that all specific joint venture property shall become and remain the absolute property of the State with the State's option to purchase fixed or movable equipment. This maintains the philosophy of the existing clauses 31(2) and (3) for each venture.

New clause 31(6) specifies that upon determination to the extent that it relates to the Domgas venture, the Domgas joint venturers' interest in common property vests in the LNG joint venture together with all obligations and liabilities. This is subject however to the State or its nominee being granted by the LNG joint venturers the right to use common property as would enable the State to receive and process sufficient natural gas required to meet the quantities and rates of withdrawal priorities expressed in articles V and VII of the SECWA gas sale agreements, with the State or its nominee being obligated to pay a reasonable share of operating costs.

Clause 31(6A) expresses a similar philosophy to that contained in clause 31(6) with respect to a determination in the LNG joint venture, but with common property being vested in the Domgas joint venturers and with the State's right to use.

Under clause 4(10) of the variation the current indemnity, clause 34 of the principal agreement, is amended by a new clause 34 to recognise the two separate Domgas and LNG joint venturers.

The existing clause 37(F), which exempts from stamp duty any agreement relating to the sale of natural gas to which SECWA is a party, has been broadened by clause 4(11) of the variation to include—

- (i) each of the heads of agreement dated 3 July 1985 between the respective Domgas joint venturers and the State Energy Commission;
- (ii) the deed of amendment, incremental gas pricing agreement, and Pilbara purchase agreement to be executed pursuant to each such heads of agreement; and
- (iii) any purchase notice given pursuant to any such Pilbara purchase agreement.

These are documents flowing from the new arrangements between SECWA and the Domgas joint venturers negotiated between the joint venturers and me in February and March this year.

With regard to liability of the joint venturers under the agreement, clause 4(12) of the variation includes a new clause 40 to recognise separate liability of the Domgas joint venturers and the LNG joint venturers.

The marketing authorisation, clause 42 of the principal agreement, is amended by clause 4(13) of the variation agreement to specify that only Domgas joint venturers are authorised to sell gas to SECWA, and subject to gas agreements with SECWA, to market gas in the Pilbara to major industrial customers whose annual average consumption exceeds 1.1 million megajoules per day in circumstances where the total demand for gas in the Pilbara exceeds the quantities available to SECWA under such gas agreements for use in the Pilbara. This amendment is consistent with SECWA arrangements with the Domgas joint venturers.

Clause 4(14) of the variation agreement relates gas sales agreements to the Domgas joint venturers only.

A new clause 44A is included by clause 4(15) of the variation agreement which specifies that all joint venturers shall at all times use the onshore facilities to ensure that the priorities and rates of withdrawal provided for or to be agreed upon or determined pursuant to articles V and VII of the SECWA gas sales agreements are observed.

The term of the agreement has been amended in clause 4(16) of the variation agreement which replaces the current term—clause 46—with a new clause which extends the term of the agreement from 2010 to 2025 and recognises the two separate Domgas and LNG joint venture groups.

An additional clause—clause 46(1A)—provides that the joint venturers shall keep the Minister responsible for the Act informed of their intended arrangements for the utilisation of natural gas processed through the onshore facilities during the years 2010 to 2025, and before entering into any arrangements for the sale, use, supply, or export of such natural gas during those years shall consult and reach agreement with the Minister on the requirements in the State and the manner in which they will be met during those years having regard to requirements for natural gas which the joint venturers could make available on arms-length commercial terms.

Clause 5 of the variation agreement provides a standard clause to the effect that the State will refund any stamp duty paid before ratification of the variation agreement that is eligible for exemption under clause 37 as amended by the variation agreement. To this date I understand no stamp duty has been paid.

The Bill before the House provides that the Act is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This is required to ensure that all documents relating to the restructuring of joint venturer interests and obligations with SECWA and between themselves, together with the variation agreement, are brought into existence at the same time.

Members will, I believe, see the matters addressed herein as a major move towards realisation of a project of considerable benefit to the State.

Over the 15-year construction period some \$8.5 billion will be expended, and, on the figures achieved in the Domgas construction period, over 60 per cent of that sum could be expected to be spent in Western Australia on contracts won by local firms and industries. At the peak of construction activity, in 1987 and 1988, a work force of some 5 000 will be employed and this will require construction of over 300 houses and units in Karratha.

The major components of the LNG phase will be the YLNG plant, LNG storage tanks, and the LNG product loading jetty, two additional offshore facilities—Goodwyn and Rankin B—interconnecting pipelines and supporting infrastructure, and a fleet of seven LNG carriers.

The plant will be the eleventh base-load LNG plant built in the world, and the first in Australia. It will also be the only base-load LNG plant in the world to date to utilise the combination of air cooling instead of water cooling and gas turbines instead of steam turbines.

Before concluding I indicate that what appears before the House today as a comparatively simple document is in fact the product of an extraordinary process begun about 18 months ago.

At the first status meeting I had with the joint venturers after taking on this portfolio it was obvious that the project was a long way off; indeed there were many who said that it would not happen. Gradually, as the joint venturers straightened out their ownership issues and as negotiations proceeded with the Japanese utilities, it became obvious that, with a lot of work on everyone's part, the project was possible. But, to make it economically viable in today's energy world, it required substantial recasting in design and some activities, and in its relationship with the State of Western Australia.

In the past 18 months there has scarcely been a week in which I have not spoken to one or all of the joint venturers on some issue or other, and scarcely a day when one of the officers employed in one of my departments, the SEC, or the Crown Law Department, has not been engaged in discussions or negotiations on issues ranging from royalties to housing, plant design to local content, and a seemingly endless supply of legal documents of all shapes and sizes.

In this exercise I have valued the support, and often patience, of my Cabinet colleagues, and particularly the incredibly hard work of my officers. The public, I am sure, have a preconception of the Public Service that is quite at variance with the facts—certainly as I have experienced them. Within the small Resources Development Department a team co-ordinated the Government's position and negotiated this agreement; in the Mines Department the tiny petroleum division and royalties sections looked after their areas of such importance to the State's future finances; in the State Energy Commission a huge amount of work was done on a myriad of issues and documents; and within Crown Law, Robin Griffiths almost single-handedly looked after the State's legal position, often dealing with dozens of lawyers on the other side.

In the joint venture group I must say that although many of the issues have been hard fought, there has been a willingness to resolve them, a determination to make this project succeed and a great deal of co-operation from the most junior to the most senior levels with Government and me in particular.

There are not too many parts of the world where all these hurdles could be overcome, as they have been here. The litany of fallen or stalled LNG projects—some "ahead" of ours—testifies

to that. That this project is not one of them is a tribute to all of those people I have mentioned and to this great State.

The variation agreement deserves the support of Parliament and I commend the Bill to the House.

MR PETER JONES (Narrogin) [10.39 a.m.]: Firstly, I thank the Minister for his courtesy of providing a copy of the agreement, together with a detailed briefing on it, because this has ensured we can proceed today in a way that the members of this House would like and also in a way that the project deserves. What we are discussing is a Bill to ratify an agreement which amends a very great project, a project which indeed at the present time is one of the very few resource projects in this country which is actually proceeding. It is a project which has been somewhat vilified at times; it has been questioned and, as the Minister has said, it has been the subject of a considerable amount of attention, publicity, and indeed praise, as it rightly has deserved.

When the agreement we are amending was before the Parliament on 27 November 1979, it was the present Deputy Premier who said of this project that he welcomed it and confirmed the Labor Party's support for it. He said it was a project of vital importance to the State for one very great reason, among several reasons which he gave.

The principal reason was that the gas reserves at Dongara would be approaching exhaustion in the mid 1980s, and that it was necessary to start the work of harnessing another energy source, not only for domestic customers who at that time were taking Dongara gas, but also to provide for all the industrial developments, and the expansion that could occur. We knew we were capable of such developments, because we had the components that were a requisite part of those projects, but without energy, those projects would never become a reality.

One other important aspect also emerged at that time—and I refer to the Minister's figures given on 4 September last year when he spoke at the inauguration of the project—was to lower the dependence of Western Australia on imported crude oil. In 1982-83 we were 61 per cent dependent on imported crude oil, but it was estimated that by 1986-87 that dependence would reduce to 49 per cent, and by the year 2000 it would be down to only 33 per cent. That is one of the critical reasons that the project was given birth to; all the detail of which was canvassed in the Parliament in November 1979.

The Parliament has been asked to ratify an agreement which allows the second part of the project to move into those final arrangements re-

garding ownership and the various other matters to which the Minister has referred. The joint venturers will then be able to proceed with the very onerous task—which, indeed, they have already embarked upon—of spending the enormous sum of money which is involved. This Parliament is placing upon them a great responsibility. I hope no members are in any way unsure of or are not acknowledging what we are doing. It is all too easy for us to sit here and discuss this project and refer to it in very glowing terms, to welcome it and refer to what it will mean to this State. However, the actual birth and the fulfilment of that promise does not rest with this Parliament. It rests with a group of companies which have come together to form a joint venture; it rests with their capacity, initiative, willingness, and capital, to deliver on the agreement, and to honour the obligations into which they have entered and which we are acknowledging by ratifying the agreement.

So I hope none of us is unmindful of the responsibility that the participants are taking on. The domestic gas phase which has been referred to lays the foundation for this project, because I am sure that while we welcome this second stage and acknowledge its magnitude, we are also mindful of the fact that there can be no second stage unless there is a first stage, and whatever has been said about the first stage does provide the basis upon which we can discuss the project today and upon which the future LNG export phase will go ahead.

It is worth recording that in 1976-77, when some initial estimates were made regarding how large the project would have to be in order for it to be self-supporting—in other words, of an economic size which could not only sustain and service the capital requirement; but also provide the energy supply that we wanted for the State as well as a sufficient capital flow for the participants on which to build and move into the export phase—at that time the non-transport energy demand in Western Australia was assessed at the equivalent of some 1 214 million cubic feet a day in 1985.

Of course we have seen that sink away due to the various economic changes that have occurred. There have been energy crises. There has been a quite significant change in the supply of and demand for mineral resources, which in turn meant processed mineral resources which were identified as customers for the energy which would be part of the domestic gas phase.

So the project went through those early years and reached the memoranda of understanding which formed part of the basic preparation for the agreement, and the commitments which were made by the State and by the participants and were ratified in this Parliament. In that time,

under the previous Government the Wagerup and Worsley projects were developed and various other projects and efforts were undertaken involving the use of that energy.

We have reached a stage now where, some years later, with all of the difficulties that have occurred, and with all the changes and the international economic changes that have brought considerable pressures onto the project and onto the Governments, a very significant debt of gratitude is owing—the Minister has already referred to this—to the participants for what has been achieved so far.

We have talked about what is going to happen from here on, and the responsibility that will flow from the ratification of this agreement, but we must be very mindful publicly of what has been achieved by Woodside as the operator on behalf of the other participants in relation to the project and the domestic gas phase.

I am sure that those who have had the good fortune to visit the Burrup Peninsula and to physically see what has occurred since the first ground breaking, would agree that what has been achieved by those working for the companies—the subcontractors—has really been to the credit of all concerned, and this is something that we ought to acknowledge. We should publicly do so on this occasion while we are vesting the participants with the responsibility of proceeding to the second stage. Certainly when I last visited the project, only three or four weeks ago, I perceived one aspect which has become much clearer to me, and that is the diminishing number of people involved in an operational sense now that the domestic gas phase is ticking over very efficiently. I refer to the fact that what is really occurring is the establishment of the basis upon which it will now proceed to the second stage, that the actual operating of the domestic gas phase does not involve many people at all. It in fact is a very well-oiled machine that is operating very smoothly.

As I have mentioned, without that domestic gas phase we would not be in this Parliament today considering and acknowledging what will happen from here on. As the Minister has indicated, the agreement before the House does identify various key aspects: firstly, that there is a change of participants where stage two is concerned and, that although the same domestic phase participants are concerned, there is an extra one. I am not quite certain who dreamed up the title "MIMI", but it has very exciting connotations and I hope in this project that it provides the same excitement that perhaps it does in a commercial sense.

The agreement also recognises the changed equity participation and contains a whole range of technical clauses relating to responsibility in matters such as property and what happens if one project is going when another stops. There are a range of matters which I do not wish to dwell upon except to say that, like the Minister, I commend those who have been associated with the effort in making sure that all the "i's" are dotted and the "t's" are crossed.

I have no doubt there will be lawyers who will want to make sure of the details to avoid some difficulty arising down the years and in case they have forgotten something which could be utilised in years to come. Notwithstanding that, such an agreement takes a lot of time and effort, particularly with a complicated situation like this in which we are in effect dividing one project into two.

The question of ownership arises, as well as matters of responsibility and determination of one part of the project and not another, and questions relating to marketing and the key element of responsibility of Government—the responsibility to the people of this State in the development and exploitation of a resource for the benefit of the people of the State and the nation. There is also the aspect of the extension of time of the agreement and other matters of a technical nature.

I refer to one or two side issues. Perhaps the Minister could tell us something about this body called the "national liaison group". I have received correspondence and have been advised that the Federal Minister is concerned with this area. What is this body, and what will it do? Is it a new body as the Confederation of Western Australian Industry (Inc.) has said? It certainly represents a departure from what we have had in the past. I understand it has been set up with the agreement of the Government. Perhaps the Minister can tell us what is involved, and why.

It is quite right and proper in a situation such as this that we do not consider the agreement clause by clause or in detail. We may comment on it and what it does, but it is not parliamentary procedure when ratifying an agreement to go into detail; nor should it be. So far as the procedure is concerned, we will pass a ratifying Bill and accept the agreement as a schedule.

I want to refer to comments made from time to time in relation to overall aspects of the project. Perhaps the best commendation for this project was that made by the Premier who is not with us today. In 1983, following his election to office, he addressed this project and the SECWA gas purchase agreement. He referred to the briefings he

had received and made public his commendation and support for the project—his words were very fulsome indeed. He referred to the status of the project and the State's financial situation at the time that he assumed office. He was quite right and proper in doing so. After all, he was the leader of a Government that was assuming the responsibility for obligations which had been entered into by the previous Government in the name of the State. It was right and proper that two things should occur.

Firstly, the Treasurer had to be aware of what had been done in his name as Treasurer, whoever held that office, what guarantees had been given, and the State's financial situation. Secondly, he had to know the future obligations he would have to enter into in relation to such matters as borrowings on which the State would have to embark to carry out its part of the deal. That was done. The Premier indicated he and his colleagues had received very full and detailed briefings from the participants, the Treasury, the SEC, and the international bankers who had been employed to advise and support the scheme.

I commend to the House the Premier's words at the time when he referred to this as an absolutely "stunning" project and one from which there could be no doubt that the benefits to be gained were "absolutely immense". He also referred to the State's financial obligations and said—

... quickly assure ourselves of the magnificence and of the benefit that would flow to the people of this State from the development of the North West Shelf and from the involvement of your State Government in that development.

He went on to say—

... not just as a marvellous resource development one but as one that will benefit the State financially to a degree that will in the year 2005 equate approximately two and a half times the present, in money terms, State budget.

On Monday last week the Premier had this to say on radio about the project—

... future generations will bless the government that negotiated the North-West Shelf contract and the arrangements that were made.

No matter what ups and down have occurred, and inevitably they still will occur, none of us should be under any doubt whatever that we will benefit from a very significant project. That we do so will be testimony not only to the work that was done in the past by the participants and the previous Government, but also that done by this Govern-

ment. This Government has had to take out the bumps and hollows as it proceeded.

One aspect of these projects which is characteristic is the long lead times involved. The Premier and the Minister have referred to this in previous discussions on other projects. Something may be discovered today but it will be many years before it reaches commercial reality; that is, when the return of dollars to those who found it and took their share of cake along the way starts to materialise.

As is clear to anyone with knowledge of the energy situation, a very significant upheaval has occurred throughout the world in the last 10 years in relation to supply and demand, pricing arrangements, and changes in the various forms of energy which are being utilised.

This project will continue to be of considerable benefit to the State. In supporting the Bill before the House today we add our support to that which has been given to the project. We also take the opportunity of wishing the venturers well in their heroic endeavours. The fulfilment of what the State expects to get rests very largely with the capacity, initiative, capital, and endeavours of the joint participants. We acknowledge not only what they have done in relation to the domestic gas phase, but what they will do in the future with the addition of their new partner.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [11.00 a.m.]: The member for Narrogin dealt with many aspects of this Bill and the agreement. I wish to deal with a few points but, before I do, I wish to pose the question upon which I have dwelt since the Minister was kind enough to brief us on the new agreement. I wish to know the real reason that this Bill is before Parliament. The original agreement which was ratified in 1979 has two clauses relating to assignment and variation of the agreement. We admit that there has been a tremendous shuffle in the agreement relating to the ownership, as has been pointed out by the member for Narrogin and the Minister for Minerals and Energy. The assignment clause makes it absolutely clear that the joint venturers, of right, are entitled to assign to each other or associated companies and the associated companies are defined. Alternatively, if they wish to assign to a third party they can do so with the approval of the Minister. The word "Parliament" is not even mentioned in assignment clause 26 of the agreement.

In relation to the variation, we recognise that there have been very thorough variations and amendments to the agreement. Clause 27 of the agreement relates to how variations can be made and it allows virtually any variation. As a matter

of fact, it would allow for the tearing up of the agreement and the re-writing of it. It states—

The parties hereto may from time to time by agreement in writing add to substitute for cancel or vary all or any of the provisions. . .

It then goes on to say that if the variation is accepted by both parties—the joint venturers and the Minister representing the Government—the Minister is obliged to table the variation in Parliament. The usual period of 12 sitting days is allowed for any member of Parliament to move for a disallowance. If nobody does so then, by virtue of the agreement, any variation becomes a legal part of the agreement.

It is therefore necessary to raise the question: Why is it necessary to bring these matters before Parliament and, particularly, why is it necessary to have a special sitting of Parliament to ratify the agreement? I want the Minister to answer that question. I know he pointed out the reasons to me in the briefing and said that the financiers and bankers of the joint venturers insisted that the variation should be ratified and that the lawyers advised that it was necessary because of the too-formidable, substantial amendments. I do not doubt the right or the desire of the bankers to try to be on safe ground but surely they can interpret the provisions in the agreement the way I do or say so if they have any different interpretation. Knowing the joint venturers as I do, I know that they would not employ lawyers who would not give the best advice. I venture to say that, no matter how many lawyers the joint venturers employ, I cannot interpret this variation the way they have interpreted it, which is that, no matter how substantial the amendments are, they ought to come before Parliament.

Any person with a logical mind would then raise the question: Why has this matter come before Parliament? The reason might be that the lawyers and bankers think it is necessary, but why do they feel it is necessary? Obviously, there must be some reason for their request. We can only speculate if we do not know their reasons. Are they concerned about the security of the project? We know that the project is enormously important. We all know what happened in the case of the Shell company's activities in Brunei and its insistence to use its own ships. The ships move like clockwork. They are loaded and the purchasers of the liquefied natural gas receive it without having to build containers or without having to keep the product frozen. It saved them investing an enormous amount of capital in a product which would have then been very expensive if not completely unviable. We know that Australia does not have the reputation which applied in Brunei. We know that there have been

many problems relating to mining and other industries but which, as bad as they are, still do not raise the same concerns that apply to the production of LNG.

However, nothing has been said about that and there have been no assurances in relation to the amendment in that regard, so that is not the answer to the question. We are therefore entitled to ask the Minister to give us the real reason for this matter being before Parliament.

In relation to the matters in the amendment, I do not think that any Government would not have negotiated these matters extensively and not have produced similar results.

The 15-year extension might be a two-edged sword for the Government. We do not know what will happen in the next century. We do not know what the status of the oil producers will be or what state the world economy will be in. We do not know what the status of the Western Australian Government will be or what the energy requirements will be at that time. We do not even have any idea what the population of this State will be at that time. Population growth figures can vary greatly. However, Western Australia may need the energy that remains after the conclusion of the agreement and obviously the aim would then be to have new negotiations. If Western Australia is unable to find other sources of energy before then, of course the indication would be that the gas supply would be precarious. It might be that the bargaining strength would be with the joint venturers. They may wish to utilise the remaining energy and may be able then to negotiate from a much stronger position.

It is something to which I am not opposed, but I simply mention that it is very difficult to assess it in the same way as it is difficult to assess previous agreements.

Members will remember the Laporte agreement. It would be stupid to say in retrospect that we should have known what would happen, because nobody knew what would happen at the time the agreement was considered.

As far as the five-year no review period is concerned, I believe that we should be given some explanation as to its inclusion in the agreement. One can only speculate on this proposal and one could ask why there will be no review for five years. I understand that the State Government has an agreement with the Commonwealth Government as far as royalties are concerned. We should be given all the details, but I understand that a large part of the royalties will go to the Commonwealth Government, a smaller part to the State Government, and on the other hand the SEC will

lose some money. With due respect to the Commonwealth Government, one could speculate and say that it, but more likely the State Government, would say to the SEC party, "You do not have the right to review the agreement for five years, but we will pay you part of our royalty to cover your losses".

If the Commonwealth Government received four-and-one-half times the royalty of the State Government and the SEC incurred losses amounting to half of that amount again, the only conclusion that I could reach would be that some deal has been struck between those concerned. However, I do not know whether that is correct.

I am glad that I have the opportunity to draw some matters to the attention of members and to place them on record—not to defend, but to make quite clear the circumstances in relation to the number of accusations that have come from the Government, particularly from the Premier, about the previous Government. Accusations, attacks, and innuendoes were levelled against the Opposition because of the present inability of the SEC and the Government to use the quantity of domestic gas which has been contracted for. The Government's action is naturally self-defence and that is understandable, but it also implies that the previous Government was incompetent and acted in a malicious way when signing the original agreement and SEC contracts.

I am not aware of any changes in the chief advisers to the present and the previous Governments and I ask what has occurred to make them suddenly change their minds. When the previous Government was in office the chief advisers said that what that Government did was right and now they are saying that it was not right.

I would like to explain to the House the reason that the accusations made by members of this Government are incorrect, why they do not hold water, and why they are based on half or even quarter truths. The accusation that has been levelled at the Opposition was that when it was in Government it contracted to the SEC too large a quantity of domestic gas. It was implied that we were ignorant and signed the agreement for other reasons than the reasons put forward by the advisers. I suppose we should go back to the period between 1974 and 1979 and look at the circumstances involving the environment, the economy, and the petroleum climate.

As I was responsible for electricity supplies at that time, I remember correctly that the projected increase in the population of Western Australia was 6¼ per cent yearly. The increase in population is now around one per cent per year. At the time

there was an oil price rise and there was also a shortage of oil and no-one in the world, not even the joint venturers or any expert once said that we could expect an oil slump. If I had been in a position to foresee what was to occur accordingly I would have based the escalation on oil prices only instead of on a number of factors and I would have been sacked and we would have been better off today. However, I was not in that position.

I miss my friend's, the member for Collie, retrospective criticism about oil-fired power stations. I heard it year after year. He has told us, in his carrying voice, what should have been done in 1960 and 1970. This is something similar—it is all right to be wise after the event.

The proof of the pudding is that when we introduced the original Bill, the present Deputy Premier, who represented the Opposition on that occasion, praised the agreement and the circumstances surrounding it and was absolutely satisfied with everything that the previous Government had done. I advise the House that the original agreement was reached following lengthy negotiations and the Minister for Minerals and Energy would now know what that means. The previous Government was faced also with tremendous odds, such as the adversity of the late Rex Connor, and I have on one occasion told the House what that meant at the time. The largest oil company in the world left its permit areas, but fortunately the present joint venturers accepted my proposal of unilateral extension of the permits, and when the Whitlam Government was defeated the matter took care of itself.

We were also faced with the handicap of a small domestic market—this is always a handicap as far as Western Australia is concerned. At the same time there was an increase in the CPI and an increase in the price of oil and petroleum products. There were large LNG projects being carried out around the world, and a large pipeline was proposed from Russia in Asia. One had to read certain papers about the economy to know what it was all about. We had the safety of the LNG shipping line to consider and it was an enormous programme. We were faced with the problem of what would happen to a ship if it were sailing off Burrup Peninsula and LNG leaked onto the deck causing a fire.

Also we had the problem of the comparative financial weakness of Woodside. We had a problem with the extraction of LPG, yet against all these odds we were able to finalise an agreement which meant that the project would take place.

Unless the Government wanted to pay more for the gas which was to have been supplied, it was

forced to take the quantity of gas which was the minimum viable quantity in order to allow the project to proceed.

The Government was faced with the choice of either having the project or not having it. Therefore, it did what any Government would have done and that was to opt for a minimum quantity. In fact a change has been made in regard to the originally planned capital investment. The joint venturers proposed to have two platforms even for the domestic gas. I remember at the time of considering the original agreement having arguments about one platform not being sufficient in case something went wrong. We considered the possibility of storing gas in the Dongara natural basin in case something happened to the platform. The erection of one platform involved less capital.

But as I said, the question was one of whether we wanted to have the project or not. Furthermore we were justified in our decision at that time by advice from the SEC and the negotiators that two-thirds of the domestic quantity would be taken up by the alumina producer, Alcoa. That suggestion was mooted at that time. Subsequently, only one-third was taken up by the alumina producer and that fact has led to the problem we have today.

Other circumstances intervened and show the difference between our Government and the present Government. I cannot prove it, but I maintain nevertheless that had we been in Government for the past two and a half years we would have been able to provide some downstream processing projects which used a considerable amount of gas. Once this Government took office, very little happened for a considerable time. Something happened some months back, but there was very little movement in the first 12 to 18 months of this Government.

Another aspect must be considered. A Labor Government is much harder put to utilise gas for fuelling electric power stations because it always has to consider what effect that would have on the Collie coal industry. It is easier for a Liberal Government not to increase the use of coal and to advocate a greater use of gas. History will testify to the correctness or otherwise of the decision to favour the Koreans to construct the pipeline in anticipation of their participation in the smelter project.

Those facts contradict the Premier's accusation. Perhaps he made it in self-defence or to pass the buck. I am very sorry that he is not here because I wanted him to hear what I had to say. It is now on the record and I hope the Premier will take some notice of it so that his knowledge of the history of the project will be improved and will be better

than his knowledge about where apples are grown in Western Australia.

MRS BUCHANAN (Pilbara) [11.24 a.m.]: As I have the good fortune to have this project of national interest in my electorate, I take the opportunity to make a few brief comments on it and on the effects of the next stage. I certainly welcome this ratifying Bill, and consider it to be another brick to be cemented into the wall of prosperity that is currently being built in the Pilbara. Certainly in the Dampier-Karratha area, the area immediate to the project, we have all been poised quite literally on the tips of our toes ready to leap forward into this new era. The next stage of the project certainly heralds a very great era for my electorate. In fact, there is an air of buoyancy throughout the whole Pilbara electorate. Many other projects and activities are being undertaken or are in the pipeline but the North-West Shelf gas project is the leader. It is the largest project undertaken in the area or, for that matter, in Australia. We are all ready and waiting to go ahead with the work.

The project has had a chequered history. If we delve back into history we see the political struggles of the very early days. The great struggles which surrounded the proposal for this project are well documented. There have been many problems along the way, but the people involved in the project have proved that no problem is insurmountable. The progress of this project is certainly a great credit to all those associated with it, from the top level people within the joint venture down to the last grader operator. All have put their hearts into this project with the result that the first domestic stage today is very well established.

The lessons learned by the community of Karratha during the initial construction stages of the project have been well noted and certainly will be used when we launch into the next stage. The various Government departments and community agencies are already gearing up to deal with the influx of people expected to come into the area in connection with the next surge forward of the project. I am very pleased to report that construction of the new Government offices in the town is proceeding extremely well and is on schedule. They will greatly improve the conditions of the people who work in the various Government departments, as well as make for a better level of efficiency within those departments.

The people in my electorate certainly have not underestimated the importance of the North-West Shelf gas project to the area, the State, and the nation, although we have become accustomed to its massive size. As we have gone through each

stage of development, we have tended to become a bit blasé about the size aspect, but we certainly appreciate the contribution this project will make to our future well-being. There is certainly a great sense of excitement in the Pilbara in anticipation of this next phase.

One of the most important aspects is that of the employment to be created by this next phase. It is envisaged that at least 1 000 new jobs will be directly generated before the end of this year and another 2 500 will be generated by 1987. There will also be a multiplier effect. The fact that the LNG phase will last for a number of years—it has been estimated at more than 15 years—augurs extremely well, as many benefits will flow, particularly to the people in the Pilbara.

By far the greatest part of the \$225 million worth of contracts to be let this year for work on the LNG jetty, tanks, plant site, and village preparations will be spent in Western Australia. That news is certainly very welcome. In addition to the long running benefits to the State, there will also be substantial royalty payments. This is extremely good news for us all.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the tremendous amount of work that has taken place on the domestic gas phase. I also place on record my thanks to the joint venturers for the efforts they have made in respect of Aboriginal rock carvings in the area. The Burrup Peninsula contains a very important part of our heritage. It is certainly to the Woodside company's credit that it has made an exceptional effort to preserve that heritage. I also mention the company's efforts in respect of reducing smoke emissions from the gas flare. Those emissions caused the community considerable concern in the early stages. They have now been greatly reduced. The company has responded in a very responsible way. Its approach to that problem has borne results, as today the gas flare burns fairly cleanly.

The Minister has already paid tribute to the many people who by their great determination and hard work have ensured that this phase of the project will succeed and in turn I would like to congratulate the Minister on his efforts in respect of the whole project.

His enthusiasm and work have no doubt also played a very important part in getting us to the present stage of this vital project.

I welcome the next step along the way with the North-West Shelf gas project and it is with much pleasure that I support the Bill.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [11.31 a.m.]: I also support the Bill and welcome the progress that it represents in putting

finally in place this second stage of the North-West Shelf gas development: The export phase which is so important to the total project.

I want to deal simply with one aspect of the matter; that is the assurance of the success of both the construction phase and the supply period for the LNG. The question of industrial relations was raised with me very directly in recent discussions about this project which I had in London, New York, and Japan. The question was raised in a number of contexts. On occasions it was brought up directly in relation to this project and the need to ensure that the history of industrial disruption in some areas and the trouble caused by some of the extraordinary awards made by industrial commissions does not occur here. More generally the question of industrial relations was raised with regard to the record in a number of areas and how risky and damaging that performance is to Western Australia in the changed climate. On another occasion I will refer to that in relation to the existing export of iron ore. Because of the new circumstances in the world it is an issue that must be considered in a long-term context.

We have before us the final progress towards completion of all arrangements for construction and export of gas. We face the need for industrial relations arrangements which will give effective guarantees that there will be no interruption of the construction phase or during the course of supply as a result of industrial disputation of one kind or another. The point has been made to me, and I think it is a very logical and clear one, that it is one thing to have a delay in the supply of iron ore—sometimes that is very serious, sometimes it causes supplies to be taken from another market, and it costs us money when it occurs—but it is an entirely different matter when a commodity such as LNG, is being provided to a country which requires that energy source for its basic lighting, heating, cooking and industry in one aspect or another. At this stage arrangements must be made to ensure that that does not occur. In fact, a completely new approach or deal is needed for industrial relations on this project. That new agreement or new form of understanding might indeed become a model for other areas.

Mr Bryce: Are you aware of how remarkably effective the industrial relations were during the work on the Burrup Peninsula?

Mr HASSELL: I am aware of a number of aspects of the matter but I am talking about the future of this project and the necessary guarantees to secure the continuity of construction so that supply starts on time, and the continuity of supply over the life of the project. There need not be an argument about that between the Deputy Premier

and me. I am not saying there is a problem now and I am not saying that some suitable arrangement has not applied in some other area at some other time. I am suggesting that now is the time to put in place arrangements which will survive for the whole life of this project. This project and its requirement for industrial peace is different in quality and kind from other projects in other places. There is a very special need here which has to be faced up to and met before construction begins. It should not be left on the basis of feeling that the climate of industrial relations in other areas is good at the moment or has been good in some other phase. It is necessary to recognise the kinds of problems that arise and the fact that they simply cannot be tolerated in this project because of the fundamental dependence and interdependence of Japan and Australia in relation to the supply of that gas and the use of it.

That is the essential point and it is very important, because the world situation is changing in the sense that other people are capable of meeting the competition if we cannot perform.

That is very much the case in relation to iron ore. We have to put in place a secure arrangement which genuinely solves the problems on a long-term basis. We have to be concerned about this project and the problems that might arise. For example, we query what steps the Government has taken to ensure that a demarcation dispute such as that which disrupted the Argyle project for months on end this year does not occur during either the construction stage or the operation of the LNG project. That question is very real because in the case of the Argyle diamond mine construction industrial relations on the site were perfectly happy. Industrial relations were causing no problems during the operation, the workers on the site were members of unions—happily members of those unions, happily engaged in their work, and happily satisfied with their conditions.

Progress was being made when along came a rogue union, the Transport Workers Union, tacitly supported by the Government which did absolutely nothing to restrain it, and that union caused months of disruption and delay because of the attitude of Australian unions whose members were not prepared to cross the picket line which had been established or to go about their work even though they did not agree with the attitude and objectives of the TWU. The fact remains that the project was disrupted. A great deal of cost was involved and some delays occurred, although I understand this has been largely overcome in the overall programme.

Mr Parker: There was no delay because it basically did not disrupt the operations except for a matter of a few days.

Mr HASSELL: I said that I understood that the delay had been largely overcome in relation to the overall programme but there was a lot of disruption and trouble on that site.

Mr Parker: I am not arguing that point, but there were no delays.

Mr HASSELL: Is that kind of dispute something the Government can afford to risk with this project?

I refer to the situation at Perth airport. It might have been thought almost a matter of national pride that the new airport terminal should be completed in time for the America's Cup. It should have been completed long before now but there have been delays over the years.

The industrial disruption there is putting in jeopardy the prospect of Perth having an up-to-standard international airport for the America's Cup.

But leave that aside. Let us return to this project. One is not dealing with a small contract, and one is not dealing with a commodity which is not absolutely vital to another economy and another country and the people involved there. One is dealing with a situation here where the project is vital to those people and to that economy, and continuity of supply on due date will be important.

What I am suggesting is that one needs industrial relations arrangements which recognise those realities. I suggested the other day that what was needed as a starting point was a clear understanding, agreement, and commitment that this should be a strike-free area. The Minister immediately bristled and responded that one could not have any commitment against strikes in relation to such a project. I quote from *The West Australian* of Friday, 21 June. The article reads as follows—

A spokesman for the Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr Parker, said that it was unrealistic to impose no-strike clauses in an agreement.

The Government was making every effort to ensure that no problems arose for the project.

Why is it unrealistic in such a vital project to have an arrangement for guarantees of freedom from industrial strikes? The project is basic to Australia's national economic interest. It is basic to the welfare of the Pilbara. As the member for Pilbara has just said, it involves many jobs. It is basic to the needs of the people of Japan in terms

of their dependence on the supply of gas and their use of that supply for their basic energy needs.

That is the context in which we are looking at this whole project. It is not a project to supply talcum powder, salt, animal foodstuffs, or something of that nature. It is something which goes to the very heart of an industrialised country's needs—its energy supplies. We are involved in this gigantic project on that basis because we have a product to offer and we can compete with the rest of the world in respect of price. We also fit in with the Japanese objective of diversifying and guaranteeing their supply.

Why is it not important to get the ordinary Australian men and women involved in those trade unions to understand the level of importance and the kind of operation it is and to say to them that this is a special deal for Australia and that Japan requires a special industrial relations deal?

It is not that we, the Government, or the companies, would expect that there will be no industrial disputes. It is not that we suggest problems would not arise which could not and should not be aired. What we must insist upon is that there be no strikes on this site because this site is very special, both in its construction phase and in its supply phase.

I am suggesting that now is the time these arrangements ought to be made. Do not let the project get under way and then have problems arise and try to patch them up after a pattern has been set. Looking back, without being critical in any way—because it is always easy to be wise in hindsight—who today would say that better arrangements might not have been made in relation to the whole of the iron ore industry if more consideration had been given to industrial relations before the whole industry was put into place as it is today?

Mr Parker: You might have achieved the results we are achieving now.

Mr HASSELL: The Minister might well say something about that, but he should have a look at some of those results at the Perth airport or at the other sites.

It is handy that a lot of the strikes are not recorded in statistics. Take the disruptions at Fremantle. More than 50 stoppages have been recorded at Fremantle since 1 January. But that figure itself is old; there are a lot more by now, I should imagine, but I do not have an up-to-date figure.

Mr Bryce: Instead of attacking the unions you are now attacking the figures.

Mr HASSELL: I was hoping the Deputy Premier would keep up his support.

This is a special project, a special deal. It is important; it is related to our future. It is not unreasonable to suggest that these problems of industrial relations which have been experienced in other major projects—as late as this year in relation to Argyle—are the sorts of problems which should be addressed now before the construction phase gets under way.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that the Government should be working to establish a model of industrial relations which can be applied in other areas. It is not unreasonable to suggest that there could be an agreement on a strike-free area; an area to be free of strikes at all times with a disputes-settlement procedure which will allow for problems to be raised, to be dealt with and decided without direct industrial action.

More than that, what is needed is a very firm commitment by this Government and by the Federal Government to back up these proposals. It is no good standing back, as this Government has done over and over again in the face of industrial militancy, and saying, "This has nothing to do with the Government, we will leave it to the parties concerned and to the Industrial Relations Commission", because the Government well knows, and the public well know, as the Argyle experience tells us, that is a totally unsatisfactory way to proceed.

When one has a totally regulatory system of industrial relations, the Government cannot be regulated out of the obligation to give backing to law and order in that system. The Government has failed over and over again.

Of course it was the Government itself which put a stop to action being taken in Argyle to try to bring an end to that dispute through its interest in the WA Development Corporation. Through its interest in that corporation it was the Government which effectively vetoed action under the Trade Practices Act.

Mr Parker: That is simply not true.

Mr HASSELL: That is simply true. The Minister can sit talking about something he knows nothing about for as long as he likes. The fact is that there were firm proposals for action under the Trade Practices Act when the situation at Argyle became desperate and it was the representatives of the WA Development Corporation who effectively stopped that action. They were acting on behalf of the Government.

What I am trying to underline is the very real need for the Government, in its approach to this

project, to ensure that satisfactory arrangements are made and for it to give a very clear commitment to the parties involved that it will back up those arrangements.

With a project as important as this, the participants are entitled to say to the State Government and the Federal Government that they want to know where they stand if a dispute arises which disrupts the project. They want to know that the Government will be there with all its power, persuasion, and authority to back up the arrangements and to ensure they are guaranteed. This is an essential element required if this project is to be assured, because if it is just left as it is without these arrangements and the whole thing descends into a state of mush, with the Government depending on the current climate of goodwill, it can count on the fact that, based on past experience, trouble will arise when the militants and the troublemakers move in, as they do. Then there will be no established mechanisms or arrangements that will satisfy the safety of this project.

The point is this: The Government must face up to the problems now, both at the governmental and participant levels, and put proper arrangements in place and ensure that both the State and Federal Governments are committed to those arrangements. The partners must be able to rest easy knowing that they have an obligation to make sure the system works, but knowing that if it breaks down because of action by union militants, as we have seen so often in these areas, the Government will be standing there not giving tacit approval to the militants' action and not standing back washing its hands of the trouble, but rather in there positively working to guarantee what Australia needs guaranteed: that is, the continuity of the construction phase and the continuity of supply, both of which are essential elements in this very important project.

We support the Bill.

MR PARKER (Fremantle—Minister for Minerals and Energy) [11.52 a.m.]: I thank all the members who spoke for their support of the Bill and I will take the opportunity of responding to some of the queries raised with me by them. Firstly, the member for Narrogin asked for information about the National Liaison Group. I notice there are questions about this group on today's Notice Paper, so I welcome this opportunity to mention something of it now.

One thing the Leader of the Opposition said—and I will come back to the rest of his remarks later—and something with which I agree, is that these things require a great deal of thought and planning. They require the ability of people to

understand the forces at work and the sorts of concerns and issues involved in any particular problem and then to devise strategies to deal with them to ensure that the people involved are satisfied with what comes out of their efforts.

The National Liaison Group arose in part because the North-West Shelf project is the largest project ever undertaken in Australia and therefore it is a matter of national interest. As the member for Narrogin mentioned, not many other parts of the country are doing as well economically as is Western Australia, so naturally those places are looking at our economic performance and hoping they will be able to gain some benefit from it as we lead the nation.

As members will see from answers given later to questions on the Notice Paper, the National Liaison Group consists of a broad base of people, both Western Australians and people from national organisations, and the joint venture partners themselves. These people come together as a fairly informal group on approximately a bi-monthly basis in order to discuss and exchange information on issues of importance to the project, particularly having regard for things like local content and the need to maximise the level of Western Australian and Australian expenditure on the project. These people meet to exchange information of concern to the various participants on the sorts of issues concerning them and to provide a forum for greater understanding of the issues involved in the project.

The second phase of the project—as I am sure the members for Narrogin and Floreat are aware—is a very highly technological phase. As I mentioned in my second reading speech, this is only the eleventh LNG plant in the world; it is one of the largest and has been designed in a completely novel way in many respects. Many aspects of the plant are simply not capable of being handled in Western Australia or Australia. For example, we do not have the capability to build LNG carriers, and I do not think anyone in Australia would suggest that he would ever have dreamt of their being built in Australia. The heat exchangers are a very important aspect of the liquefaction process and are high technology items; only one or two companies in the world engage in the production of heat exchangers. No-one would expect that they could be built in Western Australia or Australia.

What we and the joint venturers are seeking to do—and Mr Peter Tapper, Woodside's general manager, is very dedicated to this—is to ensure that the local content is as high as possible, given the constraints of which we are all aware.

Senator Evans, the Federal Minister for Resources and Energy, did ask that there be a body formed which would include Western Australian and Commonwealth Government representation, Western Australian industry and union representation, national industry and union representation, and joint venture representation, to discuss all these issues. It is one of those areas in which we hope, by that early discussion and exchange of information, we will be able to resolve some of the questions that arise because of the fear of the unknown or simply because of ignorance. We believe therefore that this National Liaison Group is very valuable for this reason alone.

I had proposed that there be a State committee of this sort, but because of the desire to minimise the amount of interface with the joint venturers and to allow them to get on with the job without having to report back to myriad organisations, I agreed that the State committee should be merged with the national body. As a result, the national group consists of myself and Senator Evans, as co-chairmen, and I have insisted that because the State and the joint venturers are responsible to a State agreement and because the plant is being built under a State agreement, in fairness to the State—because the agreement was negotiated by the member for Floreat when he was the Minister—the committee secretariat should be under the control of my Resources Development Department. David West of that department has played a very active part in all these arrangements and has been appointed as the executive officer to the committee. He will also be the executive officer responsible for that sort of interface with the joint venture partners.

The member for Narrogin was correct when he said that the Confederation of Western Australian Industry had issued some criticism of that. I thought the statement from the confederation was a very silly one and did not reflect what had happened at the meeting nor the private discussions I had about the meeting only two nights before with Mr Davis, who wrote the Press statement, and Mr Lenzo. Mr Lenzo was at the meeting and participated very positively, so I hope their silly approach will not continue; I hope they take a much more sensible approach, as have the joint venture participants, the State and Commonwealth Governments, and other industry organisations. If they do they will be able to play a very valuable role in the way the National Liaison Group works. I think that, privately, the officials concerned are prepared to do that to ensure the group's work is of long lasting significance and importance and to ensure a good atmosphere surrounds this project, as has been the case with

statements made by certain other sections of industry around Australia.

The other point made by the member for Narrogin, apart from giving his general support to the project and outlining different features of the Bill, concerned the future obligations of the joint venturers to the State under this agreement to construct this facility.

They will spend a great deal of money and hopefully will earn an income for themselves, of course—that is why they are doing it—and for the State, both in terms of jobs and the income that flows from the project, and economic activity and, more directly, the income that flows from the royalties on the LNG. To make sure everyone is quite clear on one point, although some arrangements have been made concerning the royalties, and what is to happen to the domestic gas royalties because of the problems that SECWA faces as a result of the 1980 gas sales agreement, no such agreement has been made. The LNG royalties will represent by far the most substantial aspect of the royalties received and by the mid-1990s those royalties will form a very substantial part of this State's territorial income and will be well in excess in dollar terms of the total royalties that we get, for example, from the iron ore industry. Indeed these royalties will be in excess of the total royalties that we get from mineral resources so the project will be of great importance to this State as we approach the end of this century.

The member for Floreat asked about the real reason or desire for this special sitting, and for the ratification of this agreement. I was told that on one radio station this morning the Leader of the Opposition was quoted as saying the sitting was simply a technicality, that there really did not need to be a special sitting, but that he would take advantage of it because it had been called. That is simply not the case and it is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition did not follow the lead of his colleague, the member for Floreat, and at least ask what the position is. It is not the case that it is a technicality, by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr Hassell: I did not say it was.

Mr PARKER: The Leader of the Opposition was reported on a radio programme this morning as saying that. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that this sitting is necessary. I will now deal with some aspects raised. The member for Floreat mentioned the fact that, if negotiated, a non-ratified agreement, which can vary this agreement, must be tabled at the first available opportunity in the Parliament and can then be disallowed at any time by a motion of either House within 12 sitting days. Given that we are commencing our full sit-

ting on 20 August, 12 sitting days of this House would be towards the end of September or early October. Members can imagine that a person who intends to invest—as each of these one-sixth shareholders intends to do, \$US 1.5 billion approximately in this project—would be pretty wary about the security of those funds if at some stage or other a member of Parliament in either House could get up and move for the disallowance of the project. The member for Floreat and I know it is hardly likely, and most of the joint venturers also know it is hardly likely, but the possibility is always there. When one intends to invest amounts of money of that magnitude, one does not take those sorts of risks.

The bankers in London will look at this sort of legislation and will say it could happen. They do not know how the Parliament of Western Australia operates or who its members are. A rogue parliamentarian at some time might try to do this. These people want to do everything to protect their security. Indeed, although we discussed the question of whether we can simply sign the agreement and have it ratified later, in the final analysis, as there are very substantial charges with the phase 1 assets of Woodside which need to be released so that phase 2 can proceed and new banks can take over the financial obligations, it became quite clear that everybody wanted ratification of this agreement in order to be assured of the security of their investment or loan funds, as the case may be, in this project.

In terms of whether or not legally we could have renegotiated the agreement in such a way, as the member for Floreat said, that it would have to be virtually torn up and a new start made. I point out that there is a very substantial change. We are not just talking about some change of the agreement such as the change negotiated a couple of years ago in relation to LPG. That was a non-ratified change. This change goes to the very fundamentals and the heart of the agreement which was negotiated in 1979. Certainly our advice was that there was doubt as to whether the court would interpret this matter and take the view that an unratified agreement with such major changes in it should have been dealt with in that way. Given that lots of contracts and many issues are involved, I am sure that at some stage or other some matter will be threatened. I do not know the answer to that question, and I am sure the member for Floreat also does not. We could probably ask three lawyers and receive five different answers to our questions. Nobody can afford to take those sorts of risks and we felt that this project was of national importance, as everyone has agreed here today, that it was worth our suffering the inconvenience

of recalling the Parliament in order to allow this project to get under way.

Mr Mensaros: You know that we have nearly 100 State agreements, all allowing for arbitration, yet not once was arbitration used.

Mr PARKER: I know that, and believe me, I made that point on several occasions to people with whom we were negotiating. I understand their position. They say, "There is always a first time" and one does not know that it could not happen. They have those sorts of concerns.

There has never been a project of this magnitude in Western Australia. It could be said that this might be the first occasion on which such an event would take place. While we all know that the way in which WA does business is not likely to lead to that happening, when people invest \$US8.5 billion all-up over a 15-year period, they want to be pretty sure of their facts. This legislation, of course, places beyond any doubt at all that this is a proper, ratified agreement which has the full support of the law and the Parliament of Western Australia, assuming that the Parliament as a whole passes it today.

The member for Floreat referred also to the question of an extension of time and he said that it was a double-edged sword for the State. That is true; it is a double-edged sword. It was part of the negotiations that took place. We believe we have covered the major issues that we needed to cover because of that extension of time. We still want to be able to ensure that if we need the North-West Shelf gas after the year 2010 or after our contract expires, the joint venturers cannot simply go off and say, "We have got this plant here. We have security over it until 2025. We will go ahead willy-nilly"—assuming they get Commonwealth export permits—"and export all the gas" without having regard for the position of WA at that time. We might not want or need that gas in 2010. We might have other gas onshore or from other sources and we might be happy to allow the company to export all the gas after the year 2009 or 2010 when its current Japanese contract expires. We made it absolutely clear that between the time of our contract expiring and the Japanese contract expiring, a period of three or four years is provided, and even if there is no other gas available in WA at that time we recognise the need for that contract to be fulfilled. Otherwise obviously the Japanese buyers would not be prepared to enter into those arrangements with the suppliers. If after 2010 we do have a need to satisfy ourselves that the State's interests are protected, I believe that the agreement as negotiated and which is before members today will meet that requirement.

The member for Floreat is quite right; many of the 50-year agreements of past years are causing major headaches for us 30 years after the event. The member could have cited the example of the BP refinery agreement as well as the Laporte agreement. Those agreements are causing us massive problems, but I feel we have learned from many of our mistakes of earlier years. This agreement is a much better one, and I hope it has much better provisions in this area. Of course, this is an industry that we understand a lot better than we perhaps did in regard to the titanium dioxide industry or the petroleum industry in the 1950s.

I have resisted the temptation which was suggested to me by several people to use this occasion to have a major discussion about the gas sales agreement. I decided that whatever we might be concerned about in respect of that agreement, there will be plenty of opportunity later to discuss it, and I feel that this is not such an occasion.

Today is an occasion for celebration of a major milestone or major achievement by this State for all the people who were involved, and I did not think now was the time to indicate any of the major problems relating to the gas sales agreement.

In part, of course, the member for Floreat is right. The changing world and the energy scene has had an impact in relation to that agreement and its effect on the State. I am pleased to say that in the negotiations that took place early this year, that point was recognised to a considerable degree both by the Commonwealth in respect of concessions made for us, and by the joint venturers' concessions made to us and, of course, by the concessions the State made, especially in respect of its support for SECWA in its arrangements.

That will be something to discuss at another time. We believe that as a State we are trying our hardest to alleviate those problems, not just in negotiations with the joint venturers, but also in our attempts to gain major downstream processing industries. The member for Floreat said that had he been in Government he would have had such an industry by now. He said nothing had been done about it until the last few months. That is simply not the case. Many things are done outside the glare of publicity. Speaking for myself, I would prefer that we were able to negotiate these sorts of things until we got to the crunch, and then announce the decision. Unfortunately, for legitimate reasons the Press will not allow that; its members want to know what is going on and they want to inform the public. They have the right to do so.

An extraordinary amount of work has been done on various processing industries. I point out

that until the contract was renegotiated earlier this year, the price negotiated was such that a downstream processing industry using gas as feedstock would not have been feasible. It would be competing with much lower prices in other parts of the world, particularly in countries of which I am sure the member for Floreat is aware, and which use associated gas which formerly was flared and is now put into downstream processing activity. The opportunity cost of such gas is virtually nil. That has made a major difference to the way in which anyone looks at investment in downstream processing activity and has required us to change the basis of pricing for gas to go into any such greenfields industry that we may be able to attract to Western Australia. I believe that what we have done in that respect will enable us to attract such an industry and we are working hard to that end.

I thank the member for Pilbara for her comments about what the Government and I have done in relation to this project and its importance. I recall that in March this year she and I attended a meeting of the Roebourne Shire Council in conjunction with the Karratha Chamber of Commerce.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The level of background conversation is such that I can hardly hear the Minister. It really is far too much.

Mr PARKER: Partly because of Press comment, and partly because of speculation about the nature of the project, and because people have heard the project announced several times, especially before elections, people were not sure whether it would go ahead. I was very cautious in my remarks at that time because there is many a slip 'twixt cup and lip. Last weekend the member for Nedlands and I were in Karratha and I happened to see at the function there for Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. one of the people from the Karratha Chamber of Commerce who was very pleased to be able to congratulate me for having been right in the cautious comments I made to the chamber and the Roebourne Shire at the time.

Absolutely no doubt exists that there is a real level of expectation in the town of Karratha and surrounding regions about this project and what it will do for that area. I believe it will have an important and sustaining influence on those areas. The sorts of problems Karratha has faced in the last 12 to 18 months because of the wind-down of the domestic gas project will not occur with this project, at least not for many years. Whereas the domestic gas project had a rapid peak and a fairly rapid decline in numbers as well, this will be a 15-year project in terms of construction activity, and

longer than that in terms of operation activity—we hope many years longer.

It will stimulate more gas exploration because the partners will want to make sure they have more gas so that they can enter another contract with the Japanese and with us. All those matters, quite apart from the construction aspect, will stimulate the area for many years to come. I believe this is a very important project for the region.

I have answered the points made by the members for Narrogin and Floreat and I commend them and the member for Pilbara for their positive contributions. While they were speaking there was a very bipartisan approach to this important issue. It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition could not resist the temptation to engage in partisan politics on this matter.

Mr Clarko: Something you always refrain from doing!

Mr PARKER: No, there are occasions—we are all politicians and we all like to make our political points. But there are some occasions on which a bit of positive thinking and statement does people good. I commend the members for Narrogin and Floreat for that. It is very unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition had to dip into that area.

Mr Court: You want to ignore it.

Mr PARKER: No, I do not want to ignore it; I want to deal with it. It was the way the Leader of the Opposition did it. It was not that he should raise the issue of industrial relations that I regard as partisan, but the way in which he did it. I will deal with the issue he raised.

I do not know what was said to the Leader of the Opposition or what he said to the people to whom he spoke while overseas. I have seen probably all the same people and more than he has in regard to this project. I was in Japan as late as last week talking with both the investors and some of the utilities which are involved in the project.

The Leader of the Opposition made one point with which I agree entirely—one has to plan in advance for these things; one cannot just let them happen. Because of the good planning undertaken by Woodside, and by the SEC in the case of the gas pipeline, both projects took place with little disruption. In the case of the SEC pipeline, I think one day was lost as a result of workers' alleging they had maggots in their food. In the case of the domestic gas plant and so on, there was a little more disruption, but nothing that involved delays to the project and nothing that could not be handled.

I pay tribute to the considerable amount of work Woodside has done both during the domestic

gas phase and in its relationships with the unions which will be working for it in the construction and operating phases of the LNG project.

Another point the Leader of the Opposition made is quite right; that is, that this project cannot have any delays particularly in terms of shipping schedules and being able to meet the October 1989 deadline. Everywhere I went in Japan I found that everyone was extraordinarily complimentary about the work the Western Australian Government has done in the last 18 months or so on industrial relations in the Pilbara and elsewhere. The figures speak for themselves, and of course the Japanese see it for themselves because they see their ships coming back full of iron ore. They do not have to divert them; no ship has been diverted in the Pilbara for 18 months. They know there is not a lot of demurrage and they get reliable supplies of iron ore. Every one of them has taken the opportunity of congratulating the Government for its philosophy and policy on industrial relations and in improving the situation in the Pilbara which was, as the Leader of the Opposition said, doing us great damage in the international trading community.

We are trying to say there are no easy solutions—that one cannot put up his hand and say, "Have a no-strike clause in the contract and everything will be all right".

Mr Hassell: Who said there are easy solutions?

Mr PARKER: The point of the comments made on my behalf in response to the Leader of the Opposition on 21 June to which he referred was not that there should be some method of preventing strikes, but to say that it is not an easy solution to put no-strike clauses in contracts.

Mr Hassell: Who suggested that?

Mr PARKER: I do not want to go into the details of some of the discussions that I know Woodside has had with the unions which will be involved in both the operating and construction phases of this project. I know that Woodside and some of the other joint venturers have negotiated well in advance some of the important and critical issues on a voluntary basis—voluntary, that is, by the company and the unions involved—which in my view, quite apart from the benefit they will have in this project, represent a major breakthrough in industrial relations. Both the State and Commonwealth Governments have provided support when asked for it. I am aware of a recent instance when the Commonwealth Government provided strong support because problems were appearing in a particular area and it was thought the Commonwealth would be of assistance in overcoming them.

The support we have given has been basically to say, "Here we have a company which has shown by the way it operates it is capable of dealing with these issues". Since the operating plant and the platform have been going I do not think a single dispute has occurred at either of them; certainly nothing of any significance. The company has a lot of people working hard on the planning and they are addressing these sorts of issues. When support is required it will be given. I indicated to the Japanese as early as April last year when we were first discussing the October 1989 date before the change which took place then from April 1988—the Japanese said to me, "This is the final date; this date must be met"—that we as a Western Australian Government would give every support possible to the joint venturers to meet that date.

I have every confidence they will, just as they met the dates involved in the domestic gas contracts and just as the State Energy Commission met its contractual commitments in respect of that project. In fact, it was months ahead.

I do not want to go into detail about some of the extraneous matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition, except to say that, in the case of the Argyle project, apart from the fact that there was a delay in the project, it will, at this stage, be opened up on the date projected by the joint venturers. However, the final resolution of the dispute—it was not a dispute that had a major impact on the site but it received a lot of publicity—was as a result of the suggestion and very hard work done by the Government and particularly by my colleague, Hon. Peter Dowding. The final solution should have occurred earlier. However, I remind the Leader of the Opposition that we were asked for a long time, by the partners in that project not to become involved in the dispute. They told us they wanted to resolve it.

Mr Hassell: There was suspicion about what you were up to.

Mr PARKER: That is nonsense. I can tell the Leader of the Opposition what the situation was. It was not anything to do with the Western Australian Development Corporation. The issue was determined at the operator level and was discussed and referred back to the higher echelons in CRA. Wiser counsel within the senior executives prevailed in relation to whether that writ should go ahead. It is my view that that counsel was wise. The dispute was resolved within a few days of that happening. The senior executives of CRA decided, because of their experiences right around

Australia, that that was not the way to resolve the dispute. I can tell the Leader of the Opposition the name of the person who made the decision. However, that would not be appropriate at this time. The final resolution of that dispute was as a result of the work done by the Western Australian Government. That is not to say that the dispute was a good one or that it should not have been prevented; of course it should have been. However, the Government ensured that the dispute was resolved and the project proceeded during the dispute. That was terribly frustrating to the Transport Workers Union. The project is now proceeding on schedule and will be completed on schedule.

As I said when I introduced the Bill, this legislation is extremely important. It represents the culmination of a lot of work done by many people. I am pleased and proud to have been involved with it. I believe that the support the House has shown for it represents the strong support that all of the people involved in the project, including the investors and the people who work in it, have for it. The support for the legislation is bipartisan and I commend the Bill to the House.

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

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Parker (Minister for Minerals and Energy), and transmitted to the Council.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Point of Order

Mr THOMPSON: I have read the Notice Paper and the order for taking business today. It seems to me that the appropriate time for me to rise on notices is now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: At the moment we are in the middle of a two-part motion which was moved by the Minister for Education. The second part of the motion was that the Leader of the Opposition would move certain things. I have given the member my assurances that I will give him the opportunity, before the end of the day, to move his notice of motion and I confirm that now.

TAXES AND CHARGES

Federal Government Proposals: Censure Motion

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [12.30 p.m.]: In accordance with the leave the House has already granted, I move—

This House of the Parliament of Western Australia expresses to the Federal Government its firm opposition to proposals for new forms of taxation as detrimental, if introduced, to the interests of the people of Western Australia, and believing that real tax reform requires tax reduction, calls on the Federal Government to produce, in association with the States, a "white paper" on Federal and State expenditure and borrowings to lead to a plan to reduce and eliminate deficits.

The Commonwealth Government has proposed, as a package, a number of new taxes and a number of loss of tax entitlements. The principal elements, of course, are now well known publicly—a consumption tax of 12½ per cent, a capital gains tax to operate at the marginal tax rate, the abolition of the right of employers to deduct the cost of benefits given to employees, and a tax on gold similar to other taxes.

One would have expected these taxes to be vehemently opposed by the Government of Western Australia on behalf of the people of this State. One would have expected the Premier of this State, who is allegedly representing them at the tax summit, to represent the interests of the people by making clear his opposition to a consumption tax, to a capital gains tax, to the abolition of perks—as they are incorrectly called—and to a gold tax. However, that has not been the case and we find that the Premier of the State has in Canberra sold out the interests of the State to the extent that he actually supported Mr Hawke's and Mr Keating's option C.

Let me refer to a newspaper report which appeared in *The Australian* dated 2 July 1985. The article was headed, "Burke supports Option C, but calls for changes" and reads as follows—

THE WEST Australian Premier, Mr Burke, told the tax summit he supported the basis of Option C, but with qualifications.

When one examines those qualifications one finds that there are others. He fully supports a capital gains tax.

Mr Bryce: No, he does not and he never has.

MR HASSELL: Does he not?

Mr Bryce: He never has.

MR HASSELL: When did the Premier say that he never supported a capital gains tax?

Mr Bryce: He has told you countless times. What is wrong with your memory?

MR HASSELL: Where is his opposition and fight against a capital gains tax on behalf of the farmers of Western Australia and the rest of the business people in this State who will suffer under a capital gains tax? Where is his fight on their behalf in Canberra? Where has the Premier of this State been fighting against a capital gains tax at the tax summit? He has done nothing of the sort. He has supported option C—he is the only man in Australia who has backed option C. Even Mr Hawke and Mr Keating have backed away from option C. He is on his own and he has been left behind by the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer.

The people of this State have made absolutely clear how they feel in regard to the imposition of a consumption tax, capital gains tax, death duties, and the abolition of the right of deductions; yet the Premier has gone to Canberra, supposedly representing this State, and has tried to make out that he is representing somebody by saying that he supports option C.

Let us look at what the Premier is really supporting. He is busy talking about his concern regarding fuel tax and now he is grabbing a few lines in the newspaper talking about rural fuel costs being a worry in Western Australia. What absolute nonsense it is when the Premier of this State tries to profess concern at the national tax summit about a fuel tax, especially when one looks at his Government's record in relation to fuel taxes.

I will refer to a few points that have been recorded about this Government's record on full taxes. A commitment made in *The Road Patrol* of February 1983 reads as follows—

The key elements affecting motorists in our policies are—

Moves to reduce retail petrol prices . . .

That commitment was made prior to the last State election.

The following statement was made by Mr Burke in the *Wheatbelt Mercury* on 7 February 1983—

The ALP would improve the situation in areas such as a reduction in retail fuel prices.

The following was included in the ALP's policy speech of 7 February 1983—

Labor will stop the petrol price spiral.

Again on 7 February 1983 the following appeared in the *Wheatbelt Mercury*—

Labor committed itself to "implement a comprehensive fuel policy to reduce country fuel costs".

Let us look at the facts. In April 1983 the price per litre of fuel in the metropolitan area was 42.9c. In May 1985 the price was 56c—a 31 per cent increase. In April 1983 the price for fuel in 10 major country centres was 45.5c per litre and in May 1985 it was 58.6c—an increase in price of 29 per cent.

Where does that stand in regard to the commitments given by the Premier prior to the last election? Where does it stand when the Premier gives his support at the national tax summit to a consumption tax of 12½ per cent?

Mr Taylor: That is wrong, he does not support a consumption tax.

Mr HASSELL: What element of option C does the Premier support? All of a sudden members opposite are telling the Opposition that every element of option C is not supported by the Premier. What did the Premier support?

Several members interjected.

Mr HASSELL: Where did *The Australian* and *The West Australian* newspapers manage to find the information that Mr Burke supports the basis of option C? The basis of option C is a consumption tax which he supports, does he not?

Mr Taylor: The basis of option C is the tax reform package.

Mr HASSELL: It includes a consumption tax, the abolition of the right of deduction of employee benefits, a capital gains tax and a gold tax.

Mr Taylor: He did not say that.

Several members interjected.

Mr HASSELL: Are members opposite trying to tell me that the only basis of option C the Premier supports concerns tax cuts?

Let me advise members opposite what the Premier does, in fact, support. One element that the Premier does support is the abolition of deductibility for employee benefits.

In other words, he supports the double payroll tax which is being proposed. After all the bleating we heard from the Premier before the last State election about how he would keep tax down, he now supports a double payroll tax.

That is precisely what it is. The Federal Government wants to tax employers because they pay their employees in the form of certain benefits. The Premier supports it. In the *North-West Telegraph* of 26 June the Premier of Western Australia was quoted as saying—

I have already expressed the personal view that I would accept a tax on so-called perks.

All the Premier is asking of the Federal Government is that it not apply that tax to the iron ore industry. He is quite happy for it to be applied in other areas. Without doubt, he supports that part of the tax package. He wants to hit the private sector if it makes some expenditure towards increasing its productivity or its success rate. He is saying that a man who is provided with a car should be taxed on that benefit. He is proposing to spend \$12 million of taxpayers' money to buy an aircraft to fly around this State. He is trying to put that proposal under the carpet until after the election.

Mr Bryce: He hates aircraft. What are you talking about?

Mr HASSELL: We know all about it. He wants to spend \$12 million on a Hawker Siddeley aircraft to fly himself around the State. He is really saying that if the State buys that aircraft, the State should be taxed on it because it is an employee benefit. The Premier wants the only exemption from that tax to be for the iron ore industry. When he was in the Pilbara he made that clear. The heading of the article mentioned previously was, "Iron ore industry a special case, says Burke". Why is it a special case? Why is not the goldmining industry a special case?

Mr Taylor: It is.

Mr HASSELL: I agree that it is, but the Premier does not. The Premier wants gold companies which provide their employees with cars to be taxed on those benefits. The member for Kalgoorlie knows that his Premier proposes that a goldmining company which provides an employee with a car should not be able to deduct the cost of it from the new gold tax.

Mr Taylor: There will not be any gold tax.

Mr HASSELL: What about the nickel industry? Why does not the member for Kalgoorlie tell us why the Premier of this State proposes that the Western Mining Corporation should not be able to deduct the cost of providing cars to employees involved in the Kambalda operations? Why does he not tell us why his Premier supports that?

Mr Taylor: I can't answer for the Premier.

Mr HASSELL: The member for Kalgoorlie interjected in an attempt to tell the story on behalf of his Premier.

Mr Taylor: Don't misrepresent what the Premier had to say at the tax summit. Don't put words into his mouth.

Mr HASSELL: I invite the member for Kalgoorlie to tell us why Brian Burke is in

Canberra telling the people of Australia that we should pay more tax. The Premier is supporting option C. He knows that it pursues his socialist objectives.

Mr Bryce: You sulked and wouldn't go to the summit because you didn't think that you would do very well. You just wouldn't play.

Mr HASSELL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have to tell the Deputy Premier that I do not recall having been invited. Therefore, being the very polite fellow that I am, I did not go. Now that once again we have been able to put the Deputy Premier right in terms of accuracy, let us get back to the important point of this debate; namely, the opportunity it gives this House to express very clearly its opposition to the new taxes on Western Australians which are being proposed by the Federal Labor Government. The Premier has not voiced that opposition. He has gone to Canberra and supported a capital gains tax.

Mr Troy: Are you suggesting no changes?

Mr Bryce: More tax evasion, that's what you want.

Mr HASSELL: I inform members opposite that having received my group certificate the other day and having seen the proportion of my annual income that is being taken away in PAYE tax, I see that there is a very clear need for change. Let us not start at the wrong end.

Mr Bryce: What a man of principle!

Mr HASSELL: I am amazed that members opposite cannot keep themselves under control. I can well understand their concern about the fact that their leader and Premier is in Canberra selling the State down the drain as fast as he can. They would like to distance themselves from him and from Hawke. I can well understand that, because what is being done to this State in Canberra at the moment is not something of which any of them should be proud. In fact, they should be ashamed. They should have given the Premier better instructions before he went away from this State. The Premier is in Canberra supporting option C, supporting the so-called tax on perks, the double payroll tax. He said publicly that that is what he supports. The truth of the matter is that all of those taxes will disadvantage the Western Australian people. What is needed is what is proposed by this motion. The Commonwealth Government should not start at the tax end of the scale at all; it should start at the expenditure end. The Australian people are not stupid. Why do Labor politicians think there is total opposition to their tax package from one end of the country to the other? The Australian people know that as long as the Federal Government spends \$8 000

million more than it has, the tax package will be about increased taxation.

Mr Taylor: Are you asking them to cut their expenditure in order to balance their Budget?

Mr HASSELL: I suggest that the member for Kalgoorlie obtain a copy of the motion from the Clerk to find out what I am suggesting. I invite him to tell us that he supports the tax package being put forward in Canberra. I invite him to tell the House where he stands.

Mr Taylor: As far as PAYE taxpayers are concerned, I think what is happening at the moment is outrageous. I support parts of the package.

Mr HASSELL: If the member for Kalgoorlie were to read the motion, he would see that we have made a very practical and serious proposal. We propose that we should have a white paper, not on taxation but on expenditure, so that we can see where and how the deficit can be eliminated. We should have a national plan to eliminate the deficit because we cannot get rid of an \$8 000 million deficit in one Budget.

Several members interjected.

Mr HASSELL: Everyone knows that, but we still need to get rid of it.

Mr Parker: We could try.

Mr HASSELL: We could try but are we trying?

Mr Parker: We have taken \$1.3 billion off.

Mr HASSELL: That is \$1.3 billion off the forward estimates and not off the deficit.

I return to the point in question. What can be done is to work out a national plan to eliminate the deficit over a period.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This debate, as members well know, has the propensity to become fairly volatile and I do not intend to stop that in any way. However, I would like to ensure that the debate is taken down for the record and that is particularly difficult when so many interjections come on top of each other. I wonder if members would care to consider interjecting in order rather than on top of each other?

Mr HASSELL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I too would be pleased if members would interject one at a time.

I return to the very important point I was making. A responsible plan should be worked out in conjunction with the States of Australia which have a very real interest—and a legitimate interest because the States' revenue is tied up in that situation—in the financial situation in Canberra. A

responsible plan to eliminate the deficit over a period, with some understanding of the possibilities, would be the way to go towards restoring confidence in Australia. What do members think the tax debate is doing to Australia at the moment? It is destroying confidence and taking away any measure of confidence in the capacity of the elected Government to make decisions or to give directions.

If we are going to bring any sense into the tax system, and that is the real reform that is needed, we need to reduce the demand for revenue. The only way that can be reduced is by some realistic attack on expenditure. The tax summit is back to front, it has begun at the wrong end. Instead of having a public debate about the cost of government, the size of government, handouts and demands on government, we are holding a debate about the tax system in isolation from the other side of the ledger. We are suggesting as a practical, realistic proposition that the Federal Government should consider how to get rid of the deficit over a realistic period having considered the options and what is available.

Going to Canberra and proposing—and, as the Premier has done, supporting—new forms of taxation will not solve any of the problems. It will slow us down, it will create less confidence, and it will destroy more job opportunities.

When I was in Singapore a couple of weeks ago a man said to me very simply that he had proposed to bring a sum of money down to Australia to invest it in a certain way but that he was hesitating to do so and had put the money aside because he did not know if a capital gains tax would be imposed. That was a completely unsolicited remark which came into our conversation in a natural way. If we multiply that over many potential investors in this State it can be seen why our dollar is falling, interest rates are rising, the share market is going down, and every day there is less confidence in Australia. We are creating a situation with this ridiculous tax debate and ridiculous summit in which people do not have confidence in Australia's capacity to perform.

Mr Bryce: Ronald Reagan is about to start the same debate.

Mr HASSELL: Ronald Reagan started the debate when I was there but his proposals were of a different nature.

The national summit is a collection of interest groups, not representative of me or other ordinary Australians. The members have been elected by no-one, yet apparently are expected to produce some formula which will make it easy for the Federal Government to bring in the tax proposals

it has already decided upon. In that context it would have been reasonable to expect the Premier of Western Australia to express the views of the people of Western Australia and to represent those views, but he utterly failed to do so.

I have a publication issued by the Government of Western Australia in May 1985 called *Taxation Reform in Australia*. Page 26 contains a record of the community views on taxation from people in this State. I quote the following from page 25—

In February of this year, the Department of Industrial Development sought community views on the question of taxation reform for consolidation in a submission to the Taxation Summit. Over 2,200 community responses were received to the telephone hotline and the results generally confirm the need for taxation reform. Conclusions drawn were:—

Amongst the conclusions drawn was the following—

Respondents indicated a lack of support for the introduction of any new form of tax.

That is \$45 000 of the taxpayers' money that the Deputy Premier spent on his Tax Hot Line. That \$45 000 produced a clear result, shown in the Government's document, that there was no support for any new form of taxation, yet the Premier representing the State has gone to Canberra and told the Federal Government that he supports option C. He does not want a 12.5 per cent consumption tax, he wants a lower tax; he does not want a gold tax because he thinks that will cost the Government the seat of Kalgoorlie; he wants some modification of the perks tax because he is worried about the seat of Pilbara; but apart from that he thinks it is all right.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr HASSELL: I am basically trying to identify where the Premier of this State stands in supposedly representing us in Canberra at the national tax summit, and where he stands in relation to what the people of this State have expressed as their wish and what we know to be their needs. We know that the Premier supports the basis of option C. He told the tax summit that he supported the basis of option C with qualifications. We know from what has been publicised in the past that he supports a consumption tax, but he is worried about the rate of 12½ per cent. So he wants to have a consumption tax in Western Australia.

We know on the other hand that he is ideologically committed to a capital gains tax.

Mr Bryce: Not true.

Mr HASSELL: We know that he is opposed to the gold tax, as we are. We know that he supports

the tax on benefits given to employees, because he said so only a week ago. So he believes that when a company in the goldfields gives one of its employees a car, that should be taxed. He believes that when a company in the developing industries provides a subsidised luncheon for its employees that should be taxed, because that is a perk. If he spends \$12 million to buy a plane to fly himself or the member for Perth around, he believes that should be taxed because it is an employee benefit. He believes that if he has a Cabinet luncheon to entertain some overseas visitors at the expense of the taxpayers, that should be taxed; because that is the principle he is supporting.

The only exception he wants to the so-called perks tax, which is really a double payroll tax, is that he does not want it to apply to the mining towns in the Pilbara. That is when he is in the Pilbara. But now he is at the tax summit he does not want it to apply to housing generally. He does not want it to apply to schoolteachers' houses or policemen's houses, but he believes it should be a tax—

Mr Carr: That is misrepresenting the position.

Mr HASSELL: What is his position? Does he believe employees' benefits should be taxed or not? He is quoted as saying, "I have already expressed the personal view that I would accept a tax on so-called perks." The Premier has gone to the summit, and the only report that has come out of the summit is his opposition to the tax on housing.

What about motor cars? What about subsidised meals? What about all the other things which are given to employees? Are they supposed to be taxed? If a businessman goes out to a lunch, is that supposed to be taxed?

Government members: Yes.

Mr HASSELL: A chorus of cries! Get stuck into the private sector! That is what the people opposite believe in, and that is what their Premier believes in. At least we have made that point clear. He goes off to Canberra and he says all these things to the tax summit.

He was also doing a bit of grandstanding in Canberra, because having committed himself to supporting option C, he then went on to the National Press Club where he had a big stage on which to perform. There he told the Prime Minister how to run his Government. He thought the Prime Minister would do better if he sacked some of his Ministers or demoted them because they did not support option C, like Brian Burke did. The Premier supported option C.

Mr Bryce: No he did not.

Mr HASSELL: Oh, yes he did. Why did he say he did?

Mr Bryce: He did not.

Mr HASSELL: Is this story wrong then?

Mr Bryce: I will explain it.

Mr HASSELL: Is the story in *The West Australian* newspaper wrong too?

Mr Bryce: It sometimes is.

Mr Court: *The Australian Financial Review*—all of them.

Mr HASSELL: They are all there. "Brian Burke supported Option C". That was a headline on Tuesday. After he had made that great statement he dashed off to the National Press Club where he had some advice for the Prime Minister. The report reads—

The Western Australian Premier, Mr Burke, has called on the Prime Minister Mr Hawke, to demote Federal cabinet Ministers who have publicly opposed the Government's preferred tax levy package".

Why would he say that if he did not support the preferred package, which was Option C? Why would he say to Mr Hawke that he should sack the Ministers who opposed it if the Premier himself had opposed it?

He would not have said that. The reason he said that is that he supports the preferred option—he did on Tuesday, anyway. I quote as follows—

Mr Burke said that if ever there was a need for discipline within Labor ranks it was shown by the experience of the tax debate.

What discipline did he want? He wanted everyone to support the Prime Minister and Mr Keating, as he had, on option C. But that was Tuesday.

By Wednesday the complete debacle of the tax summit was obvious to everyone and everyone got a bit nervous. Mr Hawke and Mr Keating started to run from option C. All the inspired stories started to pop up in the media about how they were putting up a new proposal to get out of the tax mess, and it appeared that the only person supporting option C was Mr Burke, the Western Australian Premier. Nevertheless, by the next day the Premier was so worried about the position that he changed tack and we saw in the *Daily News* yesterday a story from the Premier's old friend, John Arthur, as follows—

Meanwhile the WA Premier, Mr Burke, appealed to the Federal Government to see the writing on the wall and abandon any move towards a wide-ranging 12.5 per cent consumption tax on goods and services.

That was the change between Tuesday and Wednesday; that was the change from the submission the Premier put up, when he found himself all alone in the whole of Australia in supporting option C, and in doing so he misrepresented the people of WA.

I referred previously to this official Government document produced under the authority of the Deputy Premier.

Mr Bryce: After you had asked for it 15 times.

Mr HASSELL: And I have still not received answers to questions. The Deputy Premier is still holding off because of some very embarrassing material. That is the reason. But even in the so-called "executive summary" put together by the Deputy Premier we see a clear statement under the heading "Community Views on Tax" as follows—

Respondents indicated a lack of support for the introduction of any new form of tax.

The respondents are right because they know very well that the Government is not about changing the tax system and collecting only the same amount of tax; they know it is about collecting more tax. It is about introducing a capital gains tax, not about promoting jobs, opportunities, private enterprise or success. It is about satisfying the ideological commitments of the ACTU and the left that we have been presented with a proposal for a capital gains tax, because the ACTU and the left are fearful that someone is making something for himself, achieving successes, and making a profit, so they want to get stuck into him and others with a new tax. The fact that the tax would be a disincentive to investors, that it would turn away foreign people who would invest here and so inhibit our economic development is irrelevant to the ACTU and the left wing of the Labor Party. They must have a capital gains tax.

Why is a capital gains tax in the package? It is there for one reason, and that is to buy ACTU support for a consumption tax; it is there to satisfy the ACTU. This is so despite the fact that it would not help the people of Australia generally or help to relieve the unemployment problem. It would not do anything for Western Australia except put us back. Yet it is there and being supported by the Premier; he is clearly, unequivocally and repeatedly reported as supporting option C as the basis of tax reform when option C includes a capital gains tax.

Let us consider the Government's own document, because as the Acting Premier has said, I did ask a lot of questions about the Government's Tax Hot Line on the tax proposals that this Government was trying to put forward in secret to

a national tax summit and to the other bodies that were preparing for the national summit.

Finally on 27 May, weeks and weeks after Parliament ceased sitting, I received from the Deputy Premier a letter which enclosed the responses to the telephone hot line questions and included figures expressed in percentage terms. Let us consider the matter of taxation emphasis and the "Yes" and "No" answers to the question of direct taxation. Those who said "Yes" represented 49.77 per cent and those who said "No" represented 28.05 per cent of those polled. For indirect taxation the "Yes" vote was 36.69 per cent and "No" 38.83 per cent.

The people were also asked, "Would you support the introduction of a capital gains tax, death duties, retail turnover tax and a value-added tax?" Let us consider the capital gains tax, which is considered by the Labor Party as the most popular of its tax proposals. Those who said "Yes" represented 36.77 per cent while those who said "No" represented 50.12 per cent of those polled. That shows a clear majority of people opposed to a capital gains tax.

Let us now consider death duties, remembering that the Federal Government's capital gains tax proposal includes *de facto* death duties because the realisation of property on the death of a person would be subject to the payment of capital gains tax. So we are talking about death duties right now; it is part of the package the Premier supports. Those who said "Yes" to the introduction of death duties represented 15.17 per cent and those who said "No" represented 75.03 per cent.

Let us now consider a retail turnover tax—a consumption tax—which the Premier supports. The respondents who said "Yes" represented 24.17 per cent and those who said "No" represented 55.90 per cent. For a value-added tax, those who said "Yes" represented 20.86 per cent and those who said "No" represented 64.30 per cent.

So with all those taxes there is not one majority in favour of a single new tax being introduced by this Government. That is why the Opposition is saying in the clearest of terms that the public understand what this whole tax debate is about: It is about the collection of more tax. The public know it and the Government knows it. Government members know very well that all this fraudulent and dishonest talk from Canberra about collecting the same amount of tax is absolute nonsense, yet what is going to happen is that we will pay more and more tax.

We will be paying a second payroll tax; that is what this all amounts to. This State's Premier,

who, before the last State election, strutted around the business community of WA saying he would get rid of payroll tax, is now supporting a double payroll tax. If a company or an employer gives an employee a car, that costs the company or the employer the amount of the value of the car.

The Premier believes that that should be taxed while in the hands of the employer. The employer has already paid it out as a benefit to the employee. The Government in Canberra does not have the guts to impose it on the employee; it wants to hit the employer—the wealth producer and creator.

We should be saying from this Parliament in the clearest of terms that there can be no new taxes until the Government stops spending too much. If one looks in a practical way at doing something about expenditure, one has to face reality. One cannot get rid of an \$8 000 million deficit overnight. The Government knows that, and I know it. No-one is trying to get rid of it—the Federal Government is snipping around the edges and making cuts in forward estimates. That will not solve Australia's problems and restore confidence or eliminate the deficit because it will never be eliminated on that basis. The only way to eliminate the deficit is by having a long-term plan. The public must be consulted through a white paper; there must be debate and a decision by the Parliaments of Australia on the basis of accepting realities and the harshness of making the necessary cuts along the way. That must be done over a period.

A consumption tax is about to be imposed in this State and the Premier goes to Canberra and says he is concerned about the price of fuel in the country because it will affect the people. What about fuel costs in the city and the expenses already created by the enormous increases in the cost of fuel? Those increases have been brought about by the devaluation of the dollar which is directly attributable to a lack of confidence in the Commonwealth Government.

The Premier is strutting the stage telling the Prime Minister how to run his Cabinet, to back away from option C, and then saying he supports that option so long as the Federal Government does not touch the goldmining industry or the employees in the Pilbara. Then the Premier changed his mind and said there should be no tax which would affect housing. He wants a capital gains tax, but he is trying to hide that fact. The Deputy Premier tells us the Premier does not want a capital gains tax. When has the Premier said that at the summit? When has he said he does not want a capital gains tax because it will not help

Western Australia? He has not said anything of the sort because he wants a capital gains tax.

Not one element in the tax package is designed to help business—the people who create the wealth. It is a hotchpotch of proposals designed by the Federal Government to prop up its falling popularity. It proposes personal income tax cuts at enormous cost to the people of Australia through new forms of taxation. These new forms of taxation have not been designed to help Australia, but to satisfy the ideological requirements of the various wings, factions, and branches of the Labor Party. The whole tax package is about satisfying the Labor Party and the trade union movement. Not one attempt has been made to satisfy the interests of the people of Australia or to look to the long term and face up to the deficit by consulting the States about expenditure.

The Opposition puts to this Parliament the opportunity to say clearly and distinctly that we oppose the proposals for new forms of taxation, if introduced, as being detrimental to Western Australia.

Mr Davies: What are you for?

Mr HASSELL: We are for real tax reform, and that means less tax. Paying less tax requires less expenditure and that in turn requires political reality. The reality is that it will take time to get rid of these enormous deficits being created by the socialist Government in Canberra. The only way is to train the public to have an understanding of the enormity of the decisions which must be made. That is why we are calling on the Government to start at the other end of the scale by looking at expenditure and then do something about the deplorable tax mess.

The problem will not be solved by bringing in four new forms of taxation. It will not impose any discipline on Government. It will open the way for continuing higher levels of taxation by making it easier to spend more because the Government will have more revenue. If the Federal Government imposes a consumption tax of five per cent, it will be seven per cent in a year's time, and 10 per cent or 12 per cent in a couple of years. We will still be paying the same high levels of income tax. The member for Scarborough knows that well because he has been in business.

Mr Burkett: I would like to give you a no-strings-attached donation of 50c for a new tie because that is the worst tie you have ever worn.

Mr HASSELL: The member for Scarborough, who should know something about these matters, is not so stupid as to support a consumption tax, a capital gains tax, or a double payroll tax. Yet I have no doubt when it comes to the crunch he will

vote the way he is told, to support Mr Burke and his misrepresentation of the views of the people of Western Australia.

The House now has an opportunity to say where it stands and members of the Government are challenged to say whether they oppose this tax farce and support the reality of doing something about wasteful, expensive, extravagant Government which will get no better until somebody faces up to this issue of an \$8 000 million deficit.

MR OLD (Katanning-Roe) [2.37 p.m.]: I have much pleasure in seconding this motion. Unfortunately I did not hear all of our leader's speech, but I heard enough—

Mr Bryce: Our leader!

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! Members know that it is only reasonable for the member just on his feet to have at least a minute to develop his argument before they start on him.

Mr OLD: I appreciate the thought that I might get a minute uninterrupted because I might get a few points over in that time.

Listening to the Leader of the Opposition's speech I found that it made great sense. Of course it would be absolute nonsense to members of the Government. The best thing that has happened to this Government is the calling of the tax summit because it indicates the Government is unable to make up its mind. Every day the summit goes on brings more divisions in the Labor Party. It is probably the greatest thing that has happened to Australia, and certainly to Western Australia, where we will soon go to the polls. People are saying it will be next month or the month after. The quicker the better! If the Premier wants to have a go, bring him on! We are happy to talk to him about it.

Mr Bryce: And the Nalder family will pick up the seat of Katanning again.

Mr OLD: No. The Deputy Premier is out of touch. That is Narrogin—they are winning Narrogin.

Mr Bryce: They are winning Narrogin?

Mr OLD: The Deputy Premier referred to Katanning. I am putting him right geographically; he is so ignorant he does not know where the boundaries are.

Mr Carr: You said they are going to win.

Mr OLD: The Minister is a funny little man.

Mr Bryce: You are an angry one when you bully car drivers and walk out of Parliament.

Mr OLD: Would you like to have a go?

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! It would be far more appropriate to discuss the motion.

Mr OLD: Given an opportunity to say a few words, I will carry on.

The pious paper put out by the Government of Australia called "tax reform" indicates that two problems are tax evasion and tax avoidance.

Tax evasion and tax avoidance are bracketed together. However, there is a very subtle difference between them. Tax evasion is the evasion of taxation and tax avoidance is the legal use of the taxation Acts to minimise taxation. I venture to say that it is the first time that tax avoidance has been put in a situation where it is, by virtue of its definition, an illegal practice. The reason taxation accountants are able to continue their practices is that they are able to advise people of diverse incomes how they can best utilise the taxation Act.

I have a booklet which says it is legal but, by implication that is a very bad word. I believe that anybody who is able or willing to exploit their capital to the extent that they are able to do something for themselves, the nation, or the State, should be allowed to utilise whatever avenues are available to them to minimise taxation. On the other hand, I believe Australia is one of the most highly taxed nations in the world, and that the lower income earners are in deep trouble and should get some relief.

That is what the so-called tax summit is all about. It is about helping people on lower incomes but, at the same time, helping the producers of the wealth of Australia. Governments are doing nothing to help the producers of wealth in Australia to alleviate their situations now. It is unfortunate that the Minister for Agriculture is not with us today. I realise that he is not here because he had made prior arrangements to be overseas. However, I feel quite sure that he would be delighted to answer some of the allegations and charges I will make against the Federal Government and its so-called tax reform.

In no way will the tax summit do anything to assist primary industry. In talking about primary industry I include the agricultural industries, the fishing industry, and the mining industry. Those industries contribute most of the wealth of Australia. If those industries are not encouraged to produce, they will produce no wealth and, therefore, there will be no money raised by taxation.

The primary producers are unable and unwilling to shoulder the taxation burden which they currently carry. It is an unfortunate fact that many primary producers are not paying any taxation. This is so because they are not making any money and the reason they are not making any money is because they have intolerable burdens to

bear through excise and tariffs. Government members can ask what the previous Government did to ease those burdens. My answer would be "nothing". However, that does not excuse the present or future Governments from doing nothing about it.

Mr Taylor: That is right, but at least you admit it.

Mr OLD: It is not a matter of admitting it; it is a matter of seeing what the situation is. Blind Freddie could work out what the problems of the rural community are. Unless the Government is prepared, at this crazy tax summit, to do something, then all is lost. I understand that the tax summit was born from a radio talk-back show in Western Australia in which Mr Hawke was asked by a great Labor supporter and one who is obviously able to influence the Prime Minister whether there would be a tax summit. He was told that it would probably be a good idea.

Nothing will be achieved by it. It is the greatest farce ever perpetrated on the people of Australia.

Mr Davies: Your leader said it was a good thing.

Mr OLD: I think it is good because it is showing Government members up for the nincompoops they are.

Mr Davies: Now you are saying that it is not a good thing.

Mr OLD: If the Minister had listened to me he would have heard what I said.

Mr Davies: I have listened; I have been taking notes.

Mr OLD: I will be pleased to read them later and compare them with *Hansard*.

Unless some relief is given to the rural industry very quickly, there will be no rural industry. In the past, many people have been able to accumulate some assets and because of that are able to continue in an industry into which they have been almost locked because land values have decreased due to the parlous state of the industry. The decrease in values has been to the extent where they find it almost impossible to realise their assets. If the options presented by the Federal Government are accepted by the Parliament, whatever they realise on their assets will be taxed. That is one of the sneaky things that is being introduced into the taxation system by a Government which has no regard for the wealth-producing people of this nation.

In relation to a wealth tax, a publication issued by the Government contains a very lucid statement. It says that, while Australia does not have any wealth tax as such, it does have extensive

taxes on property through payments of State land taxes and local government rates. It states also that the effect is that only six per cent of the 24 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries collect more in wealth tax than Australia. That is an indictment of the system as we know it. If we are No. 6 in that list of countries then, if the present Government has its way, we will be wearing the No. 1 guernsey and that will sound the death knell for primary industry in Australia.

I think the State Government should encourage the Commonwealth Government to begin at the right end and that is to reduce the imposts on primary industry. Those are the killers. One only has to look at the price of fuel to know how severely disadvantaged primary producers are. About 20 years ago the then Federal Government, in its Budget, introduced a three pence a gallon impost on fuel. That caused one of the greatest rows in primary producing history because it was calamitous. Today, as a matter of form, taxes in the order of 3c or 4c a litre are placed on fuel almost every day, and people shrug their shoulders because they know there is nothing they can do about it. It is time the Federal Government, of whatever colour, took a look at the imposts placed on the rural industry.

The Federal Government talks blandly about a wealth tax. That wealth tax would not necessarily be targeted at the wealthy; it would hit people in all income brackets. I assure the House that while the Commonwealth Government continues on the path that it has chosen and is as inflexible as it appears to be today, it will be good news for conservative parties throughout Australia. The prospect of a capital gains tax has been bandied about for some time. Such a tax would be disguised as one which would protect the house owner and therefore the small capitalist. But for how long would the house owner be protected from such a tax? If a matrimonial house is protected *pro tem* from a capital gains tax, a farmer's property should also be protected. Even his house is not protected. Under the proposition put up in the white paper there is no protection whatsoever for anybody in the farming industry.

Mr Hassell: You wouldn't expect them to get protection, would you? They are the wealth producers. You would slug them under the Labor proposals.

Mr OLD: They certainly are the wealth producers, but unfortunately they are not the wealthy and would not qualify for a wealth tax. The capital gains tax is a very sneaky incursion, being similar to the old probate tax. The primary pro-

ducers of this State are not as stupid as the Federal Government thinks they are. They have seen through the proposal very quickly.

A primary producer may have put a lifetime of work into building up a farm, primarily in order to make some money to keep himself and his family. But in order to be one of the greatest contributors to the export wealth of Australia, he is severely disadvantaged. The only time a capital gains tax will be instituted will be when the subject of that capital gain is realised. If one owns property one does not have to pay a capital gains tax unless one is prepared to sell for a price which would probably make it reasonable for one to pay that tax. The Federal Government talks of a very minor capital gains tax, one which is very benign. We have seen such taxes introduced previously in the Federal Parliament. Before we have known where we were, they were completely out of hand.

When the owner of an estate dies, his assets are deemed to have been realised. In other words, he has held on to a property for the purpose of benefiting his family, but on the date of his death that property is valued and if its value has appreciated he is taxed on that appreciation. That represents a return to probate duty. When in Government, this Opposition was responsible for the repeal of death duties in Western Australia. We were the second State in Australia to undertake that very important job. The move was hailed by primary industry as one of the greatest things that ever happened, but the Federal Government now intends to reintroduce it. It is doing so not openly, but by stealth. The Federal Government has said that it will not introduce a probate tax. At the end of the white paper, it states—

The Government is not proposing to introduce death duties, gift duties.

That is an absolute untruth, because the Government intends to introduce death duties by stealth. The first we will see of it will be when somebody who has spent a lifetime building up a property as an asset for his family dies. His property will then be deemed to have been sold. It will then be valued and taxed accordingly.

I ask that the Government support us in asking the Commonwealth Government to drop any thought of a wealth tax unless it exempts farming properties in the same way as residences. To some people a residence is the accumulation of their assets throughout their lifetime and, as such, should be protected. Why should not somebody who has gone onto virgin land, made a farm and appreciated the capital value of that land be protected? There seems to be no justification for

treating them differently from the owners of residences.

If the Commonwealth Government wants to introduce a probate duty, let it come out into the open and say so. Let it then deal with the acrimony of the rural community, not only farmers, but also the small businessmen who will also be affected. As has been said for some time now, the tax summit exercise is an absolute sham. It was described this morning as a ridiculous situation in which people are brought into the House of Representatives and become temporary politicians to advise the Government. If the Government of the day cannot make up its mind, it should give the game away and let the people it invites to the tax summit take over and govern this country.

Finally, I make a point about farm write-offs being the victim of one of the options proposed by the Government. The Government has said that farm write-offs are aimed at the Pitt Street farmer. We do not have any Pitt Street farmers in Western Australia. They are generally known as St. George's Terrace farmers. In the past, some of those St. George's Terrace farmers have done a tremendous amount to improve land to the extent that it becomes productive. Many people cannot afford to do that. These people have taken advantage of "tax avoidance" possibilities to develop land and obtain tax concessions. That has always been accepted as a reasonable thing to do.

Mr Mensaros: We would not have had a rural industry if that had not been the case.

Mr OLD: That is so right. But one of the propositions in the white paper is quietly to do away with that possibility. The farmer will be allowed a limited amount of money—I think it is \$10 000—in off-farm income. Income above that amount will attract the normal rate of tax. Those farmers who during a period of prosperity had the business acumen and the foresight to invest money off-farm in order to supplement their income in bad times will now be penalised. Many of them have taken money from the income of the farm and invested it off-farm. Some of these people have already been penalised because they had years in which they were affected by drought. Some of them were affected by drought for up to five years, during which time they lived on the accumulated assets they were able to take from their farms. I know of one in particular who used his assets as a barrier against the bad years until he had no assets left. During that time, when a coalition government was in power, he was not entitled to any assistance under drought relief measures.

That is fair enough; he accepted that, because that was within the parameters. But if that fellow had not invested that money off-farm he would probably have been in debt to the Government today for about \$200 000, which would have been a burden on the taxpayer. He had the foresight to go away from the farm and put some money away to earn something. If he ever gets back into the position where he can invest off-farm he will have a limit to the amount of money he can deduct from his personal taxation. This is not his farm taxation; it is his personal taxation.

Another man can be in business and earn three times as much and utilise all the deductions in the world, but because this guy goes off-farm he is not able to take advantage of that situation. If that ever becomes law—I hope it does not; I will fight it like the very devil—we will be putting another nail in the coffin of primary industry.

Finally, let me say that I am horrified to see within this taxation booklet that business tax concessions will be eliminated. Business tax concessions include soil and water conservation. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in my life.

Successive Governments have been pressured, not only by primary industry, but also by conservationists, to increase the amount of money available for taxation concessions in regard to soil and water conservation. Successive Governments have made only token gestures towards doing it, but this Government wants to take it away. We have reached the level where the concessions provided are almost non-effective. Hopefully we will be able to increase them. But these people opposite want to destroy the whole scheme. Why would anybody in primary industry be at all interested in any of the options put up by the national Government?

I support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Premier) [3.02 p.m.]: The motion which has been presented to the House by the Leader of the Opposition and supported by the member for Katanning-Roe explains to all of us, leaving no doubts in our minds, why it was that they and their colleagues, during 35 years in office nationally, simply and literally opted out of their responsibilities. The sterility of this motion reflects the form of thinking which permeated those administrations one after the other. What a gall they have to come here today and complain about the levels of expenditure and the need to cut taxes, the need for a reform in the taxation system, when over more than three decades, their colleagues in another Parliament responsible for this taxation system which now

grieves them so badly simply did not have the gumption to face up to the debate which would inevitably follow any proposal to reform the taxation system. The moment somebody takes the lid off this issue there will be a very—

Mr Bradshaw: It has backfired on you.

Mr BRYCE: Let us examine some of the performances and complete the picture by reminding the member for Murray-Wellington that there are things which should be giving him bad dreams concerning the track record of his colleagues in his party who were responsible for what is a complete mess in the taxation system which applies across the length and breadth of this nation. For three and a half decades he and his colleagues shrank from the responsibility of doing something about it because it was too hot to handle.

In fact there were two Treasurers who got close.

Mr Hassell: Are you opposed to the motion?

Mr BRYCE: Members should bide their time; it might hurt a little. I can assure them it will get more painful before it gets better.

There were two conservative Treasurers over the last 35 years who showed an ounce of guts to face up to this issue. Then, because of the pressure poured onto them, they backed away. The first was Billy McMahon during the late 1950s, who probably did more work in this area than any other individual Treasurer in the post-war history of the nation. He came to grips with this subject, but Menzies dismissed his proposal. Menzies said, "It is too hot, do not touch it". Those in government could not handle a public debate, a debate which would ensue when the lid was lifted on this issue.

The second Treasurer to get close was the former Treasurer in the outgoing conservative Government, Mr Howard. He got close, but he did not get as close as did Billy McMahon. That is why at this moment on this side of the House we find it fascinating to hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about the difference of opinion within the Labor Party. There are differences of opinion, and there should be differences of opinion amongst members opposite if they are facing up to this issue.

Opposition members: There are!

Mr BRYCE: If there are differences of opinion, what is it that makes members opposite so frightened of the expression of those differences of opinion? It is only the people in this community who cannot concede there is a really important place in politics and in the process of Government for a genuine community debate about important

issues which will see this summit as a farce or a sham.

I am talking about members opposite and their colleagues in other places. They like to see beliefs on issues of this sort nicely wrapped up and put away without any form of threat to their position or opinion. Frankly I congratulate the Federal Government on its decision to hold the tax summit. That summit, like the summits which preceded it, has heralded in a new era in Australian politics. I am very proud indeed to be a part of a political organisation which is very comfortable indeed with regard to the process of consultation with the people whom we represent.

Mr Peter Jones: Do you support option C?

Mr BRYCE: I wonder what percentage the member for Narrogin can produce? By failing to do anything about this mess when they were in Government, members of the Liberal and National Parties were delinquent. Now they are back in Opposition and, based on the arguments put to this Chamber today by their leader, they are fundamentally dishonest about how the issue of taxation reform needs to be approached.

We do not find that disturbing or surprising. In fact, we accept it. The Leader of the Opposition told many untruths. There were so many lies during the course of his remarks today that I will not even waste time trying to set right anywhere near half of the lies he put to the Chamber. He has become a man nobody believes.

This motion reveals the sterility which has overcome the Opposition. I could not believe it when I first read the motion. The Opposition has had six weeks to brew over this issue. It was inevitable it would move a motion on this subject when it was known there would be a one-day sitting, but look at what has come up with.

This is the man in this Parliament who has become known as the great knocker of the process of inquiry as part of the decision-making process. The Leader of the Opposition condemns and knocks inquiry after inquiry. What does he do in regard to this motion? He states we ought to have another inquiry. He says, "Let us look into it". There has been a nine-month debate across the nation in respect of these matters, and where is the Leader of the Opposition? He is like the bloke who fell out of the boat; he is just not in it. He has been left so far behind that he just cannot cope. He suggested that what we need in order to resolve or to adequately address this question is another inquiry. He said, "Let us have another white paper".

We have found today slightly amusing indeed. The motion that has been put to us today by the

Leader of the Opposition simply ignores the havoc that the structure of the present taxation system is causing. All the Leader of the Opposition says in his classic cop-out is, "All we want is less tax". For God's sake, since time began who has not been able to articulate that courageous stance—"All we want is less tax"? How imaginative.

Mr Mensaros: We want less expenditure.

Mr BRYCE: The Opposition wants less expenditure. Why, for God's sake, did not the member, as one of the gurus leading the Government of this State between 1974 and 1983, do something about reducing the level of expenditure? The member for Floreat and his colleagues spend money like men with no arms, year after year. I will show members the figures in a moment. The previous Government came into office in 1974 with the promise of reducing inflation and spending less. Do members know how much the level of expenditure went up in its first year in office? Spending increased by 29 per cent in one Budget! In the first three years back in office that level of expenditure went up an average of 25 per cent. That was by a Government which intended to cut the level of expenditure and the level of inflation. A former senior Minister says, "Why aren't we doing something about the level of expenditure?" I will give members those figures for every single year. The member for Floreat will never forget that interjection.

Mr Mensaros: That is the reason you don't want to cut expenditure, is it?

Mr BRYCE: No. In fact, I am proud to be able to tell members of the House that there was an embarrassingly marvellous reduction in the level of expenditure in the last financial year, a reduction which members of the Opposition will not be able to stomach when they see it in statistical form.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: Has it ever occurred to members of the Opposition that from time to time a Government's priorities might change? Do members of the Opposition assume that in 1985 we will have precisely the same set of priorities that they had in 1974? I ask members to tell me their views after I have given them the figures. They will be badly in need of some political antacid powder.

The Leader of the Opposition fronted here today with the most extraordinary form of hypocrisy. He and his colleagues have been finding life a little tough since they have been back in Opposition. They were barely acceptable while they were in Government, backed up with all of the resources of Government departments. Now that they are operating on their own merit as;

individual Opposition members, they are finding life very tough.

So what happens when the first serious political issue, the question of the reform of the tax system, comes up during this Parliament? They decide they are going to cop out. It is a classic cop-out. The work was too hard. Members of the Opposition have made no suggestions or contributions to the debate. They have not participated at all. They have simply said, as they said for three-and-a-half decades while in government, "This is too tough. It is too hot to handle." It has been a complete cop-out as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned.

I have suggested that the Leader of the Opposition should take a long, hard look at what happened during that nine-year period of conservative Government.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I will give chapter and verse in a minute.

Let us give the members of the Opposition the curry to go with their rice. Here it comes. Did we not see the crocodile tears from the Leader of the Opposition a little earlier about this level of expenditure; what Governments must do is to cut back on the levels of expenditure. He was joined in that plea by the member for Floreat. He said by way of interjection, "Don't worry about the taxation system, the revenue side; concentrate on the expenditure side of the argument". Let us look at how the Opposition concentrated on the expenditure side of the argument during the time when it was in Government between 1974 and 1983. Let us look at the rate at which the level of expenditure of the Government of WA increased while these gentlemen opposite were the stewards with their hands on the helm.

In 1973-74 the level of expenditure increased by 20 per cent. That was in one Budget. Up it went by 20 per cent. In 1974-75 it increased by 30 per cent. No matter how much members of the Opposition interject, they are going to hear these figures. It does not matter if it takes me all day.

Mr Trethowan: Why did you miss out 1972-73?

Mr BRYCE: I am talking about the Opposition's period in office.

Mr Trethowan: Why do you miss out 1972-73—because it is too embarrassing for you.

Mr BRYCE: I will give the member the 1983-84 figures or as far back as the honourable gentleman likes. As a matter of fact, we will be perfectly happy to accept our share of responsibility. Unlike the member and his colleagues, we will accept three-fifteenths of the responsibility for the last

one-and-a-half decades, but the worthy gentlemen sitting opposite must face up to the ugly fact that they have to accept the lion's share of the responsibility for the fact that high levels of expenditure are built into the system and we have a taxation system which is a monumental mess.

Let me continue with the figures. The previous Government's second year in office saw a whacking increase in the level of Government expenditure of 30 per cent. During the Government's third year in office, 1975-76, there was an increase in expenditure of 27 per cent. In 1976-77 Sir Charles Court boasted that our Budget went above the billion dollar mark, when he said, "Haven't we arrived!" We had achieved a Budget that was more than one billion dollars.

Sir Charles Court was not worried about the level of expenditure; he was proud of it. One could not get him off his feet at Budget time, so proud was he of having achieved that. How did he do it? In the fourth year, he bumped up the level of expenditure by 20 per cent. The fifth year was 1977-78, and the level of expenditure increased by 14.9 per cent. In the sixth year, 1978-79, it was 10 per cent; the seventh year, 1979-80, it was 13.7 per cent; in 1980-81, it was 13.5 per cent; in 1981-82, it was 11 per cent, and in 1982-83, it was 13.4 per cent. In the first year of the present Government, it was 13 per cent; and in the second year—that is, last year—down it came to 6.8 per cent.

Now, if any Government in the last decade and a half has demonstrated a sincere commitment to a reduction in expenditure, it has been the present Government. If any Government has an absolutely established reputation for record increases in the levels of expenditure with a disregard for the expenditure side of the level, it is the successive Governments between 1974 and 1983 comprising members who now sit opposite. What a monumental heap of humbug it is for the Leader of the Opposition to come to the Chamber today and say that, now he is back in Opposition, he has discovered this serious question of expenditure levels and to urge the Government in 1985 to do something about those levels. We do not believe the Leader of the Opposition, and nobody outside the Chamber will believe him.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: There would not be just a modicum of political manipulation involved in the demonstrations by farmers!

Mr Trethowan: In the last 10 years, which Governments contributed most significantly to the increase in the national debt?

Mr BRYCE: I am talking about the responsibility of members opposite. If the member for East Melville wants to travel with me—

Mr Trethowan: Statistics and damned statistics!

Mr BRYCE: Let us attack figures because we are feeling uncomfortable with the truth! Nobody on the other side of the Chamber would dare to stand up in this debate and argue that the Government ought to do something about the level of expenditure, given the delinquency of the member for East Melville and his colleagues in the last decade. They are culpable and negligent, so I suggest that they just sit there and reflect on their own hypocrisy.

Another aspect of this appalling debate is the amazing inconsistency of the Leader of the Opposition in particular. Members on this side of the House do not wonder or worry any longer about that. We just wait to see the form and the shape of the negativism with which the Leader of the Opposition will respond to any Government initiative. When the debate on the North-West Shelf gas project was continuing, did not members opposite hear the Minister for Minerals and Energy actually commend and thank the member for Floreat and the member for Narrogin for their constructive contributions to the debate? But, what happened with the Leader of the Opposition? When it was his turn to make a contribution, he could not resist the temptation; he had to get in there and build up a man of straw, knock that down, and find several other things to denigrate. He could not find it within himself to say, "Congratulations. A job well done. Western Australia will benefit as a result of the work that you have done."

Let me draw the attention of members to some of the things that the Government has done to achieve efficiency in government and a reduction of expenditure. Each and every one of us knows that what we have done has met with denigration and condemnation from the Leader of the Opposition.

The restructuring of the Public Works Department and the creation of the Building Management Authority was probably one of the most outstanding examples of a decision by the Government to rationalise a dept which had a traditional role, and which had "grown like Topsy" over a long period under successive Governments.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: This is how members opposite react.

Mr Mensaros: It earned you the support of the Public Service, did it not?

Mr BRYCE: The member for Floreat can criticise the methodology. If the member for Floreat is correct and we lose political and public support as a result of it, at least the member for Floreat will be big enough—

Mr Mensaros: You do not feel for the people.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Floreat is well known for his feelings for the people! On our side of the House, we have noticed how that manifests itself in his public position. Five minutes ago the member for Floreat said, "You should do something about expenditure." I highlight the specific case of a department which needed rationalisation. It was rationalised and restructured, and this man says, "Now I am terribly sorry for the people involved." We in this Chamber know that he is not dinkum. He has never been concerned about the feelings of people. It is well understood by the people who sit opposite that that is the sort of political priority the member for Floreat has chosen. He cannot have it both ways. That was a classic example.

The taxpayers of this State will save millions of dollars as a result of the Building Management Authority exercise, yet it was created with unparalleled opposition and denigration from members sitting opposite, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition.

The establishment of the functional review committee in this State was overdue by about 10 years.

Mr Peter Jones: Can you tell me of any opposition the public raised about the Public Works Department?

Mr BRYCE: My word. The Leader of the Opposition condemned the restructuring of the Public Works Department. The member for Narrogin should have a look at the columns of the newspapers.

Mr Peter Jones: It was not the restructuring of the department but the way the people went out. Seriously, that is a different matter.

Mr BRYCE: A very quiet, subtle difference, is there?

Mr Peter Jones: My word there is.

Mr BRYCE: It was the work of the functional review committee, which was established, literally, to review the functions of such organisations. It presented recommendations for that sort of rationalisation. Some of the recommendations are a bit difficult and involve a certain amount of discomfort. In all cases, when members opposite were in Government, they walked away from the challenge of such reorganisations. The Premier is to be commended for the work that he has done and the

persistence with which he has applied himself to that particular field, because despite the wonderful reputations of the Premiers who preceded him, not one of them was prepared to bite the bullet in terms of improving the efficiency of the government organisation.

Let me draw the attention of members to one of the other agencies of the Government which has been the subject of continual denigration. I refer to the Western Australian Development Commission, which was given a very specific role to assist the Government with asset management. What a wonderful bunch opposite! They sat in government and had no idea of the asset base of the State. What a wonderful reception they would have received if they had gone to a meeting of the shareholders as the board of a commercial organisation and said, "Look, we've been managing the affairs of this organisation for nine years now uninterrupted, and we can't tell you what the asset base of the company is. We don't know where the assets are. We don't know what form they are in. We don't know if they are fixed or liquid. We don't know whether we can rationalise these assets in any way." Is it not marvellous that these wonderful captains of industry, the accountants galore who were supposedly great managers, and who it was assumed would run things so smoothly, had the hide to run things in that way.

I will give members another example.

Mr COURT: Can you tell us what your department does now, because the WADC seems to do the work? Your department has expanded in size and it is not doing the work—talk about a wastage of Government funds!

Mr BRYCE: I advise the member for Nedlands that if I could remember the page number in *Hansard* I would refer him to a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Industrial Development last year when he presented to this House the basis and the outline of the new corporate plan for the Department of Industrial Development.

Mr COURT: You are the greatest waster of public funds we have seen.

Mr BRYCE: We are the only Government in a decade-and-a-half in this State—perhaps we could take the evidence back further and the evidence would be sweeter—that has manifestly demonstrated that it has cut the level of the increase in expenditure. When I presented the ministerial statement to which I have referred to this House I read out the figures involved and it would be only a blind man who could not see the political truth revealed by those figures.

Is it not extraordinary that these marvellous managers who became members of the political parties which sit opposite survived for so long as custodians of assets of Western Australia without any knowledge whatsoever of the asset basis?

Let me give an example of our management in respect of expenditure control. It was this Government that created for the first time in the history of this State the position of Minister for Budget Management.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I guarantee that that is one Ministry that members opposite will not do away with when and if the unlikely event occurs that the people of this State put their trust in members opposite by reinstating them to the Treasury bench.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I ask members opposite whether they would like me to read to them again those figures to which I have referred in case they have forgotten them.

Mr COURT: What about Mr Butler who has been appointed as a mediator when he is already employed as a mediator?

Mr BRYCE: Would members opposite like me to read the figures to them again? In case they cannot cope with remembering the annual figures, I will be generous and give them the figures on a triennial basis so that they do not have too many figures to remember.

Mr Bertram: What year was it that the Treasurer added the expenditure together—?

Mr BRYCE: It was during Sir Charles Court's time when he said that the Government had collected revenue which created expenditure of \$1 billion.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: Let me give the triennial figures.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to resume his seat. I think this is the third time, it may even be the fourth time, that I have made the suggestion—and I assure members that it will be the last time—that if they are going to interject on the Deputy Premier, although I will not preclude them from that opportunity, they must do so in some sort of orderly fashion. If members continue to interject as they are doing I will have to take action against them. More particularly, if after I call "Order!" I hear another member continue to interject vigorously I will take action immediately without any further warning.

Mr BRYCE: For the sake of the record I would like to record the levels of the increase in expenditure during the term when members opposite were in Government. I will record the figures on a triennial basis in order that members opposite do not readily forget them. From 1974 to 1977 the average level of increase in expenditure was 25.8 per cent per annum. In the second triennium they managed a slightly better figure, 13 per cent, and, in the third triennium it was again 13 per cent.

The point I have made to the House and which I hope will be taken by members opposite is that in the last financial year of this Government's management of the affairs of this State the rate at which expenditure increased was 6.8 per cent, and that rate is going down. If there is a Government which is genuinely concerned about containing that level of expenditure it certainly is the current Government of Western Australia.

Members opposite may argue about priorities—that is basically what the body politic is concerned with year in and year out—but simply cannot argue with the hard evidence that we have been more successful by a country mile in our endeavours to contain that level of expenditure.

For the benefit of the member for Nedlands I feel I would be neglecting him if I did not give him the benefit of the other example, regardless of whether he feels compelled to leave this House; that is his business, but his friends will subsequently tell him that there was another aspect to this question of the management of the economy by our predecessors which cost the taxpayers a great deal of money and which we have put right.

When this Government came into office there was no system or method to discover how many buildings were leased by the Government of Western Australia. There was no information as to how big those buildings were, who owned them, or how much space the Government was leasing.

Every year the taxpayers of this State were parting with millions of dollars which was paid to those people who own the buildings in this city and in other parts of this State, and there was no means of managing that process. The previous Government did not provide a register as a consolidated data base—the data simply did not exist. Each year the requests came in to the Government and they were approved at an accelerating pace.

The incoming Government did not know how much land it owned and we did not know whether we should be rationalising it in a certain way. We did not have a clue which buildings in the city

were being leased, the price that was being paid or the terms of payment. After 18 months in office this Government arranged for that sort of information to be compiled for the very first time, in consolidated form.

Well might members opposite shed crocodile tears to express their reaction to the question of expenditure control. Where were the fine, outstanding accountants who were expressing a genuine concern in the management of the affairs of this State at that time?

The same sort of data bases were missing in respect of the number of employees of this State. Nobody knew exactly how many were employed and nobody knew what sort of entrenchment commitments may have been looming over the horizon.

Mr Peter Jones: Are you saying that the Government's accommodation committee kept no records at all?

Mr BRYCE: I am saying that it was not able to provide the data to this Government in order that it could see the picture. The Government accommodation committee was a small committee—

Mr Peter Jones: Mr Boylen and Mr Shaddick—

Mr BRYCE: I know exactly who was on that committee.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I will say what I want to say.

Mr Peter Jones: You are saying that they kept no records.

Mr BRYCE: I am not saying that they did not keep any records. The committee kept records of the decisions in regard to which departments took up office space, but there was no consolidated data. It has taken this Government 18 months to put together a comprehensive picture in regard to who owns buildings, what sort of rent is being paid, and the terms which apply.

Where were the great managers then? I can tell members where they were. They were looking after their friends. They were not the slightest bit interested in managing the affairs and assets of this State. There are many other similar examples, but I wanted to point to just a couple. The Opposition presided over an unprecedented increase in the rate of expenditure. If the Opposition would like me to give further facts and figures I will come back to the Chamber and give chapter and verse in respect of where it spent every cent of the money. The Opposition spent at a rate of increase per annum that exceeded by far anything this Government has done.

The best piece of good news for members of the Opposition is the recent announcement relating to increases in Government charges, but I did not notice the Leader of the Opposition extolling the virtues of the Government's decision. He is extraordinary; he complains like billyo about the increases in Government charges, but when we impose minimal, below inflation rates of increases in Government charges, he describes it as an election gimmick.

For the sake of posterity, I put on record what has happened. I refer to the announcement made by the Premier only a couple of weeks ago regarding the increase in taxes and charges in this State for 1985-86, because it has such a direct bearing on the question of the Government's will and determination to control expenditure. The State fuel tax, no increase; motor vehicle licences, no increase; compulsory vehicle third party insurance, no increase; MTT fares, no increase; Westrail country bus and train fares, no increase; domestic electricity, increased by 3.8 per cent; gas for domestic purposes, increased by 3.8 per cent; metropolitan water fixed charge, increased by 2.4 per cent; metropolitan water consumption charge, up 2.7 per cent; metropolitan domestic sewerage rate, up 2.9 per cent; metropolitan domestic drainage rates, no increase; country domestic water rates, up 2.9 per cent; country sewerage, domestic, up 2.9 per cent; country drainage, domestic, up 2.9 per cent.

Mr Blaikie: By how much did you put up sewerage connection charges? What about telling us that you put them up 300 or 400 per cent?

Mr BRYCE: That is not true, and if the member for Vasse wishes to present data to the Chamber on that point, he can go for his life. I suggest that the member is suffering from the same form of hyperbole as his leader.

To continue: SHC charges, up 3.9 per cent; age pensioner SHC rents, no increase.

That list demonstrates the Government's performance. We are happy to have it on record because those particular and individual decisions altogether—including anything the member for Vasse may even care to contribute to the debate—indicate the Government's performance.

Mr Blaikie: What about plumbing charges imposed by the new Water Authority? You said you had kept the increases down to three per cent.

Mr BRYCE: I did not say that. I have merely read a list of very specific items together with their rates of increase.

Mr Blaikie: Specifically because they suited you.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Burkett): Order! If the Deputy Premier is allowed to continue his address the member for Vasse may choose to jump to his feet when he has finished. Until then, let us have speakers one at a time.

Mr BRYCE: The truth of this matter is that tax reform is long overdue. At present for the first time this century at the national level a Government has decided to bite the bullet, open the debate, air the issues, and invite people to become part of the process of consultation about the most fundamental issue affecting the people of this country; that is, the level of the tax system.

There is absolutely no doubt in the minds of any members in this place that the taxation system is in a mess.

In the Leader of the Opposition we see a man who is a member of a party and organisation the reputation of which is directly related to the mess that has been created. For 3½ decades conservative Governments at the national level have presided over the certain but gradual intensification of the mess that is now the Commonwealth tax system. The reason it is in such a big mess in 1985 is that conservative Treasurers, one after the other together with their front bench colleagues, shelved the responsibility to bite the bullet.

I conclude by making the point that the Leader of the Opposition very wilfully misrepresented the position of the Premier. I am not angry about it; I am sure the Premier would be mildly more angry, but he is becoming accustomed to the litany of untruths, white lies and slightly darker lies the Leader of the Opposition uses when he finds it necessary and appropriate to describe the Premier's position on something. He seems to be so galled by the competence and effectiveness of the Premier of Western Australia that he finds it necessary to resort to the most extraordinary misrepresentations and untruths. I will not be angry about that; on this side of the Chamber we have come to live with it as a fact of life. In fact, these days we sit here and apply something of a Richter scale to the way the Leader of the Opposition performs on that aspect of misrepresentation. Today he got quite close to earthquake proportions in terms of the severity and the number of lies peddled for all to witness. There were so many untruths. The issue is so sophisticated and complicated that the Leader of the Opposition decided he would have a ball with untruths.

The Premier of this State has not said that option C is the one for him; he has said countless times, both publicly in this Chamber and at the taxation summit, in the most unequivocal fashion,

that option C constitutes the most appropriate starting point for the debate.

A member interjected.

Mr BRYCE: Is not that a form of disarming honesty, which sits uncomfortably with the members of the Opposition, when the Premier of this State says that he believes option C is an appropriate and practical starting point for the debate? He said that he has serious reservations about parts of it—he does not cop the package in toto by any means—and he recognises that some people will not be very happy with many of the proposals contained in it. Is it not strange that the Premier would be so honest as to say the course he was recommending—the course that might be the most appropriate one—might also give some people a certain amount of anxiety and concern? He made an honest statement, unlike the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Hassell: Do you agree with option C? Are you going to tell us in simple terms?

Mr Peter Jones: Tell us which part you like if you don't like the whole package.

Mr BRYCE: The Leader of the Opposition spent the best part of an hour today continuing, as his colleagues have done for 35 years, to turn his back on the real challenge. He did not want a serious debate. He wanted a fracas on tax. He was not prepared to participate. He and his colleagues would not make a suggestion or a submission to the tax summit. He called the Federal Government's endeavour to open up this serious issue a farce and a sham.

Mr Peter Jones: Which it is.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Narrogin is entitled to his opinion. To have participated in the tax summit would have been a bit too much like hard work for the Opposition without all its lackeys to do the work in putting together all the issues. Life is rather tough on the front bench of the Opposition without people to do all the work. Members of the Opposition settled into a position of having people do all the work for them after eight years in Government. The Opposition copped out of the tax summit first because it could not handle participation in a genuine, open, public debate, and secondly, because it was not prepared to do the hard work.

I congratulate the Federal Government for the initiative it has taken in conducting the summit. The tax reform issue will not be resolved at one summit or in one Budget. No tax system that has grown up like Topsy over 40, 50 or more years will be restructured effectively in the space of six or 12 months, but at least the Federal Government has done a dinkum and honest job in opening up the

debate so that people in Australia can become better informed than ever before in respect of all the specific taxes and the issues.

I have no praise for but only condemnation of the cravens who sit opposite in this place. They were in Government themselves and presided over record increases in expenditure. In a debate on tax reform they then say, "Forget about restructuring the tax. Just concentrate on reducing expenditure". They made that statement in spite of their having presided over extraordinary increases in the rates of expenditure. When it was their elected responsibility to make a decent contribution to the debate, they were found to be paralysed in a political sense.

Amendment to Motion

Members will not be surprised to hear that I have an amendment to propose to the House. I move an amendment—

Delete all words after the word "express" in line 1 with a view to inserting in place thereof—

- (1) Its support for the need to reform Australia's Taxation System which is
 - (a) restricting economic growth;
 - (b) crippling initiative;
 - (c) penalising low and average income earners;
 - (d) encouraging tax avoidance and evasion;

Members of the Opposition run for cover when that issue comes up. I am tempted to go into the matter right now, but I am sure that my colleague, the member for Gosnells, can give chapter and verse of the Opposition's track record on that subject. If only the people the Opposition has protected over such a period were prepared to put the money into the bin that they are morally obliged to do, we could cut taxes and eliminate a range of existing taxes. I ask who it is who makes a big fellow of himself defending the principle of tax avoidance and the practice of tax evasion. The words proposed to be inserted continue—

- (e) effectively reducing the international competitiveness of Australian export industry.
- (2) This House notes the failure of the Opposition to present a case of any kind to the National Taxation Summit, which reflects the reluctance of Liberal National Country Party Governments over the past 35 years to tackle the long standing problems

of an inefficient and inequitable taxation system.

- (3) The House applauds the achievement of the Western Australian Government in holding down increases in taxation and charges below the inflation rate during the first 3 years in office, in stark contrast to the record of the previous Liberal-National Country Party Government in its last term of office.

MR PEARCE (Armadale—Minister for Education) [3.55 p.m.]: I am pleased to second the amendment and to address myself to the tax summit and tax reform in Australia. Although the original national economic summit launched by the Hawke Government was aimed at bringing about consensus, the tax summit grew out of that consensus. There was a consensus that the tax system in Australia did not suit Australians and the Australian economy and needed to be dramatically reworked. Everybody would agree about that. Even the Opposition seemed today to be saying much the same sort of thing.

Our present tax system does not suit us. It will not bring about the kind of initiative we require for growth and economic soundness. Therefore, it needs to be reworked. Many groups, each advocating different solutions, were asked to come to the national tax summit in an attempt to achieve a package that would suit our needs. Every group in Australia that was invited accepted the invitation to help in this great national task, with the exception of the Liberal Party. Even nationally the Liberal Party took the view taken by the Opposition in this Parliament; namely, that here is an opportunity for a bit of sniping around the edges, here is the opportunity to try to catch a State Government and a national Government which is determined to produce a tax system which works in the best interest of all Australians. The Liberal Party did not say that here is an opportunity to do a job that is important for the future of our State and our country. The Liberal Party did not take the opportunity to help to gauge the most appropriate tax for our time, but said that the Government wanted to impose new taxes. That is the very predictable line which the Leader of the Opposition rolled out in speaking to his weak motion before the Parliament this morning.

When the Leader of the Opposition asked whether we were in favour of a capital gains tax, he did not ask whether we were in favour of cuts in direct taxation for pay-as-you-earn taxpayers. The answer from this side of the House is a quite unequivocal "Yes". We are in favour of tax cuts to

pay-as-you-earn taxpayers who currently pay far too high a portion of the tax collected in this country.

As my deputy leader has pointed out, the real cop-out from the Opposition was that it has been critical while offering nothing. Andrew Peacock is not at the tax summit because he has nothing constructive to say. He can be only negative. The Opposition can criticise, but it cannot suggest. The net result of the Leader of the Opposition's final statement in decrying summitry was the call for a national summit to work out the ways in which Government expenditure might be reduced. No doubt if there were to be such a national summit the Liberals would not go because they would not want to say unpopular things such as, "We should cut this or that expenditure".

It is ironic that the Leader of the Opposition has the gall to talk about cuts in expenditure when his backbench colleagues and some of his candidates are roaring around the country promising new schools to everybody. Every electorate I visit now has had some Liberal there before me promising a new school here and more teachers there. Although I would certainly like to see increases in education expenditure for the good of education in this State, I wonder how committed are followers of the Leader of the Opposition to the proposition that there should be cuts in Government expenditure. If it is true that the Opposition is touting this as the answer to the economic problems of Australia and Western Australia, let them produce before the election a list of the cuts they propose to make in expenditure in Western Australia. Let them propose to the national Government a list of cuts in expenditure that they might make so that we can properly assess whether the national interest would be served by the Liberal Party's hidden list of cuts. I will not allege that there is such a hidden list because I know perfectly well that the Liberal Party has not even given a thought to reducing one dollar of expenditure from the Western Australian Budget, or indeed, the national Budget.

The Liberal Party has given a lot of thought to the many millions of dollars that it might be able to promise before the next election in the hope of winning votes. It also asked the State Government's position on the tax summit. As always, it tried to boil down that position to the simple issues that appeal to simple minds.

The question from the Leader of the Opposition has been: Do we support option C? The simple answer is that the State Government has never supported option C in the form in which it was expressed in the white paper. Even the member for

Nedlands must have seen the Leader of the Opposition go very white and drop his jaw a little while ago at a time which coincided with his reading of this evening's *Daily News*. That report summarised in many ways what the State Government has been about with regard to the tax summit. Our representatives, the Premier and the Minister for Transport, went across with the belief that Australia needed a better tax package than it currently had. We were prepared to work positively towards that end. Obviously the options A, B, and C were to be the big starting point in the debate. Western Australia, through Premier Burke, has played the honest broker role which it is often able to do at the national level. Let me read from the *Daily News* as follows—

A dramatically reworked tax package has been agreed on at the national tax summit.

The Federal Government has dropped the Option C plan to tax at 12.5 per cent food, fuel and government services like public transport, electricity and health.

Further down—

Gold mining will remain tax free.

Over the page—

The package—a victory for WA's delegation to the summit—is believed to have been worked out in high-level talks involving the Federal Government and the ACTU.

The WA Premier, Mr Burke, and the Minister for Regional Development, Mr Grill, have been lobbying the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, the Treasurer, Mr Keating, and other senior ministers.

The gold decision is a major victory for WA, where 80 per cent of the mineral is produced.

So our approach to the summit has been based on the idea that there needs to be a better tax package for Australians than the present one. I defy the Opposition to state that it approves of the present tax arrangements in their totality. Our representatives went to the summit believing that something better could emerge from it and they were determined to do their part in producing a better package. Does the Leader of the Opposition support direct tax cuts?

Mr Hassell: Do you support the tax on services? Do you support the capital gains tax?

Mr PEARCE: A little while ago the member for Katanning-Roe—I am not sure to which party he presently belongs—spoke about the big difficulties that the proposal for a capital gains tax were causing a Singapore businessman who wanted to invest in Western Australia. The mem-

ber was very concerned that this Singapore businessman should remain effectively tax free in Australia in order to make his money here, while Western Australian pay-as-you-earn taxpayers picked up the load. What equity is there in that proposition?

We are determined to do something about the heavy impost of taxes and charges on the ordinary lower and middle income earning Western Australians. That is the position; we want to do something to help ordinary Western Australians. What is the Opposition doing to assist in this matter? Andrew Peacock refused to go to the tax summit because he knew that if he went he would have to make a speech when he did not have anything positive to offer.

Mr Hassell: Do you support the latest version of the tax package?

Mr PEARCE: The Government of this State supports a new and revised tax package which takes the load from pay-as-you-earn taxpayers and distributes it across the community. Obviously the Government has not made a clear decision on the *Daily News* tax package, if I may call it that. What I am pointing to is the fact that our people have gone to the summit and have played a very important role in bringing about a revised tax package. The Opposition is saying that it supports a revised tax package, but it will not say precisely what it supports. I have waited in vain for the Leader of the Opposition to indicate whether he supports direct tax cuts, as we do. He has not even said he supports that. If he does, he has not indicated how the loss to the Australian community is to be covered.

Mr Clarko: Why don't you try to tell us what you think a good tax plan is?

Mr PEARCE: The member for Karrinyup has just been moved off me in the big football game of this Parliament! I am supporting an amendment to the motion, which amendment supports the need for reform of Australia's taxation system on the grounds outlined, and I am noting the failure of the Opposition to play any constructive role in the tax debate. I am supporting an amendment which applauds the Western Australian Government for holding down increases in taxes and charges.

We will support a new proposal which will lift the load from the backs of ordinary Western Australians who are carrying the heavy tax load of pay-as-you-earn taxation. If there is an element of a capital gains tax and an increase in the form of a consumption tax in the total package, I indicate that as long as it encourages growth in the economy and lifts the weight off ordinary taxpayers by providing more compensation by way of direct tax

cuts and does not leave low income earners worse off because a new load is to be carried by people who so far have been missing out, then we will support it.

When the Premier returns with the new details, I am sure the State Government will give very sympathetic consideration to a new tax package which does those things. It is certainly better to try to achieve some improvement than to simply ignore the problem as the Opposition did when it was in Government, or to be as totally negative as it is seeking to be now. One cannot point to any level of achievement in all the many years the Opposition was in government.

Mr Clarko: The Hawke Government is the greatest taxer in the Commonwealth area ever, just as the Burke Government is in the State area.

Mr PEARCE: There is a man who was a Minister in a Government that said it did not like deficits, yet left us, when we came to power, facing a \$30 million deficit, an absolute record deficit for WA. Members opposite speak on behalf of a Federal Opposition which, when in government, left the nation with a \$9 billion deficit, which the Hawke Government has reduced by nearly a third.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Burkett): Order! One speaker at a time, please.

Mr PEARCE: When it comes to big taxing and even bigger expenditure, a Government is not in the race unless it is a Liberal Government. One could not get a bet against a Liberal Government in those areas.

I say to the Opposition that if it does not understand the desire in the community for significant reform of our taxation system, it is not living in WA. That is the first thing.

The second thing is this: If courageous efforts are to be made to reform the taxation system, it is incumbent on anyone who feels—

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do not know whether the members for Karrinyup and Nedlands heard me call for order a moment ago, but when I do it means that they should remain quiet until they get an opportunity to speak. Thank you.

Mr PEARCE: If there is to be reform of our taxation system, people must responsibly grasp the nettle and do their best to bring about a better system.

That means being constructive and positive, not negative and carping. If we had followed the Liberal Party line we would not have gone to the tax

summit, and we might have finished up with a gold tax, a tax which is dear to the hearts of some people opposite. For all the noise made about a gold tax, the Western Australian Government appears to have stopped it in Canberra. In March 1981, "surplus Jones" who has just returned to the House carrying the aura of gas around him, put a minute to the Cabinet which would have effectively meant a gold tax in Western Australia. The Cabinet knocked it back. If he gets back into Cabinet should a coalition be formed on that side, who is to say he will not try again? The Western Australian Government has nailed its colours to the mast in the national forum where it counts and has been successful apparently in stopping the gold tax.

The Opposition is making noises because it knows an election is coming and it thinks there is a big chance of a Liberal Party win. The Opposition has no chance while it is led by a wimp who will not state a position on crucial matters facing this State. Although the State Government and the national Government have done things which are important for the State and the nation, and which may be unpopular in the short term, people nevertheless appreciate and respect the Government which is prepared to take on hard problems and make hard decisions.

Any Minister in this House will say that when he came to office almost the first thing he discovered was the biggest set of files he had seen on his desk in baskets marked "too hard". They had been left by years of conservative Governments. Our Government has been prepared to bite the bullet and take on hard problems and examine hard options. It is easier to do those sorts of things in Opposition because one has no responsibility for achieving them or for doing anything. The inability of an Opposition which cannot come to grips with difficult problems and suggest its own solutions, as this Opposition did in today's debate, will undermine any attempt to establish credibility. How can it go before the people of Western Australia and say "Here we are, an alternative Government ready to govern. This is what we are going to do; this is how we are going to face the difficult problems"? No, the Opposition has fallen back on the old resort of weak parties and leaders by saying it promises to spend much more and tax people much less. How is it to be done?

I saw Channel 7 making a film today of "Willy the Wimp" striding into Parliament, with his yellow tie flying in the breeze, to take on the Burke Government and leading the Liberals to Government. What a damp squib it has been. The day after the member for Dale returns like

Lazarus from the wilderness as the best man on the back benches for the job—

Mr Carr: The Leader of the Opposition reckons he chose him on the basis of ability.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Burkett): Order! My call for no interjections refers also to members of the Government—Ministers and backbenchers—not just to the member for Nedlands.

Mr PEARCE: How would one like to be the member for East Melville and know that one had been replaced by the member for Dale?

The Opposition will have to do a lot better than today's feeble performances if it is to establish any credibility. In future it should try to tackle the hard problems and be constructive by putting forward real policies which will work for real Western Australians instead of giving a wimpish performance while led by a wimpish leader.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [4.15 p.m.]: The debate today deteriorated very much with the speech of the Deputy Premier and the moving of the amendment before the Chair. The Minister for Education insinuated there was a lack of positive suggestions about cutting expenditure. The Deputy Premier then abused the previous Government about something which had nothing to do with the motion, and then moved an amendment which had nothing to do with what he said. The Minister for Education simply went on with criticism of the previous State Government. However, he made a number of points which I would like to take up.

The Minister for Education said we had never proposed a list or ways of cutting expenditure. He said we should be positive and not negative and that we did not have any suggestions. He said we were not constructive. In the short time available to me I will endeavour to be constructive and to make some proposals.

Despite the amendment to the motion and the Government's lashing out at the Opposition the crucial question is how expenditure can be cut. The tax summit is about Commonwealth taxes and it is not for a State Opposition to draw up a list. However, there could be a suggestion from a State Opposition as to how cuts could be best achieved by any Government at any time.

There is no doubt that the tax system which puts percentage taxes on various values, whether as sales tax or income tax—which is worse because it is progressive—achieves the result that taxes and the revenue the Government collects, keep up with inflation, or alternatively they are in excess of inflation and are growing in real terms. Once a Government collects the increased revenue its appetite is whetted for spending in excess of the

amount raised. This results in additional expenditure and higher inflation, fewer jobs, more employment benefits because there are fewer jobs, more expenditure, and more borrowing. The borrowings have to be serviced and the interest rates which the Government has to pay will affect its successors for a long time.

My suggestion is threefold. Only one attempt has been made in this country—by the Fraser Government—to index the percentage of income tax. That system should return, but I mention this only in passing, as my first suggestion.

The Minister for Education challenged the Opposition to put forward some suggestions; my second suggestion is that a statutory limit should be imposed on borrowings. The corollary of greater spending is that there must be more borrowing at the Commonwealth level. It borrows more and more money which results in more indebtedness. Borrowings in Australia, and I suppose most Westminster-type countries, are a discretionary decision of the Government. It does not have to go to Parliament to get approval. Parliament does not have a say in how much the Government can borrow.

What would be the situation if we were to put a limit on Government borrowings? That could be achieved in different ways. It could be a constitutional provision, although that would be difficult to achieve through a referendum. It could be done by an Act of Federal Parliament to limit the borrowings of the Government of the day for its term. It could be that every proposed borrowing would have to come to Parliament, but that would not be a good solution because the Government with its majority could persuade its members to vote for the proposal. If it were accepted practice that the Government could not borrow more than has been determined at the time it takes office, it would think twice about promising additional handouts and incurring extra expenditure because if it were to do so the electors would know. The Government would have to go to Parliament and ask for higher taxes.

Today these matters do not have to go before Parliament. A Government can borrow more money and worry about the interest being paid, next year, or the year after. By the time people notice that the amount of borrowings are unhealthy and that the public debt has increased, they do not even know of how that indebtedness originated. Usually it is because governments wish to increase their handouts, but pay for it later when the loan has to be serviced.

I make that suggestion of placing a statutory limit on borrowing to oblige the Minister for Edu-

cation who said that we have nothing concrete to present in this debate. I wonder whether anyone on the Government side can reject these propositions. This way the Government should be compelled to retain its expenditure at a more easily handled figure and would get into the habit of even cutting expenditure although that is probably wishful thinking.

My third suggestion is that full allowance should be made in taxation reductions for donations to charities. Previously, any donation to a charity was deductible. Therefore, if someone in the highest tax bracket of 60 per cent donated \$100 to a charity, he would receive \$60 back and the charity would keep the \$100. The situation now is that one cannot deduct anything for donations to charity unless one reaches the limit of the concessional deductions which is about \$2 000 and even then one can only deduct 30 per cent, no matter what the tax bracket. Therefore, if one wishes to donate \$100 to a charity, one will receive only \$30 back. The very same remaining \$70, if one was to allow total deductions in income tax, would yield \$175 to the same charity. Why? The taxpayer, under the present rule, has to outlay \$70 in order that the charity, for example the Salvation Army, receives \$100. However, according to my suggestion he would have to outlay the same \$70 because he would get back \$105 or 60 per cent of the total of \$175. Once he had that back, the charitable organisation would receive 75 per cent more than today, for the same contribution of the taxpayer. If the new rule were introduced, charities would receive probably 100 per cent more because if all the of a taxpayer's donations did not reach the concessional deduction limit, he would not be able to deduct anything and it would not matter, therefore, if a person was in the 30 per cent, 40 per cent, or 60 per cent bracket, he would receive nothing back. According to my suggestion, people could donate more to achieve the same net figure of the donation.

We might call this plan partial privatisation of social services because then the well-known charitable organisations such as the Red Cross, the Jesus People Inc., and other such organisations would play a much larger part in certain fields which are looked after by the Government today. They would undoubtedly do the job much better and much more cheaply and would be able to select the neediest people. People would not line up twice or three times as happens today with large Government organisations.

One could also call this suggestion the reprivatisation of charities because it was not that

long ago that governments had nothing to do with charities. All moneys were raised privately and I think it operated better.

Those are the three very brief suggestions that I make to oblige the Minister for Education. He said we are not positive or constructive. I suggest that the Deputy Premier was most negative because he spoke about the history of past State Governments. That has nothing to do with the tax summit or the raising of income tax, sales taxes, consumption taxes, value added taxes, or wealth taxes. I therefore oppose the amendment to the motion.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [4.26 p.m.]: I oppose the amendment and support the original motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I think the State Government has presented us with an excellent opportunity to be able to debate this motion in a positive way and to put forward a practical proposition out of the labyrinth of confusion brought about by the Federal Government's taxation summit held over the last four days. This afternoon's newspaper carries the headline "Tax package revamped". The options for tax reform change by the hour and people are confused. They do not know what the Government has in store for them. The Federal Government has abrogated its responsibilities. It invited everybody to a bunfight to obtain advice on how it should be governing and, as a result, has received a massive fall in popularity. That fall in popularity has also affected the State Government.

One can understand why people are confused. They want their leaders to lead. One can see, in the Sunday papers, a comic strip of the Prime Minister praying to the god of consensus. However, that god is not listening any more. The summit seemed like a tremendous idea when Mr Hawke took over. What a farce and a sham it has turned out to be. I am sure that, as a result, we have seen our last summit. Who else would want to put themselves through this sort of torture when leading a Government?

One matter that concerns me greatly about this tax summit has been the factionalism that exists in the Labor Party. The whole debate has centred around the socialist alternative. It has concentrated on the distribution of wealth in this country. Different Ministers and factions have argued about a wealth tax and a capital gains tax, and on closing the loopholes in order to grab more taxes from the people. That is the socialist alternative. The debate has been about redistributing the wealth of this country. Any such exercise should concentrate on the other end of the problem—that is, the creation of wealth. That is how we can raise

more taxes. It is also how the people will receive more benefits from the Government.

Never, at any stage, has there been any real debate about the creation of wealth. The debate has only been about the redistribution of wealth. I think that emphasises what the Labor Party is about. It cannot see; it has its ideological blinkers on. It cannot see that if it wants to change the system it should concentrate on creating greater wealth. That is what our motion is about.

The second half of the motion is about the reduction of expenditure. We have heard a heap of gobbledegook about expenditure that has supposedly been reduced. What a farce it was when the Deputy Premier told us that Government charges had been kept down. The Burke Government taxed us almost out of existence at the beginning of its term and, of course, by comparison since, we have not had such large percentage increases. The Government should ask the smokers and car drivers of this State how they feel about the Burke Government charges. Many car drivers are riding pushbikes because they cannot afford to buy petrol. I shall be anxious to hear what the Minister for Housing has to say about interest rates in the coming session and the rise in these rates. We have heard his vitriolic remarks before about rising interest rates. What about the increases in bankcard charges and the prime rate, which is the highest it has been in the history of this country? Are Government members happy that their constituents are paying a 22 per cent interest rate on their bankcards? Is that the sort of Government they are proud to belong to? I thought the Minister for Housing might have resigned by now because of these increases; no doubt, he will take some action in the forthcoming session of Parliament. I know the Minister is very sensitive about interest rates, yet here they are on the rise again. No doubt he will enjoy that situation. The interest rates may go even higher than 22 per cent in due course. I wonder how high the cost of fuel will be by 20 August. It could be 75c a litre; it could be more; in fact, it could be anything at all. It is anybody's guess what the price will be by 20 August.

The only positive thing to come from the taxation summit—I referred to this publicly before the summit took place—is that people such as John Stone, an eminent economist in this country, have said that if the Government wants to change the system in a bold and dramatic way it should consider imposing a flat rate of income tax. Many reasons have been put forward in an attempt to outline why this would not work. However, I believe such a system would work. A proposal has been made for a 12.5 per cent broad-based con-

sumption tax, but who knows what proposal will be put forward today, tomorrow, or in the future? Nobody would be able to hazard a guess. A 12.5 per cent consumption tax is an across-the-board flat rate of tax. This principle could also be applied to income tax. I was pleased that the Premier of Queensland supported this proposal. He has given it support in the past.

The need for tax changes in this country is related to generation of wealth and also to taking the pressure off company and corporate tax. The fact that we tax corporate bodies twice has always upset me. If a company makes a profit it pays tax and, if it distributes those profits to individuals, it pays tax again. That is basically wrong and unproductive, and it leads to people trying to avoid their responsibilities.

In recent weeks John Stone suggested a flat rate of income tax of 20 per cent, and the Premier of Queensland suggested 25 per cent. If one of those proposals were adopted a number of things would follow. I refer to the likely result of that situation.

Mr Wilson: Is this Liberal Party policy?

Mr LAURANCE: I am saying it has been raised as a result of the taxation summit.

Mr Wilson: It is not Liberal Party policy then?

Mr LAURANCE: It has been promoted in the last few days.

Mr Wilson: Does your leader support this concept?

Mr LAURANCE: To be quite frank, I have not asked him although he is aware of public statements I have made.

For example, a flat rate of income tax would: Create wealth, assist employment, and increase productivity in two ways. It is not only corporate and large taxpayers who would increase their productivity if they knew that they would pay a flat rate of income tax on every single dollar. The working man would also benefit. For instance, in the mining industry and in remote areas many workers pay a very high rate of income tax. If they knew that the pay for every hour they worked, including overtime, would be taxed at the same rate, I feel sure that they would increase their productivity. This would obviously be to the great advantage of this country. It would encourage enterprise and remove wasteful practices currently employed to avoid paying tax. It would also save resources used trying to catch up with those people who are attempting to evade tax.

I add my support to those people, some of them eminent, in this country who have brought forward this proposal to the taxation summit. The

proposal could be put together in a number of ways.

I quote from *The West Australian* of 1 July 1985 which reported John Stone's reference to the principles involved—

.... These included equity, simplicity, efficiency and broad community support.

The Government would get broad community support for that, but not for the things Paul Keating has advocated during his parading from one end of the country to the other in recent weeks. I quote further from the article—

Mr Stone had advised that a single-rate income tax of about 22 per cent would stimulate investment for productive purposes, rather than for tax advantage, and this would create real economic growth and employment.

The following quote from *The West Australian* on 2 July 1985 refers to the Premier of Queensland—

His proposal includes:

A single rate of tax of 25 per cent on all income.

Introduction of a \$1150 rebate to compensate for the loss of the tax-free threshold, to taper out for income earners on \$25 000 to \$30 000.

Existing rebates to be maintained but with all except zone allowances to cut out at the same level as the \$1150 rebate.

A fringe-benefits tax on the beneficiary, but with employers to be required to record such benefits on group certificates.

Removal of existing tax shelters such as negative gearing, farm losses for Pitt Street farmers and film industry concessions.

No consumption tax, capital-gains tax or changes in company tax.

That would still be productive at a flat rate of tax on all personal income. It would be a bold way to change the system. We have heard enough about being bold and courageous and this proposal is one way the Government could do something positive for the country. Many reasons have been put forward as to why it would not work and would be inequitable. However, some countries make it work—for example, Hong Kong—and they are amazingly successful. If the regressive rates were removed and replaced with a flat rate, the Federal Government would gain more revenue than most people anticipate.

The proposals from the Federal Government were fully supported by the Premier of this State. He was caught in the middle and the only way was for him to support option C.

Mr Troy: Did you say we should remove the regressive rate?

Mr LAURANCE: Yes, I said it should be removed from the present system and a flat rate of tax applied.

Mr Troy: You have not thought it through.

Mr LAURANCE: Yes, I have.

Mr Troy: Who would be the most advantaged from a flat rate of tax?

Mr LAURANCE: I said the Australian economy would be, and I said it would create employment. Therefore, anyone looking for a job would be at an advantage. It would assist and encourage enterprise and it would increase productivity. A worker who knew that from the pay for every extra hour of overtime he would be taxed only 25c in the dollar rather than 60c would be more productive.

If we consider the proposals introduced—if they stop still long enough to be examined, because they change day by day—it can be seen that primary industry would certainly be adversely affected. My colleagues have indicated how primary industry would be affected. The mining industry and people in remote areas such as the Pilbara would be disadvantaged by what this Government has in mind. The shenanigans of the current Premier will not change the people of the Pilbara. They realise what is in store for them under Labor Governments, both Federal and State. The benefits built into the system to attract people to work and live in the north-west of the State are being threatened.

A great deal of its wealth is generated in the north of the State. A large proportion of the wealth of this State is generated in the remote areas through the mining, pastoral, and other industries.

People in those industries should be compensated. Those in the remote areas should be compensated through the tax system; not penalised. This Government has in mind to penalise them.

The people in the north of the State have always paid more; the member for Pilbara would know that. Look at the sales tax situation, and payroll tax. It has always been regarded as inequitable that payroll tax is paid on the total wage, including the district allowance. If one is an employer in Port Hedland, Karratha, Broome, Derby, or Kununurra, one must pay a district allowance to

employees. Because of the area in which those people are employed, one has to pay additional payroll tax. This is an inequitable system, yet by adding things like consumption tax, taxes on perks, and so on, this Government is keen to see this introduced, and the Premier has supported it.

We know what effect that will have on the remote areas of the State. People living there should not be penalised; they should be compensated.

That fact has been recognised by Governments over a long period of time. We have had zone allowances since after World War II; these were supposed to compensate in some way for the difficulties and burdens of so remote area employment. Governments of both political colours have done something about that in recent years to try to re-establish the value of the zone allowances, to get them back to something like they were when they were first introduced. But now the ALP has decided to stab those workers in the back. As I have said before in this Parliament, that area should be looked at as a special development zone.

I talked about economic zones last year. I said that sort of approach should be brought in for the north-west. The Government decided to bring in a scheme like this at Bunbury. So it has taken on these ideas. It did not like the idea of deregulation, but a couple of blokes looked like going to gaol in Esperance because the transport of wool was regulated. It was amazing how quickly the Minister for Transport and the member for that area expressed the idea of deregulating wool. Suddenly deregulation is in favour.

That brings me to the second part of our motion. I want to concentrate on that rather than on the stupid amendment the Deputy Premier put forward. There are ways in which we can achieve this end. It will take courage and initiative, but deregulation and privatisation are the ways. This party on this side of the House has gone to the public and demonstrated to the people of Western Australia that it is prepared to move that way; it is prepared to get the Government off the backs of industry and the private sector. It will be able to reduce the Government's drag on our economy.

It will not be easy, but at least the Leader of the Opposition and his team have expressed that principle, they have documented it clearly so that they can put it into action when they are in Government in April, May, or whenever it is next year. That is the answer and the people of Western Australia are beginning to accept it.

We have had opposition from the ALP about methods like privatisation and deregulation, but when the skids are under the Government it is

amazing how quickly it will turn round and say what a great thing deregulation is.

It has been interesting to watch the whole sorry charade surrounding this tax summit. The Opposition has come forward with some positive proposals today and it will continue to do so when we get back into this Parliament, if the Premier is game enough to call Parliament together. He is putting it off as long as he can. He calls a single meeting of Parliament and he cannot even arrange to be present. The result is that the popularity of the Government has slumped terribly. Mr Hawke has fallen off the bottom of the popularity ratings. The Premier is about as popular as a pork chop in a synagogue.

We look forward to giving this Government, which is on the skids, a gentle push to help it on its way. Today has been a curtain raiser for the forthcoming session of Parliament when we will make sure we give the Government a push far enough to see it go out of the window.

I am proud to support the amendment brought forward today.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Burkett): The amendment or the motion?

Mr LAURANCE: I support the motion, and I point out what a farce the amendment brought forward by the Deputy Premier is. I oppose the amendment.

MR McNEE (Mt. Marshall) [4.45 p.m.]: The Hawke Government has created records in this country such as no Government has ever done before. It has even beaten the Whitlam Government's record; farmers across Australia have turned out in their thousands to protest. Still the Government has not got the message. ALP members will not be in Government in this State long enough to learn the lesson, they need not bother wasting time.

Nonetheless, I would like to mention one or two things about the tax summit. What a charade it has been. The only matter it has addressed is how to redistribute the wealth of this country; it has not addressed itself to the real problem at all.

If one likes to look at what is happening to the rural industries, the primary industry bank rate currently stands at 18.25 per cent. In January it was 15.25 per cent. Do Mr Hawke and the Premier really believe that their financial management is sound? They should be taking another look, because that costs the average farmer \$5 000 on top of the \$4 000 which has already been stolen from him.

Let us have a quick look at the position. I do not want to spend too much time on it. The Minister

for Education spoke about remarks made while in Opposition. Let us have a brief look at what the present Government said in Opposition. It said it would reduce retail fuel prices. That was ALP policy in February 1983. The Government committed itself to reducing fuel oil costs.

A member: What has it done?

Mr McNEE: I have just said it cost the average farmer \$4 000—and that was after the Premier's pre-election promise to stop the price spiral.

Then he goes on, in April 1985, to say the State Government would control the price of petrol. We all know what has happened since the Burke Government took control. We were called to this House and legislation was introduced. The Government said it did not work anyway. The Government is not even sure what it did itself. The result was an absolute disaster. I do not want to dwell on that, but I would like to remind members that Labor policy was to eliminate the difference in the price of petrol in the city and country. That was ALP policy in February 1983. The Minister for Education now has the temerity to stand up and say that we talk only when in Opposition. There is the record for him to look at.

I would like to remind the Minister about that matter. The people are already speaking out against him but he is not listening. Never mind. They have probably given up even bothering about him.

The Government's present thinking on the economy of this nation dates back to the industrial revolution because that is where it comes from. That is the sort of thinking members of the Government have. They believe in a socialistic theme of redistribution, that by screwing somebody who has got something they will help somebody who has nothing. Good luck to them. If the Government wants to do the things it says it wants to do for our economy other than to rape it—and the Government is very good at that—the Government needs to generate wealth and encourage people to generate wealth. That is one thing the Government is absolutely hopeless at doing because it is paranoid that someone might make a dollar.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Could I just indicate to the member that the amendment we are supposed to be debating is that all words after the word "express" be deleted, and if that is the case—and I am sure it is—perhaps the member should now bring his remarks to bear on that matter.

Mr McNEE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker: I will do so. Of course, I also wanted to speak about capital gains tax. I stand opposed to the Govern-

ment's amendment and I support the Opposition motion. I understand that Senator Walsh does not really think that a capital gains tax will affect farms or the farming community very much. They are the people I represent and about whom I am concerned.

Let us have a quick look at what might happen, under the Federal Government's proposals, to a property which was purchased in 1975.

Several members interjected.

Mr McNEE: I do not have a lot of time, so I will answer the Deputy Premier's questions later.

Very quickly, I would like to run through the situation in regard to capital gains tax. Keep in mind the fact that the tax is to be levied at marginal tax rates. It will not be very long before we see a maximum marginal rate. It might now be 50c or 60c in \$1, but it could be different tomorrow.

Kelty and Crean are in charge of the tax summit; Hawke only thinks he is. Let us assume that a 4 000-acre property was purchased in 1975 for \$65 an acre. If we assume that that property was valued for capital gains tax in 1981, it would have a value, after inflation, of about \$102 per acre. We could allow about 10 per cent simple interest for six years. The market value of that property in 1981 could well have been \$210 an acre. Those figures are as near to reality as possible.

I am assuming that a farmer would be taxed at \$108 per acre, the difference between \$210 and \$102, so that would mean 4 000 acres would be taxed at \$108 an acre, 62c in the dollar; a tax of \$260 000. Senator Walsh does not think this tax will hurt farmers! It is okay for him. We will assume that the hypothetical farm is running well because the thing about capital gains tax, which nobody likes to mention, is the death duty—the sting in the tail. Everybody knows it exists. Assume that that property was being run effectively, but the owner died and the beneficiaries had to borrow from the \$260 000. In those circumstances it is fairly likely that they had a few bad seasons and they probably have not made a lot of progress in getting rid of that \$260 000 debt. In 1985, as a result of a series of bad seasons or other circumstances, that property has a value of \$100 an acre. That could happen and in fact is happening in the country now.

We have seen properties which were purchased for \$64 an acre, and which have a value on paper of \$210 an acre, yet the property is now available for sale at \$100 an acre. That is the going rate.

Many people have approached their bank managers saying that they need to borrow some money for the following year's programme. The bank

manager says, "I am sorry, but your equity is not there". Their equity on the property may have fallen to \$140 000 and it simply is not a viable lending proposition. This situation would be caused by the fact that they had to pay a \$260 000 bill for capital gains tax. That merely takes the land into consideration. I have not bothered to deal with the stock and plant. Nobody has mentioned this, but stock and plant, I am sure, under this Labor Government, would certainly be part and parcel of capital gains tax. Probably, on a property of that size, one would have a couple of hundred thousand dollars-worth of plant at market value being written down to make \$100 000 and there is another \$100 000 for the tax man. However, according to Senator Walsh, this tax will not hurt the farmers.

Under Labor Governments a person cannot afford to die. One has to die by special arrangements at certain times. At the march in Canberra that point was made to the Prime Minister, but of course he would not listen. Members on the other side of the House might not understand this, but that is the sort of problem we are facing. These are the people the Government wants to screw out of their last cent and the Government has very effectively done so. The Government has raped and plundered the economy. The tax summit was an absolute disaster. The Government is paying absolutely no attention to the economy of the country. The capital gains tax, as far as the rural sector is concerned, is an absolute disaster and this Government wants to continue along that kamikaze course in regard to this country's economy. I oppose the Government's amendment and support the motion.

MR CRANE (Moore) [4.58 p.m.]: I must oppose the amendment moved by the Deputy Premier because it represents the very essence of our problems. It is not my intention to rape, plunder, or screw anyone. However, I would express my continuing concern about this matter. There is no point in my reiterating what has been said today, or for emotionalism to take over in this place, but we are on the brink of disaster in Australia and there is a very real need for a re-look at the whole situation.

The Opposition's motion endeavours to address the problem before us and all of us, I am sure, at some time in our lives, have faced very stringent financial times. During those times the most effective measures are to pull in our belts and reduce spending. The State Government must do the same and reduce its spending.

That is what Australia must do now. It must curtail its expenses and this is covered in this motion. We must all play our part in curtailing our

expenses and then there is a possibility that perhaps we may recover if we work hard and do not make too many demands on each other or on our country.

The previous speaker expressed his concern for the rural industry. I always do likewise because it is, has been, and will continue to be, the backbone of this country—if Australia is to survive. That it has been screwed, as was mentioned by the previous speaker, is a well-known fact. The industry is on its knees and we would hope that this summit will take heed of the message which was given, not only in Western Australia but also in Canberra last Monday, where I am led to believe over 30 000 primary producers marched to deliver their message to the Prime Minister and the Federal Government. This is a very serious state of affairs; it is almost too late to remedy, but it is never quite too late if we do take action. The opportunity is here for us, first of all to produce this white paper which will show where cuts can be made, and where improvements in the taxation system can be made also.

In the amendment here today the Acting Premier has said that this House knows the failure of the Opposition to present a case of any kind to the national taxation summit. I would disagree with this because the Premier of Queensland, Sir Johannes Bjelke-Petersen, did present a case similar to what was presented many years ago by Doug Anthony for a flat rate taxation. This idea has never met with any support from the money moguls, but when we look at it very seriously, we find it is equitable and it is fair. It is fair to all and that is what we must ask for in a taxation system. It is not a crime to make money because many of us are guilty of having made a few bob in our time. In doing so, we have created employment for other people and successive Governments have made sure that we did not keep too much of what we earned anyway. That money has gone into the economy of this country. It is not a sin to make money. Money is a great incentive and we should be encouraged to make it. A flat rate of taxation, as proposed by Sir Joh, and supported by Mr Stone, the previous taxation officer, is a matter which does require an in-depth study. I am not saying it is foolproof, but I am saying it fully deserves a study and needs to be dissected in every way to prove it does work. We know it works in many other countries, including Hong Kong, and it works effectively.

My time is almost up but before I conclude I would like to make these comments about fuel, the price of which affects the whole of Australia. We speak in Australia of giving everyone a fair go. Seventy-five per cent of our fuel is consumed in

the metropolitan areas of Australia and that 75 per cent is delivered free to its outlets. If there was a charge of 0.5c per litre on that 75 per cent, which could be absorbed by the fuel companies, and another 0.5c per litre could be absorbed by those people who use it, the price of fuel could be equal throughout Australia. It is so simple it is silly. It could be done and in keeping with that idea, it would be necessary for the fuel companies themselves to be responsible. That would necessitate the removal of those parasitic companies which operate only in metropolitan areas—never in the country. I do not refer to the big companies like Shell, Mobil, Caltex, and others but the little companies which want to make a profit in the cities. These small companies should be eliminated. Let the main companies which supply fuel all over Australia be given the added incentive and they would get by if they do not have the competition from the parasites in the metropolitan area.

I believe this is a very simple plan. Seventy-five per cent of our fuel is used in the metropolitan area as against 25 per cent in the country. The price should be equalised throughout the whole of Australia. I wanted to make that contribution to this debate in the Parliament today and I hope someone will take the matter up, and do their sums.

I strongly support a flat tax of 25 per cent or even 30 per cent if it must be. Whatever it is, taxation should be more equitable. I am concerned about a capital gains tax and what the Federal Government is trying to do to us. Therefore, I cannot in any way support the amendment before the Chair.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [5.05 p.m.]: I want to express my strong opposition to the amendment because what the Government is trying to do in its desperation over this taxation issue is to avoid indicating its position on the Federal Government's proposals to increase taxation. The whole point of the motion moved by the Opposition today was to give the Parliament an opportunity to express to the Commonwealth Government its opposition to the introduction of new taxes—a capital gains tax, a consumption tax, a tax on gold, and a double payroll tax—and then to say to the Federal Government that our belief is that real tax reform requires tax reduction and that therefore the problem of expenditure must be tackled first. That is a clear-cut proposition, all day we have been seeking to get from this Government and its members a statement as to whether they support these new taxes.

The Deputy Premier, representing the Premier, has avoided the issue. The numerous people from the Government interjecting have always avoided the issue when they have been asked the question, "Do you support the consumption tax; do you support the capital gains tax; do you support the double payroll tax?" They will not answer the question and now we have before the House a motion which tries to cloud the issues and which tries to let the Government off the hook and get away from that fundamental question, "Do you support these new taxes?" The latest episode was the speech of the Minister for Education; he looked proudly at tonight's *Daily News* and wanted to quote the comment of a journalist, Mr John Arthur, that the outcome was a great victory for Mr Burke. Okay, it is a victory for Mr Burke in this new package to have a tax on fringe benefits, to have a national identification card system, to have an increase in wholesale taxes, to have a tax of 12½ per cent on services and to have a capital gains tax. Is that what this Government has achieved through its Premier? Is that the victory which the Government claims for itself in Canberra? Is that what the quiet negotiations that have taken place in the dead of night on behalf of Western Australia have produced? All that has been achieved is a package of new taxes and more taxation. Those are the achievements that the Minister for Education claimed for the Premier and the Government.

Those are the very issues that we raise by our clear-cut resolution today, a resolution which gave every member of this House the opportunity to say, as we say that with our economy faltering, our currency down, the share market down, interest rates up, and confidence going out the window every day because of the activities of the Federal Government, now is not the time to introduce new taxes to Australia.

This is not the time to be adding to the burdens of the Australian economy. This is not the time to be introducing a tax package which provides no relief and no assistance to the business sector which provides the jobs and the employment opportunities. All the Government is saying by moving this amendment is that it supports one of the multifarious various that has been dished up by the Federal Government because it has not the courage to stand aside from the Prime Minister; or else it has an ideological commitment to those very same things the ACTU and the left-wing want. That, of course, is the real nub of the matter.

We have a tax package that is being put forward for an ideological reason. There is no economic reason which justifies a capital gains tax in

Australia, and yet the Government is supporting it. The Government has come up with a shabby attempt to avoid the issue and it will avail it nothing.

The truth is that the Government supports the tax package which incorporates three new taxes including death duties. The people of Western Australia know it and the Government will be judged on it.

I oppose the amendment to the motion.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 25	
Mr Bateman	Mr Tom Jones
Mrs Beggs	Mr McIver
Mr Bertram	Mr Parker
Mr Bridge	Mr Pearce
Mr Bryce	Mr Read
Mrs Buchanan	Mr D. L. Smith
Mr Terry Burke	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Burkett	Mr Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr Troy
Mr Davies	Mrs Watkins
Mrs Henderson	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hughes	

(Teller)

Noes 17	
Mr Blaikie	Mr McNee
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Mensaros
Mr Cash	Mr Old
Mr Clarko	Mr Rushton
Mr Court	Mr Thompson
Mr Coyne	Mr Tubby
Mr Hassell	Mr Watt
Mr Peter Jones	Mr Williams
Mr Laurance	

(Teller)

Pairs	
Ayes	Noes
Mr Brian Burke	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Tonkin	Mr Crane
Mr Jamieson	Mr Spriggs
Mr Evans	Mr Grayden
Mr Grill	Mr Trethowan

Amendment thus passed.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Premier) [5.15 p.m.]: I move an amendment—

To substitute for the words deleted the following—

Its support for the need to reform Australia's Taxation System which is—

- restricting economic growth;
- crippling initiative;
- penalising low and average income earners;
- encouraging tax avoidance and evasion;

(e) effectively reducing the international competitiveness of Australian export industry.

This House notes the failure of the Opposition to present a case of any kind to the National Taxation Summit, which reflects the reluctance of Liberal National Country Party Governments over the past 35 years to tackle the long standing problems of an inefficient and inequitable taxation system.

The House applauds the achievement of the Western Australian Government in holding down increases in taxation and charges below the inflation rate during the first 3 years in office, in stark contrast to the record of the previous Liberal-National Country Party Government in its last term of office.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 25	
Mr Bateman	Mr Tom Jones
Mrs Beggs	Mr McIver
Mr Bertram	Mr Parker
Mr Bridge	Mr Pearce
Mr Bryce	Mr Read
Mrs Buchanan	Mr D. L. Smith
Mr Terry Burke	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Burkett	Mr Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr Troy
Mr Davies	Mrs Watkins
Mrs Henderson	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hughes	

(Teller)

Noes 17	
Mr Blaikie	Mr McNee
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Mensaros
Mr Cash	Mr Old
Mr Clarko	Mr Rushton
Mr Court	Mr Thompson
Mr Coyne	Mr Tubby
Mr Hassell	Mr Watt
Mr Peter Jones	Mr Williams
Mr Laurance	

(Teller)

Pairs	
Ayes	Noes
Mr Brian Burke	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Tonkin	Mr Crane
Mr Jamieson	Mr Spriggs
Mr Evans	Mr Grayden
Mr Grill	Mr Trethowan

Amendment thus passed.

Motion, as Amended

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

Ayes 25

Mr Bateman	Mr Tom Jones
Mrs Beggs	Mr McIver
Mr Bertram	Mr Parker
Mr Bridge	Mr Pearce
Mr Bryce	Mr Read
Mrs Buchanan	Mr D. L. Smith
Mr Terry Burke	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Burkett	Mr Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr Troy
Mr Davies	Mrs Watkins
Mrs Henderson	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hughes	

(Teller)

Noes 17

Mr Blaikie	Mr McNee
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Mensaros
Mr Cash	Mr Old
Mr Clarko	Mr Rushton
Mr Court	Mr Thompson
Mr Coyne	Mr Tubby
Mr Hassell	Mr Watt
Mr Peter Jones	Mr Williams
Mr Laurance	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Brian Burke	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Tonkin	Mr Crane
Mr Jamieson	Mr Spriggs
Mr Evans	Mr Grayden
Mr Grill	Mr Trethowan

Question thus passed.

CRIME: SEXUAL ASSAULT REFERRAL CENTRE*Committee of Inquiry: Notice of Motion*

MR THOMPSON (Kalamunda) [5.20 p.m.]: I give notice that, at the next sitting of the House, I shall move—

That in the opinion of this House the Minister for Health should disband the Committee of Inquiry which has been appointed to investigate alleged staff conflict at the Sexual Assault Referral Centre—

Point of Order

Mrs HENDERSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, it is my understanding that the whole question of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre and its future is the subject of writs that have been issued out of the Supreme Court. I ask you to rule as to whether this motion can be continued with this afternoon as a notice of motion.

Deputy Speaker's Ruling

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is my intention to allow the notice of motion to proceed and to be entered onto the Notice Paper. However, in view of the information given by the member for Gosnells, I feel it will be necessary to inquire at the Supreme Court as to whether those writs have been issued. I will cause those inquiries to be made and make a decision about whether the matter is *sub judice* at that time.

Notice of Motion Resumed

Mr THOMPSON: My notice of motion reads—

That in the opinion of this House the Minister for Health should disband the Committee of Inquiry which has been appointed to investigate alleged staff conflict at the Sexual Assault Referral Centre and act on the several reports already compiled by senior officers at the Queen Elizabeth Medical Centre, from which reports it is clear—

- (i) that the three lay counsellors, L. Flanagan, B. Leach and J. Rawling, have refused to co-operate with Mrs Jenny Hamilton, the Clinical Director;
- (ii) that these people are incompetent for some of the work that they are undertaking;
- (iii) that the lay counsellors, since an industrial agreement entered into about twelve months ago, have claimed a dramatically increased number of hours worked over previous years, with the result that the anticipated expenditure of \$23,000 for each position has been exceeded, with two of the counsellors having already received well in excess of \$40,000 and the third in the vicinity of \$30,000 for the last financial year.

It is further the opinion of this House that the Committee of Inquiry that has been established is perceived by many of the staff at the Queen Elizabeth Medical Centre, including people associated with SARC, as being biased, and that its composition has been affected by the influence which supporters of the lay counsellors have in the Labor Party and because of this perceived bias it is unlikely that its finding would be acceptable to all. Particular exception is taken to the inclusion on that committee of Wendy Silver, who is a known Labor Party political activist.

**NORTH WEST GAS DEVELOPMENT
(WOODSIDE) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT
BILL**

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

[Questions taken.]

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR PEARCE (Armadale—Minister for Education) [5.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until a date and time to be fixed by the Speaker.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

3209. *Withdrawn.*

TRANSPORT: AIR

Deregulation: Advisory Committee

3301. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Will the Government be appointing an advisory committee to assist it with its work on the proposals designed to deregulate airline services?
- (2) If so, who will be the members of that committee?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Mr J. Roberts (Chairman)
Mr D. Hatt (Secretary)
Mr A. Barlow
Mr A. Bond
Mr B. Coppin
Mr D. Dempster
Mr W. Donaldson
Mr D. Horgan
Mr S. Huang
Mr W. Jones
Mr A. Norwood
Mr W. Pateman.

TRANSPORT: WESTRAIL

Commercialisation

3317. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Government still considering the Westrail commercialisation proposals?
- (2) Why is it taking the Government so long to confirm and approve the programme?
- (3) When does the Government expect to announce the Westrail commercialisation programme that it approves?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) The Government wants to ensure that all-affected and interested parties are consulted and their opinions taken into account before decisions are taken on the various aspects involved in making Westrail a more competitive transport organisation, and this is the procedure being followed.
Once the consultative process has been progressed the Government will not de-

lay announcing the initiatives taken. I have made announcements in respect to Westrail engaging in other transport modes such as pipelines and conveyor technologies and will continue the process described in regard to other competitive proposals.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES: ACCOMMODATION

City Mutual Building

3333. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) What Government departments and instrumentalities are located within the City Mutual building in St. Georges Terrace?
- (2) How many floors are occupied by the bodies referred to in (1)?
- (3) What has been the cost of partitions, furnishings and equipment installed by the various departments and instrumentalities in the accommodation they occupy in the City Mutual building?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) The member has been advised in writing.

TRANSPORT: AIR

Intrastate: Deregulation

3349. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Government committed to deregulation of intrastate air services?
- (2) To what extent is the Government prepared to allow private air services to operate, subject only to the necessary safety requirements?
- (3) Is the Government intending to continue controlling air services within Western Australia?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The Government is committed only to ensuring that the most efficient network of air services possible is provided for air travellers in Western Australia. The question of regulation or deregulation has been, and will continue to be, considered within this context.

The Government has accepted the finding of the Review of Internal Air Services and Policy that there should be an appropriate mix of market place com-

petition and Government regulation. As the Review recommended, "The degree and pattern of competition introduced to the West Australian system (should) be geared to the ability of respective routes to support market place competition". Accordingly, the Government has been prepared to license additional operators on those routes which it considers can benefit from increased competition.

The question of whether competition can be extended to other routes, or intensified on existing competitive routes, is kept under constant review and, where benefits can be shown to accrue, further licences will be issued.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Answered by (1).

MINERALS: DIAMONDS

Joint Venture: Investment

3350. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Government concerned that its investment of public funds into the Argyle diamond venture has been shown to be at too high a cost for the percentage interest it acquired?
- (2) At current values, what is the loss in value of the interests in the Western Australian Diamond Trust held by the Western Australian Development Corporation, and any other statutory authority which acquired units in the trust?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member has been advised in writing.

MINERALS: DIAMONDS

Price

3351. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the average carat price for rough diamonds from the Argyle diamond venture remained as originally estimated at the time the Government acquired its interest in the project?
- (2) Is it fact that the average price per carat has fallen below the estimates given to the Government at that time, and upon which the Government defended its acquisition of Northern Mining?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member has been advised in writing.

3359 and 3371. *Postponed.*

TRANSPORT: FREIGHT

Wool: Deregulation

3382. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Adverting to the reply given to question 3098 of 17 April 1985, what are the ways and means currently being examined to lessen the cost impact upon growers of charging centralisation costs against those growers using Albany?
- (2) Is he suggesting that the possibility of deregulating wool transport in Western Australia is dependent upon the decisions and policies of the Wool Council of Australia, regardless of the benefits which would accrue to Western Australian wool growers?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), for what reason does the Government consider that all Western Australian wool growers should be penalised in this way?
- (4) Has this issue been discussed with the Primary Industry Association and the Pastoralists and Graziers Association?
- (5) What is the expressed attitude of these bodies to the Government's maintaining regulations controlling wool transport for the above reasons relating to Albany?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Following on from the work of the Albany Wool Study Group, attention has been focused on reducing rail rates from Albany to Fremantle, gaining support from brokers, possibly in the form of reduced charges at Albany, and judicious application of Government assistance, perhaps through redeployment of the existing subsidy.

The rail rate will, in fact, be reduced significantly for the 1985/86 season. The other matters are still being investigated.

- (2) Clearly, any decision on the deregulation or otherwise of wool will be taken within the context of the overall costs and benefits to this State. The effect of deregulation on Albany's wool handling industry, should the Wool Council's centralisation cost policy be introduced, is

one impact which would need to be considered in assessing the desirability of such a move. Other issues such as benefits to growers, on the one hand, and impacts on Westrail's finances, on the other, also need to be considered.

- (3) to (5) As stated in the answer to question (2), the Government's policy on wool transport is not determined purely by the Albany issue. Consequently, these questions are not applicable.

TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

Directors

3395. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

- (1) Who are the directors of Exim?
- (2) What are the Articles of Association of Exim?
- (3) How much are the directors of Exim paid?
- (4) Do any of the directors of Exim have to declare any interest in any of the projects undertaken by Exim?
- (5) What are the subsidiary companies of Exim and who are the members associated with each of these companies?
- (6) Are the people referred to in (5) paid and, if so, how much?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (6) The member has been advised in writing.

MINERALS: DIAMONDS

Dispute: Trade Practices Act

3400. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it fact that Mr David McKinlay, Managing Director of the Western Australian Development Corporation, advised the Argyle diamond project participants that the State Government did not want section 45D of the Trade Practices Act used against the Transport Workers Union?
- (2) Why was such an indication given when the Transport Workers Union was instrumental in denying many workers the opportunity to continue their employment when they wished to do so?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member has been advised in writing.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3401. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, has he personally undertaken any inquiries and discussions relating to the above accident?
- (2) Has he received advice from his various officers that there was no negligence or incompetence displayed by any of the employees of the Fremantle Port Authority and the Marine and Harbours Department?
- (3) If so, where does the responsibility rest for the accident which occurred?
- (4) Has he received advice that there was negligence on the part of the vessel's owners?
- (5) Will he please table the advice he received from Crown Law on this matter?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) Responsibility may be determined in the event that civil court proceedings are initiated.
- (4) and (5) No.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3402. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, has he been able to satisfactorily establish which department or authority was responsible for marking the hazard struck by the Fremantle Port Authority?
- (2) If so, which department or authority had that responsibility?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) Refer question 3405, answer (3).

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3403. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, is it fact that the Regional Director of the Department of Transport inquired of Sea Search and Rescue why no warnings of the hazard had been put out?
- (2) For what reason did the Fremantle Port Authority not issue warnings immediately after the hazard was identified?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Not known.
- (2) Warnings were issued to all known vessels arriving at and departing from the Port of Fremantle and also to—
 - (i) Federal Sea Safety and Surveillance Centre, Canberra.
 - (ii) R.A.N. Hydrographer, Sydney.
 - (iii) N.O.C.W.A. H.M.A.S. *Stirling*.
 - (iv) Marine and Harbours and Rottneet Island Board.
 - (v) Yacht Clubs, Australian Yachting Association and all America's Cup Syndicates.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3404. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, has he recently written to the vessel's owners indicating that the Government is not intending to offer any assistance in their efforts to obtain any compensation or recompense for the loss of their vessel?

- (2) If so, will he please table a copy of the correspondence?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The owners have been advised to seek legal advice.
- (2) Copy of letter dated 13/3/85.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3405. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, has the Fremantle Port Authority had any discussions with the Department of Transport in Canberra regarding the hazard with which the *Leschenault* collided?
- (2) Were these discussions before or after the collision and sinking of the *Leschenault*?
- (3) Did any such discussions establish which authority or department was responsible for the marking and removal of the hazard?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Before and after.
- (3) The responsibility for marking and removal of the beacon lies with the Fremantle Port Authority.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3406. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, did the Fremantle Port Authority ask the Overseas Telecommunications Commission to issue warnings to sea traffic after the hazard was identified, and before the *Leschenault* was sunk after collision with the hazard?

- (2) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The issue of warnings by the Overseas Telecommunications Commission have to be authorised by the Federal Sea Safety and Surveillance Centre, Canberra, who were issued with warnings by the Fremantle Port Authority.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3407. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, what was the precise nature and description of the object struck by the *Leschenault*?
- (2) Was it marked in accordance with all the international regulations and requirements relating to such a hazard?
- (3) If so, what were the details of the manner in which the obstruction was marked?
- (4) Was a light of quick-flashing frequency attached to the hazard?
- (5) If not, what form of flashing light was attached to the hazard?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The toe of the leg of the eastern south passage light beacon.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) In accordance with the International Association of Lighthouse Authorities buoyage system "A".
- (4) No.
- (5) Lighting in accordance with the International Association of Lighthouse Authorities system "A".

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3408. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, is it fact that the Fremantle Port Authority removed the object struck by the *Leschenault* immediately after the collision occurred?
- (2) If the object was considered dangerous enough to be removed after it had caused considerable loss of property, why was it not removed immediately it was deemed to be dangerous?
- (3) When were discussions first held with a view to removing the dangerous object?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Obstruction was removed on the same day as *Leschenault* collision.

(2) Object was adequately marked and was not considered dangerous.

(3) Monday 17 December 1984.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3409. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, did an accident or collision occur on 16 December 1984, at the place where the *Leschenault* subsequently was sunk on 19 December?
- (2) If so, what was the nature of the collision or accident?
- (3) What action or safety procedures were taken following any collision or accident on 16 December 1984?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Investigations by Fremantle Port Authority have indicated that Japanese fishing vessel "Koei Maru No 27" allegedly collided and pushed over eastern south passage beacon. This accident was not reported to FPA on its occurrence.
- (b) The pleasure yacht "Tenggara" reported at 11.00 a.m., 16 December 1984 that it had collided with the toe of the beacon leg resulting in this Authority first becoming aware that the beacon had been displaced.
- (3) Action by FPA immediately after "Tenggara's" report was—
 - (a) Advised Federal Sea Safety and Surveillance Centre, Canberra.
 - (b) Alerted Department of Marine and Harbours to guard hazard from all shipping until FPA had laid lighted buoy in accordance with International Association of Lighthouse Authorities buoyage system "A".
 - (c) All known arriving and departing vessels to the Port of Fremantle informed by FPA Signal Station of existing navigation hazard.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3410. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, did he agree that an inquiry should be held and offer to establish one?
- (2) Has such an enquiry been held?
- (3) If not, and if he had originally agreed to the holding of an inquiry, for what reasons has he not honoured his undertaking?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) In view of the apparent reluctance of the owner of the *Leschenault* to settle the matter by seeking legal redress, the Fremantle Port Authority agreed to arrange a private investigation by an independent investigator.

However, subsequent legal advice negated this action on the grounds that:

- (a) The F.P.A. would be acting without statutory sanction in holding such an inquiry.
- (b) Difficulties would be created in respect to the provision of information to the investigator and in regard to the probable lack of protection to those involved, including the investigator, from any potential defamation action.
- (c) The legal and practical effect of prohibiting from use the relevant findings or transcript in subsequent proceedings was questionable.

"LESCHENAULT"

Sinking

3411. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the circumstances surrounding the sinking of the ketch *Leschenault* on 19 December 1984, will the Government immediately take action to establish an inquiry into all aspects and circumstances relating to the sinking of the *Leschenault*?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) Refer to answer to question 3410.

**CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS
COMMITTEE**

Members

3425. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Budget Management:

Who were the members of the Charitable Collections Committee on—

- (a) 1 July 1981;
- (b) 1 July 1982;
- (c) 1 July 1983; and
- (d) 1 July 1984?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) Slade Drake-Brockman
Lawrence Alton Jackson
Clive Deverall
Geoffrey Edward Summerhayes
Arthur John Parker.

(b) As above.

- (c) Slade Drake-Brockman
Lawrence Alton Jackson
Clive Deverall

The terms of Messrs Summerhayes and Parker expired on 30 June 1983 and they were replaced by the Hon. Roy Frederick Claughton and Miss Margaret Patricia Ryan on 7 February 1984.

- (d) Slade Drake-Brockman
Hon. Roy Frederick Claughton
Margaret Patricia Ryan

The terms of Messrs Jackson and Deverall expired on 30 June 1984. Mr Deverall was re-appointed on 24 July 1984 and Mr Jackson was replaced by Ms Rhonda Frances Griffiths on 24 July 1984.

MINERALS: TENEMENTS

National Parks

3430. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Will he please provide me with a list of—
 - (a) Western Australian national parks, indicating the identifying number, area and, in the case of tenements issued under the Mines Act 1904, the purpose of all mining tenements which affect each national park;

- (b) Western Australian nature reserves, indicating the identifying number, area and, in the case of tenements issued under the Mines Act 1904, the purpose of all mining tenements which affect each nature reserve;
- (c) forest Management Priority Areas (flora, fauna and landscape) and Management Priority Areas (recreation), indicating the identifying number, area and, in the case of tenements issued under the Mines Act 1904, the purpose of all mining tenements which affect each such Management Priority Area?
- (2) What proportion of the total area of Western Australia's national parks are subject to current—
 - (a) mining leases;
 - (b) prospecting licences;
 - (c) exploration licences?
- (3) What proportion of the total area of Western Australia's nature reserves are subject to current—
 - (a) mining leases;
 - (b) prospecting licences;
 - (c) exploration licences?
- (4) What proportion of the total area of forest Management Priority Areas (flora, fauna and landscape) and Management Priority Areas (recreation) are subject to current—
 - (a) mining leases;
 - (b) prospecting licences;
 - (c) exploration licences?
- (5) What is the Government's policy on mining and mineral exploration in—
 - (a) national parks;
 - (b) nature reserves;
 - (c) forest Management Priority Areas (flora, fauna and landscape) and Management Priority Areas (recreation)?
- (6) (a) Are there standard form conditions which, until now, have been applied to mining tenements granted over the categories of land described in part (5) above;
- (b) if so, will he please table a copy of such conditions?
- (7) Will he please table a list of the titles and authors of all studies which have been carried out on the impact of mineral exploration on national parks,

nature reserves and forest Management Priority Areas (flora, fauna and landscape) and Management Priority Areas (recreation)?

- (8) What further such studies are currently planned?
- (9) Will he make copies of the findings of such studies as have been completed available to members of the public, and make available the findings of any further studies as and when they are completed?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) to (9) The information requested by the member would require an extensive commitment of staff resources which I am not prepared to authorise. I will provide a written answer to those parts of the question for which information can be readily supplied.

TRANSPORT: WESTRAIL

Redundancies

3431. Mr TOM JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

As a result of the use of natural gas at the Kwinana power station, will he please advise—

- (a) the loss of income to Westrail due to the decline in coal traffic;
- (b) the number of railway workers who will become redundant at the Collie railway depot?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (a) and (b) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

WATER RESOURCES: DAM

Harris River

3432. Mr TOM JONES, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Will he advise the current situation in relation to the construction of the Harris River Dam at Collie?
- (2) Provided Commonwealth approval is given to proceed with the construction of the dam, will he advise—
 - (a) the anticipated capital cost;
 - (b) when construction of the dam will commence;
 - (c) the period involved in construction;

- (d) at what date would the dam water be available for use in the system?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Cabinet has approved the construction of a dam on the Harris River, subject to the availability of funds under the Federal Water Resources Assistance Programme and an environmental clearance.
- (2) (a) The cost of the dam and associated works is estimated to be \$30 million.
- (b) Assuming early Commonwealth Government approval, the construction of the initial site facilities will commence in 1986. The construction of the embankment will follow, commencing in 1987.
- (c) Construction of the embankment is scheduled to take two years. This means that water should be stored for the first time during the winter of 1989.
- (d) Towards the end of 1989.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Station: Kwinana

3433. Mr TOM JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What was the capital cost of construction of the Kwinana power station?
- (2) What were the final conversion costs of the units which were converted to burn coal instead of oil?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The capital cost and date of completion of the Kwinana Power Station was as follows:—

	ACTUAL CAPITAL COST	COMMISSIONING DATES
STAGES I & 2 (4 Units)	\$47 Million	September 1970 March 1972 February 1973 November 1973
STAGE C (2 Units)	\$43 Million	February 1976 *March 1978

*First commissioned after conversion to coal firing.

- (2) The cost of conversion of generating units at Kwinana Power Station and the

time of completion of the conversions was as follows:—

STAGE I (2 Units)	\$50.6 Million	September 1983 October 1983
STAGE C (2 Units)	\$32.5 Million	March 1978 April 1979

Recognition of the time when expenditure occurred is important in considering this information as substantial escalation of costs occurred during the period in which these works occurred, 1965—1983.

ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Agreement

3434. Mr TOM JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

Was the North-West Shelf Agreement signed on a confidential basis which does not permit the Government to disclose the provisions contained in the contract?

Mr PARKER replied:

The North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement was not signed on a confidential basis as it was ratified by an Act of Parliament. If the member is referring to the Gas Sales Agreements, they were signed on a confidential basis and their contents cannot be revealed.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Station: Kwinana

3435. Mr TOM JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Due to the previous Liberal Government's commitment to buy a certain volume of gas, does this require the State Energy Commission to burn gas at the Kwinana generating station instead of coal?
- (2) When will gas be used for production of electricity at the Kwinana power station?
- (3) As a result of the use of gas, what effect will this have on the coal orders being currently supplied to the Kwinana power station?
- (4) With the use of gas in preference to coal, how will this affect the economics of power production costs at the Kwinana power station?

- (5) As a result of the commission being forced to use gas, will this result in increased electricity charges to consumers?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Yes. Four units at Kwinana Power Station have been converted to fire gas.
- (2) From mid-1985 until surplus gas is consumed.
- (3) There will be no effect on coal from Griffin because of the 1978 Contract. Coal from Western Collieries has been reduced from previous levels, although it is not envisaged there will be any further reduction. Normal growth in coal orders has been eliminated because of the Gas Sales Agreements of 1980.
- (4) The cost of power production at Kwinana will be approximately the same.
- (5) An increase in charges for the reasons indicated is not considered necessary at this time. In the long run the Gas Sales Agreements have increased the Commission's costs overall.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Station: Bunbury

3436. Mr TOM JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is it intended to reduce the output from the Bunbury power station?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) what effect will it have on coal orders; and
 - (b) from when will it apply?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) It is intended that the output from Bunbury Power Station will be reduced progressively until the power station reaches the end of its economic life at which time it will be closed completely.
- (2) (a) and (b) It is intended that total coal orders will not be reduced below current levels. Some coal which would have been consumed at Bunbury Power Station will be transferred to Muja Power Station.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAY

Station: Bunbury

3437. Mr WATT, to the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) How many times was the television commercial advertising the opening of a new Bunbury railway station shown and on which television channels?
- (2) What was the total cost of preparing and making the commercial?
- (3) What was the total cost of all showings?
- (4) What purpose was served by the commercial?
- (5) Is it intended to use television to advertise official openings of other Government facilities and/or buildings in the future, either in Bunbury or elsewhere?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (5) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: "ALBANY TOMORROW"

Advertising

3438. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) How many brochures and how many car stickers were printed and distributed in the Great Southern entitled "What is Albany Tomorrow"?
- (2) Who did the art work for the brochure and at what cost?
- (3) Were competitive quotes sought for both the art work and the print; if so, from whom?
- (4) What was the total cost of—
 - (a) printing the brochures;
 - (b) printing the car stickers;
 - (c) distribution throughout the region?
- (5) Is it proposed to print and distribute further brochures in the Great Southern of a similar nature?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) 16 000 Brochures
16 000 car stickers.
- (2) McCann-Erickson Advertising Pty. Ltd. The artwork for the brochure and car stickers combined cost \$3 888.07. There were also agency and administration fees.

(3) Competitive quotes:

- (a) Artwork—No.
- (b) Printing—Yes.

The brochure was printed by the Albany Advertiser after preliminary quotes were obtained from two other companies.

Quotes for printing the car stickers were obtained from Poster Productions and Decal Craft, Perth. (Inquiries at the time by McCann-Erickson established that the type and quality of work required, in this case, could not be undertaken in Albany.)

- (4) (a) \$4 050.99.
- (b) \$2 836.00.
- (c) \$1 583.55.
- (5) There are no plans for similar brochures at this stage.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: MARINA

Sorrento: Contract

3439. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the contract for the construction of the Sorrento marina yet been let?
- (2) If so, to whom has the contract been let?
- (3) When were tenders for the contract called?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Staff

3440. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

What is the total number of staff currently employed by the Tourism Commission?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

151 employees inclusive of temporary staff.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Office

3441. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is the Tourism Commission currently renovating its offices at 16 St George's Terrace, Perth?

- (2) If so, what is the nature of the renovations?

- (3) How much will the renovations cost?

- (4) Who is completing the renovations?

- (5) When did tenders close for those renovations?

- (6) Is it fact that a major portion of these renovations are being carried out by six-hourly shifts from 6.00 p.m. to midnight?

- (7) If so, why is this so?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Essential partition alterations and general renovations to the 9th, 10th and 11th floors to cater for the establishment of the America's Cup Unit, transfer of the Accounting Division from 772 Hay Street and to group the Research and Planning and Investment and Development Divisions.

- (3) \$167 696.

- (4) Design Sales Pty Ltd.

- (5) Design Sales was invited to tender for the contract and its tender was subsequently accepted.

- (6) Restructuring work that could not be carried out during normal office hours because of dust hazard, noise and disruption to the working environment, was completed over a three-week period between the hours of 1700-0200.

- (7) See reply to (6).

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Film: America's Cup

3442. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it fact, as reported in the *Australian* of Wednesday 12 June, page 16, that the Western Australian Development Corporation has agreed to finance a film about the America's Cup?

- (2) If so, what is the nature of that agreement?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING: SKILLS WEST '85

Expenditure

3443. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) How much has been spent to date on the Skills West programme?
- (2) Will the Minister detail for me the areas in which the money has been spent?
- (3) Who administers the programme and how many people are employed in that department to carry out the administration?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) \$1 851 004.57.
- (2) Yes, for the Job Link Scheme, the Job Placement and Training Scheme and publicity activities.
- (3) The Department of Employment and Training.

TOURISM: INVESTMENT MISSION

Funding

3444. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Who funded the recent investment mission led by the Managing Director of the Tourism Commission to the North West and Kimberley?
- (2) Who travelled on that mission?
- (3) What did the tour cost?
- (4) Did any of the people on the tour make any contribution towards its cost?
- (5) If so, who and what contribution?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Tourism Commission.
- (2) H. C. Huang Orchard Hotel
Brian Easton Exim Corporation
Garry Pearce Allied Westralian
Mark Hohnen Oceanic Equity
Rex Bevan Capel Court
Ted Karasek Marketing Director,
 Western Region
 Ansett

Len Brush Superannuation Board
Bruce Buckley Bond Corporation
John Dunn Skywest

Peter Prendiville Western Resorts Corporation Ltd

Hugh Schmitt The West Australian Newspaper

Warren Tucker Commissioner, WA Tourism Commission

Brett Goodridge Managing Director, WA Tourism Commission

Terry McVeigh Director, Investment and Regional Development, WA Tourism Commission

Mark Sparrow Director, Research and Planning, WA Tourism Commission

Vaughan Emery Regional Manager, WA Tourism Commission

(3) Approximately \$15 000.

(4) No.

(5) Not applicable.

SPORT AND RECREATION: INDOOR COMPLEX

Construction

3445. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) When will construction begin on the proposed sports complex to be built on university land at McGillivray Oval?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of the contract?
- (3) Who has been awarded the contract?
- (4) When were tenders called for the contract?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

GAMBLING: CASINO

Development: Revised Cost

3446. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the estimated total cost of the now revised casino development which is taking place on Burswood Island?
- (2) Will he provide me with a breakdown of this cost?
- (3) By when does he estimate that these costs will be expended?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) According to the Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Act and the Prospectus of the Burswood Property Trust, \$210 000 000 plus a provision of \$10 000 000 for cost overrun.
- (2) Refer to Table I on page 17 of the Prospectus of the Burswood Property Trust.
- (3) December 1986.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Oakford

3447. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the purchase for the new Oakford school site at the corner of Anketell and Thomas Roads been completed?
- (2) If "No", why is this delay occurring when he made a commitment to have the new school established before this present winter?
- (3) Why is the Government continuing to refuse to pay market value for the land, as disclosed in its Comment Paper of 25 June 1985?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I made no such commitment. I offered Oakford people the chance to have a new school next year rather than a re-location of the existing school this year, and this was agreed.
- (3) The land required for the replacement Oakford Primary School has been valued by the Valuer-General's Office. In line with Government procedures, the initial offer made was based on this official valuation.

Negotiations with the land owners are continuing.

MINISTER OF THE CROWN: PREMIER

Electorate Visits: Dwellingup

3448. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Why did he not extend the normal courtesy of informing the local Members of Parliament of his recent visit to Dwellingup?
- (2) What commitments did he make to the people attending the meeting?

(3) For what purpose is the \$100 000 promised funding to be spent?

(4) At what cost and on what site is the toilet block to be built?

(5) What commitment did he make for Nanga Brook Road this year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) to (5) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

3449. *Postponed.*

TRAFFIC: SAFETY

Ranford Road

3450. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will immediate approval be given for construction of safety measures to be made on Ranford Road between Nicholson Road, Gosnells and Westfield Road, and Armadale?
- (2) Will funds be provided this financial year by way of grants to the councils involved for safety measures to be introduced?
- (3) Will clearing of bush from the shoulders of the very narrow sections be done?
- (4) Will pull-off bays be constructed along the narrow sections to provide for vehicles breaking down?
- (5) If "No" to (1), (2), (3) and (4) what relief will be given to the seemingly dangerous position now being experienced by drivers and passengers using Ranford Road?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) to (5) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: BUS-RAIL TRANSFER STATION

Armadale

3451. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has a design of the Armadale train/bus transfer station been completed?
- (2) Will he table a copy of the design?
- (3) When is it expected the Armadale train/bus transfer station will be built?
- (4) Will commencement of the transfer station commence this financial year?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

WATER RESOURCES

Dwellingup

3452. Mr RUSHTON, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Referring to my question 2992 of 4 April 1985, has the decision been made for alternative sources of water for recreational purposes in the town of Dwellingup?
- (2) If "Yes", what arrangements have been agreed for watering—
 - (a) the Dwellingup town oval;
 - (b) the Dwellingup school oval?
- (3) If "No" to (1), when will the decision be made considering I had been advised the decision would be made before the end of April?
- (4) Are the Shire of Murray and Alcoa to be allowed to use the previous town bore sites for equipping for supply to the town oval and school oval in Dwellingup?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The recent investigations into the sources needed for the future development of the Dwellingup town water supply have indicated that the groundwater sources at Dwellingup can be released for recreational purposes.
- (2) to (4) The development of facilities for the watering of ovals is now a matter for resolution by the Shire. The Water Authority of Western Australia is prepared to allow the use of the old bores or the drilling of new bores for this purpose.

ROADS

Nanga Brook Road

3453. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the grant to be allocated to Nanga Brook Road, Dwellingup in the next financial year?
- (2) What formation and sealing is expected to be constructed from the grant mentioned in (1)?
- (3) What negotiations have been held with Alcoa towards building the road compat-

ible with the future mining expectations in the area?

- (4) Has Alcoa been asked to contribute to the cost of the road?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), what is the sum requested?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (5) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: WOOL

Deregulation

3454. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When is the Government to introduce the next stage of deregulation of wool to allow transportation by road or rail?
- (2) What have been the extra costs incurred by the growers for wool not being completely deregistered from 1 July 1983?
- (3) What has been the estimated saving to the consumers of the stage of transport deregulation since 1980?
- (4) By what Government was the grain freight committee, formed from the Grain Industry Association, negotiated and initiated to de-politicise the setting of grain freight rates?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

WATER RESOURCES: DAM

Wandering

3455. Mr RUSHTON, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the lining of the Wandering No. 1 dam been completed?
- (2) If "No", when will this work be finished?
- (3) When will dam No. 2 be lined?
- (4) What consideration has been given to the alternative water storage for Wandering town put forward by the shire?
- (5) When will a decision be made upon the shire proposal?
- (6) Is it anticipated the Town of Wandering will experience water restrictions next summer due to the late lining of the No. 1 dam?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) This is subject to the availability of funds.
- (4) Preliminary studies have indicated that the Shire alternative is less cost-effective than the lining of the existing dam. However, the District Engineer at Narrogin is monitoring the Shire's site to ascertain its runoff characteristics this winter.
- (5) If the lining of the No. 2 dam proceeds, the Shire's alternative proposal will no longer be necessary.
- (6) Because of the lack of early rains, the slight delay in the completion of the lining has had minimal effect on the present storage.

POLICE: SPEED LIMITS

Air Surveillance

3456. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) In view of the recent court decision regarding the accuracy of assessing speeds of motor vehicles from the air, have the police continued with this form of apprehending speeding drivers?
- (2) If not, does the Police Department intend to resume this method of detecting speeding motorists?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) Yes. Following the decision in the case a review was carried out resulting in a determination that the method of detecting speeding motorists from aircraft was sound. However, some minor changes to procedure have occurred to assist in presentation of cases to the courts.
- (2) Answered by (1).

3457 to 3460. *Postponed.*

COMMUNITY SERVICES: MEALS ON WHEELS

Electricity Tariff

3461. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is he aware that "Meals on Wheels" organisations pay over 12 cents per unit for their electricity?

- (2) Is he prepared to lower the tariff to this organisation?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Government is considering this matter in conjunction with the Final Report from the Committee of Inquiry into Electricity and Gas Tariffs in Western Australia.

WATER AUTHORITY

Housing

3462. Mr TUBBY, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is it the policy of the Water Resources Authority to purchase Government Employees' Housing Authority housing for Water Resources Authority staff in country towns?
- (2) If "Yes", will he please give reasons for this change of policy?
- (3) Will this mean a different standard of housing for Water Resources Authority staff as compared with other Government employees?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Districts: Declaration

3463. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the normal timespan from application to approval for the declaration of a soil conservation district?
- (2) How many districts have been approved?
- (3) Would he please list the districts approved to date?
- (4) How many applications are awaiting approval?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Preliminary approval is usually given within two to three weeks. However the requirements under the Soil and Land Conservation Act for the formal establishment of a district committee involve a number of steps in sequence requiring considerable consultation and the average time from application to formal gazettal is about six months.

- (2) 51.
(3) The following districts have been established:

East Perenjori
Jerramungup
Gingin
Yilgarn
Mt Marshall
Dowerin
Derby/West Kimberley
Trayning
Merredin
Bruce Rock
Mukinbudin
Kellerberrin
Narembeen
Westonia
Boyup Brook
Carnarvon
West Maya
Kent River
Stirling
Three Springs
Carnamah
Buntine/West Wubin
Denbarker
Tammin
Wyalkatchem
Morawa
Wickepin
Nugadong West
Koorda
Gnowangerup

The following Districts have been approved but not yet established:

West Katanning
North Eastern Goldfields
Mogumber
Chittering
Latham
Pithara
Watheroo-Coomberdale
Esperance
Frankland Below Gordon
Waddi Forest
Quairading
Northam
Burakin-Bunketch
North Stirlings
Ballidu East
Meekatharra
Mobrup
Ravensthorpe
Perenjori
Nungarin
Murchison

- (4) None.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Revaluations

3464. Mr McNEE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Regarding revaluation of shires, why do shires have to be revalued at a set period?
- (2) Why do shires have to be revalued without a request from the council concerned?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) and (2) The Valuer General is required under section 22 of the Valuation of Land Act 1978, to ensure that valuations comprising a general valuation are accurate and up-to-date as far as practicable.

Revaluations are necessary at regular intervals to allow local governments to strike a rate and raise revenue from a rating base which reflects the contemporary value of the land.

Revaluations are not made for the exclusive use of local governments. They are used by other rating and taxing bodies.

ALUMINIUM SMELTER

Construction: Change of Mind

3465. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What made the Government suddenly change its mind on the future of the aluminium smelter of Kemerton?
- (2) Why did the Government keep saying the project to build the aluminium smelter was to proceed when all indications pointed to the project being doomed?
- (3) Does the Government intend to proceed with trying to establish an aluminium smelter in Western Australia?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government's considered decision was based on advice received from the Western Australian Development Corporation and the recent views of the Reynolds Metals Company concerning the persisting overcapacity in the industry and low metal prices.

- (3) The Government continues to support private enterprise initiatives to establish an aluminium smelter in Western Australia.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT

Officers: Katanning

3466. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Is there any intention of reducing the number of Conservation and Land Management officers currently stationed in Katanning?
- (2) If "Yes", what are the plans for the future of the Katanning office, and what is the reason for the reduction in numbers?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

TRANSPORT: WESTRAIL

Katanning: Redundancies

3467. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What further staff redundancies are expected to occur at Westrail, Katanning, in the next six months?
- (2) Is it envisaged that the marshalling yard will be dismantled in Katanning?
- (3) Is Westrail planning to close the Bokarup Street crossing?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

EDUCATION: HOSTEL

Lake Grace

3468. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has any progress been made with studies regarding the necessity and desirability of a four-day High School hostel at Lake Grace?
- (2) If so, would he please advise the current situation?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) No—There has been no formal study carried out. The Country High School Hostels Authority has not generally supported the concept of small five

day hostels as such hostels would not be financially viable.

WATER RESOURCES

Rural Water Supplies: Policy Document

3469. Mr CRANE, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

In view of the interest in country areas of Government policy on water reticulation, is the Government policy document on rural water supplies completed, and if not, when can it be expected to be released?

Mr PEARCE replied:

As previously stated, consideration of this policy document on Rural Water Supplies was deferred pending examination of the financial implications of the policy options.

This examination is well advanced and the Government is hopeful that it will be able to finalize the policy document in the near future.

SCM CHEMICALS PTY. LTD.

Pollution

3470. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Is he aware of the recent media reports that the groundwater at Australind is polluted by effluent seepage from SCM Chemicals?
- (2) If so, what is being done to improve the situation?
- (3) If not, will he investigate the reports?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The company has undertaken to collect, treat and dispose of all contaminated ground water in an environmentally acceptable manner.
- (3) Not applicable.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Warooka

3471. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) At what stage is the purchase of the land for a new primary school at Warooka?
- (2) How long does he expect the transfer of title to take?

- (3) Is he proceeding as fast as possible to obtain the land?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) Negotiations for the purchase of the land for the Waroona District High School Primary Annexe have broken down.
- (2) Unknown.
- (3) Yes. A Notice of Intention to Resume was published in the *Government Gazette* of 12 April 1985.

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Products: Sales

3472. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have the sales of tobacco products diminished in the last two years in Western Australia?
- (2) Is it possible to obtain accurate figures when people are allegedly importing tobacco products from the Eastern States to avoid the high Western Australian duty?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The Health Department is not provided with sales data by the tobacco industry. However, evaluation surveys conducted as part of the Smoking and Health Project indicate that a large number of smokers have attempted to quit or cut down their smoking as a result of the Quit Campaign.
- (2) It would be very difficult to obtain precise figures for total sales under these circumstances.

SCM CHEMICALS PTY. LTD.

Air Samples

3473. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Health Department taken air samples at SCM Chemicals and surrounds since the new acid plant was installed?
- (2) If so, what are the results?
- (3) Are the levels now within acceptable standards?
- (4) Have noise levels been taken in regard to SCM Chemicals at Australind?
- (5) If so, are these levels acceptable?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) No. There has been a delay in commissioning due to several untoward events and normal operation was only achieved on 28 June 1985. Emission testing carried out so far by the Company indicates the plant is now complying with the acceptable standard. All calciners will be converted to natural gas by 24 July 1985. It is proposed that testing of the acid plant and calciners by the Department of Conservation and Environment will proceed immediately after that.
- (2) Answered by (1) above.
- (3) Answered by (1) above.
- (4) No.
- (5) Not applicable.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Admissions

3474. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the present situation regarding admissions to teaching hospitals in Western Australia as far as people having to wait for treatment or operations is concerned?
- (2) Are the teaching hospitals running at full capacity?
- (3) If not, what is the bed average for each of the teaching hospitals?
- (4) Has the bed average increased for teaching hospitals in the last 12 months?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), what has been the average increase for teaching hospitals in the last five years?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The waiting periods for admission to teaching hospitals are extremely variable, depending on the nature or reason for admission, and can extend from several days to many months. Patients categorized as requiring urgent admission are being admitted without delay and receive priority over elective or non-urgent admissions.
- (2) Of the 2 499 teaching hospital beds, the year to date occupied bed average up to the end of May was 2 078.9.
- (3) The individual year to date occupied bed averages for each teaching hospital to the end of May 1985 are as follows:

	Occupied Bed Average	Available Beds
Royal Perth	817.7	954
Sir Charles Gairdner	581.5	667
Fremanlle	285.6	363
Princess Margaret	173.1	257
King Edward Memorial	221.0	258

- (4) No. Statistics of average occupied bed days in teaching hospitals have remained relatively constant between 1983/84 and year to date 1984/85. The percentage change was less than +0.02%.
- (5) Not applicable.

HEALTH

Human Tissue Transplants

3475. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he intend to introduce legislation in regard to human tissue transplants?
- (2) If so—
- (a) when; and
- (b) what type of legislation does he intend to introduce?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Human Tissue and Transplant Act was assented to on 8 December 1982 and came into operation on 1 March 1983.

HEALTH: MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

Population Ratio

3476. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

What is the doctor-population ratio in—

- (a) the country;
- (b) the metropolitan area?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (a) 1:1 459.
- (b) 1:486.

*Based on previously conducted survey of medical practitioners. It is planned to repeat the survey in 1986.

HEALTH: HOSPITAL

Bentley

3477. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he still intend to annex the Bentley Hospital to the Royal Perth Hospital?
- (2) If so, when?

- (3) If not, what does he plan for the Bentley Hospital in regard to doctor use of the hospital?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) No, it is intended that Bentley Hospital will continue to function as a district community hospital.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) On 1 July this year the Board of Management of the Royal Perth Hospital took over the responsibility for the administration of Bentley Hospital from the Health Department. This responsibility encompasses doctor usage of the hospital.

HEALTH: RADIATION

Mr Errol Archer

3478. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What action has been taken by the Government to alleviate Mr Errol Archer's radioactivity problem near Busselton?
- (2) Does he consider the radioactivity levels above acceptable levels?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Agreement has been reached with Mr and Mrs Archer for the excavation of radioactive sands from their property and the replacement of those sands with non-radioactive soil.

Work is expected to commence within the next 10 days.

- (2) Yes.

PLANNING: CANAL DEVELOPMENT

Dawesville

3479. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for the Environment:

When will the report on the proposed Dawesville Cut be released to the public?

Mr DAVIES replied:

It is anticipated that an ERMP encompassing the Dawesville Cut, as one of a number of options, will be available for public scrutiny within the next two months.

COMMUNITY SERVICES: HOMEMAKERS

Bunbury

3480. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Were all the homemakers in the Bunbury area sacked recently?
- (2) Did any homemakers from other regions receive the same treatment?
- (3) Did the sacked homemakers receive less than one week's notice?
- (4) Does he intend to replace the homemakers?
- (5) Who will be in charge of the "Community House" at Brunswick in future?
- (6) Is he aware of the possibly difficult position in which he has placed some of the sacked homemakers by giving them less than one week's notice?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The Homemaker Service was suspended following a review of programmes over the past three months. I have received representations from the Member for Mitchell and have called for a full report.
- (2) No.
- (3) No. Homemaker staff were informed of the review in March and on 11/6/85 they were advised the Service would be suspended as from 30/6/85. A Homemaker on leave was advised of the decision upon return from overseas and before recommencing work.
- (4) It is intended that there will be appointments of Homemakers to specific programmes on a contractual basis as the need arises.
- (5) The Talbot Street Homemaker Centre has been under the management of a client consumer group since March and it will continue to operate under that system.
- (6) See answer to (3).

RUMANIA: VISIT

Group Membership

3481. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) With regard to the forthcoming visit to Rumania by a group from Western Australia, who are the members of the group?

- (2) How is the group to travel to and from Rumania?
- (3) What meetings, discussions and visits are scheduled to be undertaken during the visit?
- (4) What costs associated with the visit are being met by the Western Australian Government?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The State Government representatives visiting Rumania are—

- (1) Premier, Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr Chris McSweeney and Mr Vince Shervington.
- (2) By air.
- (3) An extensive itinerary, involving meetings with senior Rumanian Government representatives, has been prepared.
- (4) Appropriate travel and accepted expenses for State Government officials will be met by the Western Australian Government.

3482. *Postponed.*

ALUMINIUM SMELTER

Reynolds Australia Alumina Ltd.

3483. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he confirm that the communication from the Reynolds organisation which gave that company's assessment of the world aluminium market potential was not received by the Government until Friday, 21 June 1985, as published in the *South Western Times* on Tuesday, 25 June 1985?
- (2) If so, was any consideration given to further market surveys or assessments by recognised international companies, before cancelling the project?
- (3) As the project was assessed as being economically viable and competitive only two weeks prior to being cancelled, is the Government prepared to immediately have the project re-assessed by those who had previously confirmed its viability and cost-effectiveness?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

ALUMINIUM SMELTER

Advice: Businessmen

3484. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) With regard to his statement relating to the aluminium smelter published on 9 June 1985, that "practical, hard-nosed businessmen agreed on the financial viability of the proposal", who were the businessmen involved?
- (2) On what basis was their advice made available to the Government?
- (3) When making their assessment of the project, did the persons concerned have access to the indicative energy tariff arrangements?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) and (2) The statement was based on commercially confidential discussions with private enterprise participants in the proposed aluminium smelter.
- (3) Yes.

3485. *Postponed.*

ALUMINIUM SMELTER

Electricity Tariff Subsidy

3486. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

Is the Minister still able to confirm that no element of subsidy or support was contained in any part or period of the power tariff arrangements for the proposed aluminium smelter agreed between the participants and the Government representatives at meetings in the United States of America in late May?

Mr PARKER replied:

The Government has stated consistently that no other State Energy Commission customer would be disadvantaged because of power supply to the proposed smelter. Government officers did not vary from this position at the meetings in America in May.

ALUMINIUM SMELTER

Cancellation

3487. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) In view of his statement, published on 9 June 1985, that power tariff arrangements had been agreed and other energy arrangements finalised for the proposed aluminium smelter and that "the economic benefit has been confirmed", what information became available between 9 June and 21 June which caused the project to be cancelled?
- (2) In what respect did any information relating to the international aluminium market differ greatly from information previously known and available?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) and (2) Earlier views were based on a wide industry expectation that overcapacity and metal inventories would decline and metal prices increase by the middle of this year. As the Member for Narrogin would be aware, there has in fact been no change in the international aluminium market to justify project commitment at this time.

ALUMINIUM SMELTER

Reynolds Australia Alumina Ltd.

3488. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) At meetings with the Reynolds group, held in the United States of America in late May to discuss the proposed aluminium smelter, which State Government officers were present?
- (2) Was agreement reached on the energy supply arrangements?
- (3) Were discussions held regarding the viability of the project?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The following State Energy Commission Officers were present:

Mr J. B. Kirkwood—Commissioner
Mr P. J. Harvey—Chief Manager,
Power Production
Mr M. D. Chatfield—Project Engineer

The Commission's legal adviser assisting with the Electricity Supply Agreement was also present.

Mr J. Horgan, Chairman of the WADC, attended as a member of the Smelter Consortium.

- (2) Substantial agreement was reached in principle. However, a detailed contract document was not finalised.
- (3) State Energy Commission officers were not involved in discussions of project viability.

ROADS: MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Tenders

3489. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the assessment and awarding of tenders by the Main Roads Department for construction and maintenance work, by whom are the various tenders assessed?
- (2) Are the officers of the Main Roads Department who assess the private tenders also aware of all Main Roads Department costings and tender prices?
- (3) For what reason does the Main Roads Department exert excessive inspection requirements over work being done by private contractors, compared with work being undertaken by Main Roads Department day-labour gangs?
- (4) Has the Government discussed the increasing concern of private contractors relating to the assessing, awarding and inspection of private tenders, with the representatives of the private construction industry?
- (5) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (5) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

COMMUNITY SERVICES: AGED PERSONS' HOMES

Electricity Tariffs

3490. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) How many registered charitable aged-persons institutions receive electricity at the domestic tariff rate?
- (2) Do "Meals-on-Wheels" organisations also qualify for electricity at the domestic tariff rate?

- (3) If not, are they classified as commercial customers?

- (4) If "Yes" to (3), on what basis can "Meals-on-Wheels" be classified as a "commercial" operation?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) 90.
- (2) No.
- (3) and (4) The classification of Meals on Wheels is being considered in conjunction with the Final Report from the Committee of Inquiry into Electricity and Gas Tariffs in Western Australia.

ENERGY: DISTILLATE

Westrail

3491. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the supply of distillate to Westrail, what price concessions are available to Westrail which are not available to non-Government buyers?
- (2) At what price is distillate currently available to Westrail?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

3492. *Postponed.*

HEALTH: RADIATION

Mines Radiation Safety Board

3493. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) With regard to the announcement of a proposed Mines Radiation Safety Board, what evidence was available to Government which showed that greater vigilance was necessary to ensure safety standards are maintained?
- (2) Why is it necessary to legislate to establish such a body?
- (3) Is it fact that the Government is considering the appointment of Professor Philip Jennings as Chairman of the proposed body?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The evidence is contained in a report entitled

"Report to the Minister of Health of Western Australia on Protection from Ionising Radiation Associated with the Mineral Sands Industry—June 1984" by

Associate Professor Murray Winn
The School of Physics
The University of Sydney

Dr John Mathews
Australian Council of Trade Unions
Occupational Health and Safety Unit

Mr Alan Tough
Western Australian Chamber of Mines.

This report is generally known as the "Winn Report".

In summary, the report concluded:

- (a) That existing codes, regulations and laws were being complied with but that the goal of bringing radiation levels as low as is reasonably achievable "needs to be pursued with more vigour".
- (b) The report proposed the establishment of a Mines Radiation Safety Board to oversee the sand-mining industry's operations from the point of view of radiation safety, including the development of updated codes and regulations.
- (2) To function effectively, the Board requires statutory means for the administration of radiation safety on mines.
- (3) Yes.

3494. *Postponed.*

MINERALS: COAL

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd.

3495. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) With regard to the resolution of disputed payments for coal between the State Energy Commission and Griffin Coal, has financial settlement been finalised?
- (2) Is the State Energy Commission intending to use funds from capital borrowings to make the agreed payment?
- (3) If not, from what source will the necessary funds be taken?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Agreement has been reached but the matter is not yet finalised.
- (2) No.
- (3) Retained funds.

TRANSPORT: TAXIS

Disabled Persons

3496. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it fact that one of the special taxis for handicapped persons now has reduced hours each week?
- (2) If so, for what purpose has this been done?
- (3) What are the hours during which taxis for handicapped persons are available?
- (4) If there is not complete availability of such taxis, will he investigate the situation with a view to ensuring greater availability?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

AMERICA'S CUP

Government Entertainment

3497. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is the Government considering obtaining the use of an appropriate vessel on which to entertain visitors during the period of the America's Cup?
- (2) If so, what arrangement is being considered?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Options being considered are chartering, leasing or building.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Private Vessels: Charter

3498. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Does the Western Australian Tourism Commission charter private vessels for promotion or departmental and Government purposes?
- (2) Does the Commission ensure that any vessel so chartered has been properly

surveyed and complies with all gazetted requirements and safety precautions?

- (3) Where use of any vessel is donated but the survey and safety requirements still apply, does the Commission ensure that all arrangements comply with the gazetted requirements?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Commission enters into charter arrangements with licensed operators only.
- (3) Such action would be taken only if considered appropriate under the circumstances.

TRANSPORT: SHIPPING

Survey Standards

3499. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the intention of the Department of Marine and Harbours to impose revised regulations relating to survey standards and requirements for vessels during the period of the America's Cup, by whom were the draft regulations and survey standards prepared?
- (2) For what period of time is it intended the revised standards should apply?
- (3) With which organisations, yacht clubs, and persons have the proposals been discussed?
- (4) Has agreement been reached with all parties regarding the proposed changes?
- (5) If not, what discussions are since being undertaken?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (5) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

ENVIRONMENT

Wetlands: Inquiry

3500. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) With regard to the inquiry into wetlands and road systems announced by the Premier in September 1984, by whom has the inquiry been undertaken?
- (2) Is the inquiry completed?
- (3) When is it expected to be available for public consideration?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Le Provost, Semeniuk & Chalmer.
- (2) No, however a draft copy has been received and is currently being revised into final form.
- (3) The release of the document is yet to be determined.

MINERALS

Western Quarries Pty. Ltd.

3501. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the operations of Western Quarries Pty Ltd, when is it anticipated production will commence?
- (2) Has a special freight rate been agreed to apply to all metal railed from the quarry to Kewdale?
- (3) In providing ballast for Westrail will the freight rate charged to Western Quarries be the same as that applying to other quarrying companies who may tender to supply ballast?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: FREMANTLE

Disputes: Settling Procedure

3502. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has a dispute-settling procedure been instituted within the Port of Fremantle?
- (2) If so, what are the details of procedures involved?
- (3) What persons are involved in any procedures?
- (4) Have the shipping companies, agents, and port-users been involved in developing and administering any procedures for settling industrial disputes?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) No. However, discussions on the proposal to establish a dispute settling procedure are continuing between the Maritime Workers Union, Merchant Services Guild, Fremantle Port Authority, Association of Employers of Waterfront Labour and the Office of Industrial Relations.
- (2) See (1).

- (3) See (1).
- (4) The Association of Employers of Water-front Labour is currently involved in discussions and the Chamber of Shipping will be consulted at a meeting on July 5, 1985.

ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Tariffs

3503. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) In determining energy tariffs for the 1985-86 year, what level of borrowings has been approved for the State Energy Commission other than those previously approved for the Dampier-Wagerup gas pipeline?
- (2) What percentage of the commission's operations for 1985-86 is to be funded from tariff revenue?
- (3) What is the amount of capital expenditure to be committed to the rural contributory extension schemes during 1985-86?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The level of borrowings for the 1985/86 year has yet to be finalised.
- (2) 97 per cent.
- (3) \$4.2 million.

ENERGY: PRICES

Increases

3504. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) In determining the percentage increases in energy prices for 1985-86, what was the budgeted surplus/deficit for the 1985-86 year?
- (2) What was the consolidated surplus/deficit result for the commission's operations during 1984-85?
- (3) What percentage allowance has been made for increased energy sales, when calculating increased revenue requirements?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) I wish to observe the same tradition as the member for Narrogin when Minister and not release such commercial information.

- (2) The finalisation and preparation of the Commission's annual accounts is currently being undertaken and the final operating result is not yet available.

- (3) The projected increase in energy sales for the 1985/86 financial year is:

Electricity	7.2%
Gas	60.7%

TRANSPORT: WESTRAIL

Deficit

3505. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

What was the financial deficit for Westrail for the 1984-85 financial year?

Mr GRILL replied:

I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: DEREGULATION

Costs: Farmers

3506. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

Is the Government in accord with the statement by the Marketing Director of Westrail, that transport deregulation would not reduce farmers' costs?

Mr GRILL replied:

I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: DEREGULATION

Details

3507. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the proposed deregulation of transport announced by the Government, what are the precise details of the changes to transport of—
 - (a) wool;
 - (b) fuel;
 - (c) fertiliser;
 - (d) grain?
- (2) What is the estimated loss of revenue to Westrail from the changes?
- (3) Was the effect upon Westrail's 1985-86 budget known before the deregulation decision was announced?
- (4) How many jobs will be lost within Westrail as indicated by the Premier

when announcing the proposed deregulation?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

3508 and 3509. *Postponed.*

PORTS AND HARBOURS

Maritime Council

3510. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the proposed Maritime Council, what is the proposed membership of the council?
- (2) Are representatives of shipping companies, exporters, and port users to be members of the council?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Expenditure

3511. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) On Wednesday, 1 May 1985, in reply to question 3334, he advised that the categorisation of all expenditure on Aboriginal services being undertaken by his department had not yet been finalised. As all departments had been requested to respond urgently, is all the required information yet available?
- (2) What departments or instrumentalities have not responded?
- (3) When will the details be publicly available?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) and (2) All departments approached have provided information about their expenditure on Aboriginal services.
- (3) This is an internal review of Government services and programmes and the information is required for continuing discussions with the Commonwealth Government.

ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Restructuring

3512. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

In reply to question 304 on Tuesday, 7 August 1984, he indicated that legislation to restructure the State Energy Commission would be introduced during that session or in the Autumn session of Parliament in 1985. As both those sessions have been completed without the legislation being introduced, I seek his advice as to when will the proposed legislation now be forthcoming?

Mr PARKER replied:

It is proposed that this legislation be introduced in the forthcoming session of Parliament.

3513. *Postponed.*

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Information

3514. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

In reply to question 1561 on 6 November 1984, he advised me that the Western Australian Development Corporation would be replying directly providing the information sought in the question. As I have not yet received any response or communication from the Western Australian Development Corporation, when might I expect the information?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The member will be advised in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: DEPARTMENT

Details

3515. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In reply to question 1568 on Wednesday, 7 November 1984, he indicated that an announcement would be made at an appropriate time concerning the details of the proposed new Department of Transport. When is it proposed to announce the administrative changes?
- (2) When will the necessary legislative changes be introduced to Parliament?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

LAND CLEARING

Regulations

3516. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In reply to question 1514 on Thursday, 1 November 1984, he advised that those regulations relating to the clearing of agricultural land were still being considered under the Soil and Land Conservation Act and that an announcement would be made in due course: what stage has been reached with the development of these proposed new regulations and when is it expected it will be tabled for parliamentary consideration?
- (2) With which persons or bodies have discussions been held regarding these proposals?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Discussions are taking place with the producer organisations regarding final details of a programme that the Government intends to adopt. When that consultative process is complete proposed regulations and guidelines will be tabled for parliamentary consideration?
- (2) The Government's proposal on land clearing has been discussed with a large range of organisations including the Primary Industry Association, the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, the Local Government Association, the Country Shire Councils Association and all Government Departments with a role or interest in land management.

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS

Licensing Board

3517. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

In reply to question 3289 on Thursday, 18 April 1985, the Minister advised the members of the Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board, and indicated in response to part (3) of the reply that one of the current members was a person who currently deals in motor trucks. Which of the members is currently engaged in

dealing in motor trucks on a commercial basis?

Mr PEARCE replied:

Mr C. W. Houghton.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

Midland Workshops

3518. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the working party established to examine the manning levels at Westrail's Midland workshops, what changes, if any, have so far been implemented as a result of the deliberations of the committee?
- (2) What are the present manning levels at the workshops?
- (3) Has general work and activity within the workshops increased during the past two years?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

Seaman Inquiry: Funding

3519. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

Further to his reply to question 311 of 17 April 1985 that information was being compiled regarding funds used in the South West Region in relation to the Seaman Inquiry, and that he would by letter advise me: as I have received a further inquiry regarding this matter, when may I expect his reply?

Mr WILSON replied:

As the information the member seeks will take some time to compile, I will reply in writing when it is available.

EDUCATION: NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Funding

3520. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Education:

In response to question 3111 on Tuesday, 16 April 1985, concerning Commonwealth Government funding of independent schools, has the Government completed its consideration of the Feder-

al Government's new guidelines; and if so, with what result?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The Government has accepted the responsibility of providing cash grants to non-government schools on the basis of need. To determine the basis of need, the State Government has utilised the classification developed by the Commonwealth Schools Commission.

This will mean that schools will only have one classification and not two. Accordingly their administrative arrangements will be quite simple.

Whilst the Commonwealth Schools Commission has produced a scheme which will provide for quite substantial shifts between classifications, the State Government has produced a more modest arrangement within the financial resources available.

Tabled for information is a copy of a circular sent to all non-government schools.

(See paper No. 634.)

ROAD: MITCHELL FREEWAY

Extensions

3521. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the northern extensions to the Mitchell Freeway, for what traffic density has the freeway been designed?
- (2) What is the present vehicle count on the section already completed?
- (3) Is the Government satisfied that the proposed design for the northern extensions will accommodate anticipated vehicle density?
- (4) Have funding arrangements yet been finalised for the extensions involving the Shire of Wanneroo and the Joondalup Development Corporation?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

ENERGY: GAS

Fremantle Gas and Coke Co. Ltd.

3522. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) With regard to his prepared statement of 13 January 1985, relating to the Fremantle Gas and Coke Company Ltd, has he received the advice from the Crown Law Department which he referred to on page 3 of his statement, and indicated he would need to obtain?
- (2) If so, what is the substance of the advice relative to the Minister's powers to give "certain undertakings"?
- (3) What were the "certain undertakings" being sought?
- (4) Has he met with the parties currently engaged in seeking to acquire the company?
- (5) Are any "undertakings" still being sought from him by any of the parties engaged in offers to acquire the company?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The advice indicated that a legally enforceable undertaking in the terms of clause 5(8)(a)(iv) of the J. N. Taylor Holdings Ltd. offer could not be given.
- (3) An undertaking was sought that the provisions of the Gas Undertakings Act would not be invoked against a related company of J. N. Taylor Holdings Ltd.
- (4) Only as outlined in my Press statement of 13 January 1985.
- (5) No.

TRANSPORT

Fertiliser

3523. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Under the existing regulations applying to the transport of fertiliser, what restrictions apply within the Shire of West Arthur?
- (2) Do any load limits apply on fertiliser transported from the Wagin bulk fertiliser installation?
- (3) When is it intended to remove any existing restrictions within the Shire of West Arthur?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

GRAIN: CO-OPERATIVE BULK HANDLING LTD.

Access

3524. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) On what basis does Westrail provide land and railway access for grain handling installations owned by Co-operative Bulk Handling?
- (2) What was the total income to Westrail from Co-operative Bulk Handling for lease and use of land during 1984-85?
- (3) What negotiations and discussions are undertaken between Westrail and Co-operative Bulk Handling regarding the location and establishment of bulk grain installations?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: FREIGHT

Grain

3525. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does the Government agree with the statement by the Marketing Director of Westrail that grain freight would be cheaper if railage could be spread across a longer period of time?
- (2) For what reason is the grain railage not spread across a longer time span?
- (3) Has Westrail considered revising its arrangements with Co-operative Bulk Handling in order to consider any freight cost advantages which could flow from changed railage timing?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: TAXIS

Licences

3526. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With regard to the additional taxi plates which were recently issued by the Taxi

Control Board, how many applications were received for the plates?

- (2) Who were the successful applicants?
- (3) Was Budget Rent-a-Car a successful applicant?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

MOTOR VEHICLES: HIRE

Private Owners

3527. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is any vehicle owner able to ply for hire with his vehicle?
- (2) Is a private vehicle owner able to provide transport for functions, weddings, etc?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Income Loss

3528. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) With regard to the agreement between the Government and the North-West Shelf participants relating to the natural gas sales and purchase contract, what is the estimate of income which will be foregone by the State Energy Commission because of the Government's agreeing not to initiate price reviews as provided for in the original contract?
- (2) What legal advice was obtained by the Government or the State Energy Commission regarding the liabilities of the various parties under the revised arrangements?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) and (2) The member for Narrogin should be aware that the price redetermination provisions of the contract are only initiated in the event of there being no agreement between the parties on appropriate contract and pricing amendments. Legal opinions were obtained by both sellers and the buyer and an agreed settlement was reached between the parties.

3529. *Postponed.*

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

Legislation: Federal

3530. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Have representatives of the State Government been recently undertaking discussions with representatives of the Federal Government on Aboriginal Land Rights legislation?
- (2) If so, who have been the State Government persons involved?
- (3) When did the discussions take place?
- (4) What was the substance of the discussions?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The honourable Premier and I, with various officers.
- (3) and (4) Discussions have been occurring since the Opposition-controlled upper House rejected the legislation prepared by mining, pastoral and Aboriginal groups. As the discussions are ongoing between the State and Federal Governments I do not propose to reveal details until they are finalised. The honourable member may rest assured that a public announcement will be made as soon as possible on this issue.

TRANSPORT: SCHOOL BUSES

Esperance

3531. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Did he receive a letter from the Minister for Transport and member for Esperance-Dundas, dated 11 April 1985, seeking a review of various decisions made by the school bus section of the Education Department applying to school buses in Esperance?
- (2) Does he intend to further review the Esperance complaints?
- (3) Have any further considerations been yet made regarding the need for more realistic arrangements in Esperance?
- (4) Has the matter yet been resolved regarding replacement buses, components, and general contract arrangements in Esperance?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) and (4) Bus inspectors will continue to assess the need for early bus replacement due to extreme driving conditions where appropriate.

TRANSPORT: SCHOOL BUSES

Contractual Arrangements

3532. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is it expected that new contractual arrangements regarding the operating of the school bus service in Western Australia will be finalised?
- (2) Have any contracts yet been signed with existing operators which contain the new financial arrangements?
- (3) Does the general 5 per cent reduction in base contract fee, also extend to reducing each cost component a further 5 per cent when applied?
- (4) What allowance is being made for recent fuel increases?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Contractual arrangements are being finalised as each school bus service is renewed.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No—Cost increases are reviewed and adjustments made to the standard rate each term. The 5 per cent is then applied to the new standard rate figures.
- (4) These are currently adjusted each school term and will possibly be adjusted half yearly from 1986.

3533. *Postponed.*

ENERGY: GAS

Woodada

3534. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What is the present situation regarding the future of the Woodada gas field?
- (2) What is the current estimated level of reserves within the gas field?

- (3) Are there any proposals being considered for continuing any level of production from the Woodada gas field?
- (4) Has the Government recently received any approaches from participants in the Woodada gas project regarding continuing an agreed level of production from the gas field.

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) and (3) In view of the projected surplus of gas in the short term, work is being undertaken to ensure the planned reduction in supply from the Woodada field is carried out in accordance with sound engineering practice.
- (2) Reserves cannot be accurately determined but are estimated to be 23-35 billion cubic feet (600-1000 million cubic metres).
- (4) The Woodada participants submitted a proposal to the State Energy Commission a few days ago. I have had frequent discussions with participants about ways of keeping this field (which the member for Narrogin when Minister promised to shut down) operating.

GAMBLING: CASINO

Design: Changes

3535. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Was the Government consulted on proposed changes to the casino design?
- (2) If so, when first was this proposed?
- (3) Did the Government approve the changes?
- (4) If so, when?
- (5) Has the casino agreement been complied with?
- (6) Will the changes represent or mean any reduction in the total investment in the casino development?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) After negotiations between Mr D. Dempster and the Perth City Council which enabled a relocation of the proposed exhibition centre.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Formally on 23 April, 1985, although the proposed design changes were known

to the Casino Control Committee before that date.

(5) Yes.

(6) No.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: AUTHORITY

Chairmanship

3536. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

Has the Government considered, or does it propose the appointment of Hon. Tom Stephens, M.L.C. as a member or the chairman of a port authority?

Mr GRILL replied:

I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TOURISM: BUNGLE BUNGLE

Management Committee

3537. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Has a management committee for Bungle Bungle reserve been established?
- (2) If not, what is the present situation?
- (3) If so, who is on it, and when did it first meet?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) No, however interim management measures are being co-ordinated by Kimberley representatives of the Departments of Conservation and Land Management, Regional Development and the North West, Youth, Sport and Recreation, and the Tourism Commission in liaison with the Department of Conservation and Environment.
- (2) The Environmental Protection Authority has endorsed the final recommendations of the Government Working Party and it is anticipated that Cabinet will consider these issues in the near future.
- (3) Not applicable.

FISHERIES: SWAN-CANNING ESTUARY

Licences

3538. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Following the article headed "Net Fishing Restrictions" on page 22 of *The West Australian*, dated 29 June 1985, does he intend to proceed with the issue

of the two lapsed Swan-Canning Estuary fishing licences first advertised by his department on 18 November 1982?

- (2) Does he intend to allow further transfer of, or partnerships in existing professional licences for the Swan-Canning Estuary as provided for in the Fisheries Act 1905-1975, section 17?
- (3) Is he aware that a number of fishermen holding current Swan-Canning professional fishing licences now do not appear to meet the licensing criteria of his department as stated in the Fisheries Act 1905-1975, section 17?
- (4) (a) Following his answer to question 2161 on Tuesday, 19 February 1985, does he now intend to initiate a review of the 17 existing Swan-Canning professional fishing licences;
- (b) if so, when does he envisage this review taking place?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The past policy of reducing the number of endorsed licences in the Swan-Canning Estuarine Fishery by not replacing those who retire will be continued.
- (3) Yes, those estuarine fishermen who are now operating at a lower level of activity than previously due to increasing age are still permitted to renew their licences each year.
- (4) No.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Upper Preston

3539. Mr OLD, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

What is the level of salinity in water being supplied in the Upper Preston Irrigation Scheme?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The salinity of the water supplied from Glen Mervyn Dam last irrigation season ranged from 409 to 514 milligrams per litre total soluble salts.

WATER RESOURCES: IRRIGATION

Upper Preston

3540. Mr OLD, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

What is the current cost of irrigated water at Donnybrook in the Upper Preston Irrigation Scheme and Harvey?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The estimated cost to the Water Authority in 1985-86 for the Preston Valley Irrigation Scheme is \$90 560 and for the Harvey Irrigation Scheme \$2 610 600.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

Katanning-Nyabing

3541. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) For what period during each of the last three years has the Katanning/Nyabing railway line been utilised?
- (2) What has been the average weekly number of trains to and from Nyabing in each of those years?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

DAIRYING: INDUSTRY

Hygiene Standards

3542. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he any information that the hygiene standards relating to the dairy industry in Victoria are as stringent as those required under Western Australian regulations?
- (2) What tests are carried out on imported dairy products from Eastern States, especially cream and milk?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) I am advised that there are only minor differences between the hygiene standards required in Victoria compared with the requirements in Western Australia.
- (2) A sample of dairy products sold in Western Australia, regardless of origin, is subjected to compositional and microbiological examination. Particular attention is paid to table creams which occupy a more significant proportion in the local market than is the case with other imported dairy products including milk.

Table creams are subjected to a wide range of micro-biological and compositional tests in the dairy laboratory.

FISHERIES: TUNA

Quota: Holdings

3543. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) How much Southern Bluefin quota is held by the Western Australian Government?
- (2) How much of the quota held was purchased?
- (3) What was the total cost of the purchases?
- (4) How much additional quota was obtained from the Commonwealth without payment?
- (5) How much money was set aside for assistance to the tuna industry?
- (6) How much was expended?
- (7) What is the total amount of tuna quota known, or believed to be held by Western Australian fishermen?
- (8) How much of that held quota is being fished locally and how much is leased to Eastern States fishermen?
- (9) (a) Will the quota given to the Government by the Commonwealth at no cost be sold to fishermen;
(b) if so, how will the price be determined?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) 383 tonnes.
- (2) 291 tonnes.
- (3) \$408 000.
- (4) 92 tonnes.
- (5) \$700 000 from CRF for purchase of quota and \$150 000 from the Fisheries Research and Development Fund to assist south coast fishermen develop alternative fisheries.
- (6) \$408 000 for the purchase of quota. Expenditure from the Fisheries Research and Development Fund will not be known until the on-going projects have been finalised.
- (7) and (8) Commonwealth records show that as at 23 May 1985 the WA-owned quota was 2 131 tonnes, and that of this amount 1 393 tonnes was held for capture off Western Australia.

- (9) The quota granted to the State by the Commonwealth is currently being leased to the fishermen at the same lease fee as that charged for the State-owned quota.

A final decision on the use in 1985-86 of all quota held by the State has not yet been taken.

WORKS: BUILDING MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Staff Party

3544. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware of a staff party held at the Building Management Authority on Friday, 28 June 1985?
- (2) If "Yes", what was the purpose of the party?
- (3) How many staff attended the party?
- (4) At what time did the party commence?
- (5) Who paid for the party?
- (6) Has the Building Management Authority received complaints from members of the public who claimed to have been inconvenienced in the transaction of their business with the authority due to staff attending the party during normal working hours?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) A function was held on Friday, 28 June to formally mark the last working day of the Public Works Department after a period of 156 years over which period that department was the major construction authority for the State of Western Australia.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) An estimated 450 staff members and retired staff members attended.
- (4) The function was nominally scheduled for 3.00 p.m. and arrivals continued all afternoon. The formal ceremony was set for 3.45 p.m.
- (5) A charge of \$4.00 per head was made on those attending and a contribution was made by the staff social club.
- (6) No. The Building Management Authority which came into existence on 15 October 1984 is a separate department and its staff members did not attend the function which was to mark the end of the Public Works Department.

AGED PERSONS

Podiatry Service

3545. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Health:

Did he or a representative from his office recently give an undertaking to members of the Dianella Autumn Centre that the current subsidy paid to assist in the provision of a podiatry service at Dianella would be reviewed to provide more adequate facilities?

Mr HODGE replied:

No formal undertaking has been made to the members of the Dianella Autumn Centre to review the subsidy paid. The Health Department's Senior Podiatrist has had discussions with this and other centres throughout Western Australia and a review of subsidies will commence shortly.

AGED PERSONS

Podiatry Services

3546. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he consider there is a need to provide a reliable and efficient podiatry service to senior citizens?
- (2) Does he support the provision of podiatry services being available in local authority autumn centres?
- (3) Is he aware that the current subsidy paid to local authorities to assist in the provision of podiatry services is considered by many local authorities to be inadequate?
- (4) What action does he propose to take to alleviate this problem?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The Health Department of Western Australia continually monitors and reviews the podiatry needs of the community. A review of subsidies paid is to commence shortly. Local authorities may make submissions as to the adequacy of the current subsidy. I have received no representations from the Local Government Association on this matter.
- (4) See answer to (3).

AMERICA'S CUP: PARK HOTEL

Purchase

3547. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Has the America's Cup Committee allocated any funds to the City of Fremantle to purchase the Park Hotel, Fremantle?
- (2) If "Yes", what was the amount allocated?
- (3) What was the total amount of the purchase?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$450 000 was provided for the purchase and renovation to enable its use as a boarding house for displaced single persons.
- (3) \$300 000.

AMERICA'S CUP

Fremantle City Council: By-Laws

3548. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Has the America's Cup Committee allocated funds to the City of Fremantle for the purpose of conducting a review to its by-laws?
- (2) If "Yes", how much was allocated by the America's Cup Committee?
- (3) What proportion of the total project cost does this funding represent?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$13 000.
- (3) 85 per cent.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES: ACCOMMODATION

New Police Building

3549. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) When does the Government intend commencing construction of the proposed police building adjacent to the existing Police Headquarters?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of the project?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) Provision has been made for the Stage II development of the existing Police Headquarters complex in the Police Department's Capital Works proposals for the forthcoming financial year. However, commencement is subject to funding from the 1985/86 General Loan Fund budget.
- (2) As the design brief is yet to be finalised it is not possible to estimate the cost of the project at this point of time.

HOUSING: STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Name Change

3550. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) For what reason did the State Housing Commission change its name to Homes West?
- (2) What is the estimated cost consequential upon the change of name?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The State Housing Commission has not officially changed its name, although consideration is being given to a proposal involving a name change.
- (2) Not applicable.

AMERICA'S CUP: FUNDING

Local Authorities

3551. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Which local authorities have made submissions to the America's Cup office for funding consideration?
- (2) How much was the total value of these submissions?
- (3) Which local authorities have received America's Cup funding to 30 June 1985 and what was the total value of this funding?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Armadale
Cockburn
Cottesloe
East Fremantle
Subiaco
South Perth
Stirling
South West Metropolitan Local Authorities Management Group
Wanneroo

Kwinana

Mandurah

Mosman Park

Nedlands

Rockingham

Swan

Inquiries were also received from several non-metropolitan authorities, such as Dandaragan, Beverley and Exmouth.

- (2) \$58.7 million.

- (3) East Fremantle

Fremantle

Rockingham

South West Metropolitan Local Authorities Management Group

\$8.8 million provisionally committed with \$3.5 million advanced.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mt. Lawley

3552. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Education:

What action has his department taken in respect of a letter dated 1 May 1985, sent to the Director General of Education by the Mt. Lawley Primary School Parents and Citizens Association in which the association sought urgent improvements to alleviate the unsatisfactory condition of the current school library?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The association was advised that the building could be improved by the provision of insulation, internal wall lining and fans. Such proposals fall into the Minor Works category and it has been suggested that the association ask the principal to submit a request through the local Regional Education Office.

ROAD: MITCHELL FREEWAY

Directional Signs

3553. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did he meet with representatives of the City of Stirling on Wednesday, 17 April 1985, to discuss the use of directional signs on the Mitchell Freeway and other important regional roads in the City?
- (2) Did he give an undertaking to reply to the City of Stirling submission without undue delay?
- (3) Had he replied to the City prior to 30 June 1985?

- (4) If "No" to (3), what administrative or technical problems is he encountering in formulating a reply?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TAXES AND CHARGES: FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

Revenue

3554. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) How much revenue has the Government collected from the Financial Institutions Duty since its inception?
- (2) What was the amount of financial institutions duty collected during—
 - (a) 1983-84; and
 - (b) 1984-85?
- (3) What were the monthly collections of the financial institutions duty during 1984-85?
- (4) How much does the Government anticipate collecting from the financial institutions duty for the period 1985-86?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) To 30 June 1985 the total was \$51.651m.
- (2) (a) \$16.537m.
(b) \$35.114m.
- (3) 1984

July	\$3.352m
August	\$3.334m
September	\$3.445m
October	\$3.178m
November	\$3.452m
December	\$3.493m

 1985

January	\$3.545m
February	\$2.249m
March	\$2.067m
April	\$2.246m
May	\$2.209m
June	\$2.543m

Note: The reduction in F.I.D. from 5c to 3c per \$100 took effect on 1 January, 1985, and is reflected in collections from February 1985.

- (4) The anticipated revenue will be announced as part of the 1985/86 budgetary process.

PLANNING: APPEAL

City of Stirling

3555. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has he received a letter dated 22 February 1985, from Mr A. A. Pibeam of 106 Hayes Avenue, Yokine, appealing against a decision of the City of Stirling in respect of a right-of-way in Hayes Avenue, Yokine?
- (2) If "Yes", what action has been taken on this matter?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) The Department of Local Government received a letter from Mr A. Pibeam.
- (2) Mr Pibeam was advised on 28 June that there was no right of appeal in respect of the matter raised. A copy of the reply was also forwarded to the honourable member.

TAXES AND CHARGES: STAMP DUTY

Land Transfers

3556. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What penalties are provided for in the Stamp Act for the late payment of stamp duty in respect of land transfers?
- (2) How are these penalties applied?
- (3) What avenues of appeal are available against the imposition of a penalty?
- (4) Does the Commissioner of Stamps or the Treasurer have any powers to reduce penalties imposed for late payment of stamp duty on land transfers?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing as soon as possible.

LAND: TITLES OFFICE

Letter Searches

3557. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) When were the fees for letter searches at the Land Titles office increased?
- (2) How much was the increase—
 - (a) in monetary terms;
 - (b) in percentage terms?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Office of Titles fees were last increased in November 1983.
- (2) The fee for a search of a Certificate of Title was increased from \$2 to \$2.50, an increase of 25%.

For searches by post there is a 40 cent postal charge imposed.

TRAFFIC: SAFETY

Improvement Programme

3558. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What are the criteria for the allocation of Main Roads Department, Traffic Safety Improvement Programme, funding?
- (2) What amount of funding did the department allocate to this programme for the period 1984-85?
- (3) Has the funding to any specific project exceeded \$100 000 during the period 1984-85?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), which projects?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

ROADS

Marmion Avenue-West Coast Highway Link

3559. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Planning:

When will he be in a position to present to the House the proposed Metropolitan Region Planning Authority amendment for the linking of West Coast Highway to Marmion Avenue?

Mr PEARCE replied:

I am advised that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is awaiting advice from Stirling City Council regarding traffic management control proposals for part of West Coast Highway before making a recommendation for my consideration.

Assuming this matter is agreed soon and I am satisfied on the Authority's recommendation the amendment should proceed, the amendment is likely to be tabled in both Houses this Spring Session.

TAXES AND CHARGES: STAMP DUTY

Property Transfer

3560. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What was the amount of stamp duty required to be paid on the transfer of a property valued at \$200 000—
 - (a) as at 30 June 1983;
 - (b) as at 30 November 1983?
- (2) What was the percentage increase in the amounts payable?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) (a) \$4 100.
- (b) \$5 150.
- (2) 25.6 per cent.

AMERICA'S CUP: FUNDING

Stirling City Council

3561. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Is the Minister aware that the City of Stirling may be unable to complete proposed America's Cup related works on the Scarborough Esplanade and foreshore because of a lack of funding support from the America's Cup office?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

No.

PLANNING

Stirling District Planning Scheme No. 2

3562. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Has the City of Stirling requested that he gazette Stirling District Planning Scheme No. 2?
- (2) If "Yes", can he advise when he is likely to gazette City of Stirling District Planning Scheme No. 2?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The new scheme will be finalised when it has been modified by Council to accord with my conditions for final approval.

AMERICA'S CUP: FUNDING

Commonwealth Government

3563. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) How much funding for the America's Cup has been committed to the State by the Commonwealth Government?
- (2) How much of these committed funds has been allocated to date?
- (3) What amount of America's Cup funding has been allocated to the following local authorities—

- (a) the City of Fremantle;
- (b) the City of Stirling?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) \$28 million.
- (2) \$21 million provisionally committed with \$5.7 million advanced.
- (3) (a) \$8.3 million provisionally committed with \$3.1 million advanced.
- (b) Nil.

WATER RESOURCES: CONSUMPTION

Excess

3564. Mr BATEMAN, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) In view of the continual complaints received from constituents regarding the extremely high cost of excess water, will he advise the allowable consumption in litres for the average household before assessment for excess water comes into being?
- (2) Is there any consideration taken into account for large families or other domestic users?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), what is the exact amount allowed and on what basis or ratio is it assessed?
- (4) If "No" to (2), why not?
- (5) Are new home owners allowed a certain amount of water to allow for building wastage plus the establishment of new gardens?
- (6) If not, why not.

Mr PEARCE replied:

In answering the member's question I have assumed he refers to the metropolitan area.

- (1) 150 000 litres.
- (2) No.

(3) Not Applicable.

(4) The system is based on pay-for-service/pay-for-use.

(5) No.

(6) See (4) above.

AGRICULTURE: FARMERS

Financial Position

3565. Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware of rumours that there is a deliberate attempt to disguise the true financial position of many farmers and their long term chances of survival?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) has he investigated these rumours to dispel them;
 - (b) if not, will he do so?
- (3) Has he obtained a report from industry leaders suggesting that no immediate action need be taken?
- (4) (a) Has he had a report from his department detailing the critical condition of farmers;
- (b) if not, will he obtain a report and publish it as soon as possible?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No.
- (4) (a) The Department of Agriculture has advised that a poor season is in prospect and could have very serious financial consequences for many farmers.
- (b) The Department and industry are co-operating to obtain a clearer estimate of the situation and will monitor the financial prospects as the season develops.

The Drought Consultative Committee is meeting on 4 July and a report is expected.

ABATTOIRS: SHEEP

Drought

3566. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In the event of the drought persisting forcing the sale of large numbers of

sheep, is there sufficient abattoir capacity to handle the turn off?

- (2) If "No", what plans has the Government to handle the problem?
- (3) Are there sufficient markets to absorb the increased mutton that would be available?
- (4) If "No" to (3), will the Government take the initiative in sponsoring a trade mission of interested processors to seek markets?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (4) Detailed information is being collated and assessed by the Meat Industry Authority.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Kimberley

3567. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government arranged for the purchase of—
 - (a) Emanuel Kimberley properties;
 - (b) Australian Land and Cattle Company properties; and
 - (c) on what date of settlement?
- (2) What role has the Western Australian Exim Corporation Pty Ltd had in the purchase and acquisition of the properties?
- (3) Further to (1), what are the terms and conditions regarding the purchase of the properties?
- (4) What stock was included on each of the properties owned by—
 - (a) Emanuel;
 - (b) Australian Land and Cattle Company; and
 - (c) what is the final date for a muster?
- (5) What Government agencies have arranged for the purchase and payment of the properties?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (5) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

3568. *Postponed.*

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Kimberley

3569. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) With the announcement that the Government is to purchase pastoral stations from—
 - (a) Emanuel;
 - (b) Australian Land and Cattle Company,
 who are the members of the consultative committee?
- (2) Further to (1), what is the particular qualification of each member?
- (3) Who is the chairman of the committee and what are his qualifications?
- (4) Are members appointed to the consultative committee by the Government or by the Western Australian Exim Corporation Pty Ltd?
- (5) (a) Has the Government indicated to the Western Australian Exim Corporation any policy guidelines regarding the reconstruction of the eight properties and the future of the Kimberley pastoral industry; and
 - (b) if so, would he detail?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) and (2) The consultative committee is comprised of:

Mr Ernie Bridge, M.L.A.
Member for Kimberley

Mr Joe De Pledge,
Pastoralist
Nominated by the Pastoralists and Graziers Assoc.

Mr Douglas Dixon
Pastoralist
Nominated by the Pastoralists and Graziers Assoc.

Mr Keith C. Gale
Consultant to WA Livestock Holdings Ltd

Mr Bruce Gray
Pastoralist
Nominated by the Primary Industry Assoc.

Mr Stephen Hawke
Representative of Marra Warra Warra Aboriginal Community

Mr J. R. Henwood

Pastoralist
Nominated by the Pastoralists and Graziers Assoc.

Mr R. McCorry

Pastoralist

Nominated by the Aboriginal Development Commission

Mr Mervin Norton

Pastoralist

Nominated by the Primary Industry Assoc.

Mr Jeremy O'Driscoll

President

Shire of Derby-West Kimberley

- (3) Mr Keith Gale. Broad commercial experience and a familiarity with rural industry in Australia.
- (4) Members were invited to participate in the Consultative Committee by the Western Australian Exim Corporation.
- (5) (a) No. The Government is in discussion with Exim as to principles to be adopted. The final outcome will be subject to the approval of all relevant agencies including the Pastoral Board.
- (b) Not applicable.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr Stephen Hawke

3570. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) Why has the Government appointed Mr Stephen Hawke to the consultative committee investigating restructuring Kimberley pastoral properties and their disposal?
- (2) What special qualification does Mr Stephen Hawke possess that causes the Government to appoint him to this important and highly influential position?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

TOURISM: CAMPING

Illegal: Barrel Wells

3571. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Is he aware—
 - (a) of illegal camping on Crown Land known as "Barrel Well" adjoining

Victoria location 4660 at Ajana; and

- (b) this is being done in defiance of a sign indicating camping is prohibited?

- (2) Is he aware of the problems being created for surrounding landholders?
- (3) Is it a fact that an Aboriginal land claim has been made?
- (4) If so, on what grounds has the claim been made?
- (5) Why has not action been taken to remove the illegal campers?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) Yes.
- (2) I am aware of alleged conflict with an adjoining landholder.
- (3) The Aboriginal Boomerang Council, through the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority, made application for use of "Barrel Well" Reserve 1475 in October 1983.
- (4) The Aboriginal Boomerang Council has requested use of Reserve 1475 for the development of a rural training centre.
- (5) Action on the removal, or otherwise, of the Aboriginal campers awaits the outcome of consultation currently *en train* with the Shire of Northampton. The latest advice indicates that Council intends to inspect Reserve 1475 before considering the matter further.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

Claim: Barrel Well

3572. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) In each year since 1980, how many inquiries have been received, and from whom, seeking to acquire Reserve 1475 known as "Barrel Well" and what has been the response to date?
- (2) On what date did the Aboriginal Boomerang Council (Inc) make application for all or part of the reserve?
- (3) What has been the response of the Northampton Shire Council?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) The Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority, on behalf of the Aboriginal Boomerang Council, initiated inquiries about "Barrel Well" Reserve 1475 in October

1983 and the Shire of Northampton first approached the Lands Department on the same matter in April, 1984. There have been no other recorded inquiries about the acquisition of Reserve 1475 in the years 1980 to 1985.

- (2) The Aboriginal Boomerang Council, through the A.A.P.A., made application for Reserve 1475 on 21 October, 1983.
- (3) The latest advice indicates the Shire of Northampton is undecided and council intends to inspect Reserve 1475 before considering the matter further.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Squatters: Ajana Area

3573. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) When was he made aware of the concern of the Primary Industry Association complaining about Aborigines illegally squatting on reserve 1475 in the Ajana area and what was his response?
- (2) As the Primary Industry Association has expressed concern over sheep affected with lice being brought to the reserve and reports of open fires burning on days of extreme temperature, what reports has he received from the—
 - (a) Bush Fires Board;
 - (b) Lands and Surveys Department, regarding the illegal usage of this reserve?
- (3) Why has he not ordered the eviction of the squatters?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) The Primary Industry Association of Western Australia wrote to me on March 14 and May 16, 1985, concerning the Aboriginal campers on Reserve 1475. The Association was advised of competing interests for Reserve 1475 and that a decision would be made on the future use and control of the land following proper consultation with relevant authorities.
- (2) (a) Although I was aware of an allegation regarding open fires, the matter did not call for a special report from the Bush Fires Board and none was provided.
- (b) The Lands and Surveys Department has reported to me on the general

background on the use and control of Reserve 1475, resulting in inquiries being made as per (1) above.

- (3) Action on the removal, or otherwise, of the Aboriginal campers awaits the outcome of consultation currently en train with the Shire of Northampton. The latest advice indicates that council intends to inspect Reserve 1475 before considering the matter further.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

Claim: Barrel Well

3574. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) When was he aware that the Aboriginal Boomerang Council (Inc) was interested in acquiring Reserve 1475 known as "Barrel Well"?
- (2) What are the reasons for the council's claim?
- (3) Has he directed the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority to investigate the legitimacy of the Aboriginal land claim, when was that direction made, and with what result?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) I can recall representations from the Aboriginal Boomerang Council since 1983 about its interests in acquiring Reserve 1475 known as Barrel Well.
- (2) I understand that members of the Aboriginal Boomerang Council have historically used that area of land for camping and hunting purposes. It now wishes to use that land for those purposes.
- (3) No, however, I have asked the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority to liaise with the Department of Lands and Surveys which is also considering approaches from the Aboriginal Boomerang Council and the Northampton Shire.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: PLANNING AUTHORITY

Members

3575. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Who are the members of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority?
- (2) When were they appointed and what are their terms of office?

- (3) What are the particular qualifications or interests of each member?
- (4) Are any fees and allowances paid and what has been the monthly amount since 1 July 1984?
- (5) How many times has the authority met since 1 July 1984?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) to (5) The Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority is a body corporate established under the terms of Section 8 of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act 1972-1984.

The Authority does not have any members, but is staffed by officers and temporary employees appointed under and subject to the Public Service Act 1904.

3576 to 3578. *Postponed.*

FIRES: BUSHFIRES

Select Committee Report

3579. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Has the Government considered the report of the Select Committee into Bush Fires in Western Australia and with what result?
- (2) Does the Government intend to adopt any recommendations and, if so, would he detail?
- (3) What recommendations are not accepted by the Government and would he provide reasons?
- (4) Does the Government accept recommendation 6.1.7 and, if not, why not?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) to (4) The Government has received considerable input from interested organisations since the publication of the Select Committee Report. No specific decisions have been made on the numerous recommendations and related submissions. A related factor is the recent report of the Committee of Review of Emergency Services which was recently completed and is being examined.

ENVIRONMENT

Leschenault Peninsula

3580. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) Following reports that the Government has been called on to turn Leschenault Peninsula, at Bunbury, into a tourist mecca, how far have these proposals proceeded?
- (2) Is the land in question under Government ownership and how much land is involved?
- (3) What Government agencies have, or will be, involved in discussions?
- (4) Have any projections been made at the cost of creating a tourist mecca and, if so, to what extent?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

FORESTS

Bunbury Sawmills

3581. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) How many people are employed at Bunbury Sawmills, Picton (SMP 1248)?
- (2) For how many years has the mill been operating?
- (3) What has been the amount of royalties paid by the mill in each year since 1970?
- (4) Does the Government intend to ensure that further supplies of Crown timber are to be available to the mill?
- (5) If not, what other steps can the proprietor take to avert closure?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Seven employees.
- (2) Eighteen years.

(3) Year	Royalties (\$)
1970	9 740.17
1971	7 719.13
1972	7 428.83
1973	8 336.64
1974	9 557.48
1975	11 979.08
1976	14 152.49
1977	16 027.12
1978	15 870.42
1979	22 910.60
1980	28 919.33
1981	31 951.09

Year	Royalties (\$)
1982	29 337.96
1983	45 906.73
1984	40 628.08
1985	43 576.55

- (4) Sawmilling Permit 1248 expires on 31 October 1985 as timber resources are exhausted. Any supplies of Crown land timber beyond that date could be obtained only from licensed salvage log operators.
- (5) Purchase timber from private property sources.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

Claims: Kimberley

3582. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Can he advise whether any Aboriginal group has indicated any interest in—
- Emanuel;
 - Australian Land and Cattle Company
- pastoral leases, and if so, to which stations and by what Aboriginal group?

- (2) Further to (1), has any Aboriginal group indicated any interest in the restructured properties, and if so, would he give details?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. Various groups in the Fitzroy Valley have indicated an interest in some of the land within the Emanuel and ALCCO Leases. Consistent with the policies adopted by the previous government, the Government is considering means by which Aboriginal groups may be granted excisions and may purchase pastoral leases in the area.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: SOUTH WEST DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Staff

3583. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) When did the—
- director; or
 - South West Development Authority,
- request additional staff at their—
- Bunbury;
 - Mandurah office?

- (2) Did the request include a publicity/liaison officer?
- (3) What were the reasons why the Government did not appoint a qualified south west resident in each instance?
- (4) (a) Were the positions advertised;
(b) would he provide details;
(c) if not, why not?
- (5) What—
- salaries; and
 - allowances,
- are paid in each instance?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (5) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

3584. *Postponed.*

LAND RESOURCE POLICY COUNCIL

Membership

3585. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Has the Government appointed members of the Land Resource Policy Council and, if so, would he provide details including qualifications of members and terms of appointment?
- (2) On how many occasions has the council met?
- (3) What sitting fees, allowances etc., are available to members?
- (4) Who is the chairman at meetings of the council?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes, the Government has appointed members of the Land Resource Policy Council. The appointed members are:
- The Permanent Heads of the following Departments—
- Department of Agriculture
 - Water Authority of Western Australia
 - Department for Sport and Recreation
 - Department of Mines
 - Department of Conservation and Environment
 - Department of Resources Development
 - Department of Lands and Surveys
 - Town Planning Department
 - Department of Conservation and Land Management
 - Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Plus seven private members—

Representing Local Government

—Mr J. H. Towie, Dip. Eng. Surv.,
L.S., M.I.S. Currently Shire President,
Shire of Manjimup.

Representing agricultural and pastoral interests

—Mr J. D. S. O'Connell, farmer.

Member of Primary Industry Association of Western Australia.

Representing Aboriginal interests

—Mr K. Colbung, M.B.E., J.P.

Community Leader—Nyoongah Community;

President, Institute of Aboriginal Studies;

Chairman, State Aboriginal Advisory Council;

Chairman, Aboriginal Board of Management;

Fellow of the Museum.

Representing sport and recreational interests

—Mr A. W. Robinson, MSc (Loughbrough),

Grad Dip. Admin.

Dip. Ed. Admin.

Member of Institute of Recreation.

Retired Deputy Director of the Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation.

Representing land management research and educational interests

—Professor A. D. Robson B.Sc. (Agric.)

Ph.D (U.W.A.) Professor of Agriculture (Soil Science), University of W.A.

Member of Australian Society of Soil Science;

Vice-President of W.A. Branch of Australian Institute of Agricultural Science;

Member of W.A. State Wheat Research Committee.

Representing resource-using industries

—Mr A. Tough, B.E. (Hons) M.B.A., F.A.I.M.

Member of Executive Council of Chamber of Mines; Council member of the Australian Mines and Metals Association, Member of Heavy Mineral Sands Committee

and Interim Mines Radiation Committee (Health Department).

Representing conservation interests

—Dr A. Tingay, B.A. (Hons), Ph.D. (U.W.A.) in wildlife studies Vice President of the Australian Conservation Foundation.

The terms of appointment of all members are indefinite.

(2) The Council has met twice, on 15 April 1985 and 10 June 1985.

(3) The Public Service Board is expected to approve sitting fees of \$86 per full day and \$58 per half day plus public service travelling allowances for travel outside the metropolitan area for private members. Sitting fees are not payable to Government members, however they are eligible for appropriate public service travelling allowances for Council business.

(4) The Chairman of the Council is Dr M. J. Mulcahy, B.Sc. (For.), Ph.D, F.A.I.A.S. Mr N. J. Halse, Director of the Department of Agriculture, has been nominated the Acting Chairman when Dr Mulcahy is absent.

ENVIRONMENT

Road Works

3586. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

(1) Have officers of the Department of Conservation and Land Management inspected roadworks carried out on the Vasse Highway by the Manjimup Shire Council and with what result?

(2) (a) Does the Government intend that shires and the Main Roads Department should submit road clearing plans to the Department of Conservation and Land Management before works are approved in the future; and

(b) if so, would he provide policy detail?

Mr DAVIES replied:

(1) Yes. It was noted that trees have been felled within the road survey as part of a project to improve traffic safety.

(2) (a) The subject of road clearing plans by Shires and the Main Roads Department will be investigated by the Land Resource Policy Council.

(b) Not applicable.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Nine-day Fortnight

3587. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) Would he detail those Government departments and agencies that work a nine-day fortnight?
- (2) What has been the cost of this employment benefit?
- (3) Does the Government employ extra personnel to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, e.g. State Energy Commission etc.?
- (4) Has there been any effect to—
 - (a) services provided and expected;
 - (b) increased costs; and
 - (c) if so, to what extent?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

WATER RESOURCES

Gracetown

3588. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What progress has been made on establishing a water supply for Gracetown?
- (2) From where will the supply be drawn?
- (3) Has there been any regard for environmental safeguards, and would he detail?
- (4) What is the projected cost of the scheme?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) It is anticipated that the necessary environmental clearance will be obtained by the end of the year. Subject to the availability of funds, construction of the scheme could then commence early next year.
- (2) It is proposed to draw the supply from Ellen Brook, a perennial stream 4.5 kilometres south of the town.
- (3) Considerable regard for environmental safeguards is being taken and the following matters are being considered:
habitats of rare snails,

locations and types of access and pipeline tracks through the National Park.

provision of underground power to pump station.

minimal disturbance to native flora.

minimal disturbance to surrounds at the Ellen Brook homestead.

impact of the scheme on aboriginal sites in the area.

- (4) The scheme is estimated to cost \$710 000 based on construction of the headworks on the existing pipehead dam and above ground power supply. If a new site is required and below ground power is stipulated, the cost will increase substantially.

HEALTH: HOSPITAL

Margaret River

3589. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Health:

Will he advise what funds will be available in 1985-86 to commence building a new hospital at Margaret River?

Mr HODGE replied:

The Health Department will include a provision for a new hospital at Margaret River in its Capital Works Programme bid to the Treasury Department.

This will be considered along with the other projects considered worthy of competing for the State's limited funds available for capital works.

HOUSING: STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Hamilton Hill

3590. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the State Housing Commission purchased or built a property at Lot 739 Ely Street, Hamilton Hill?
- (2) What was the cost of either purchasing or constructing this house?
- (3) For what purpose has the commission purchased or built this property?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The Commission is currently constructing a house on Lot 739 Ely Court through the Public Tender system.

- (2) The tender price was \$35 696 but final construction cost will be varied by Cost Adjustment.
- (3) The property is four bedroom accommodation and will be used for rental purposes.

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY

Funds: Letter

3591. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Who paid for the letters distributed under his name, some of which were dated June 21 seeking funds for the Australian Labor Party?
- (2) Who paid for the postage of those letters?
- (3) Who paid for the preparation of the letterhead?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) All costs associated with the letters referred to will be paid from Australian Labor Party funds.

3592. *Postponed.*

MINERAL: GOLD

Tax: Government Opposition

3593. Mr MENSAROS, to the Premier:

In which way did he impress upon the Commonwealth Government his (and presumably his Government's) opposition to a gold tax as announced on the front page of the 10 June *West Australian Government Notes*?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

My opposition to the proposed extension of income tax to gold production has been made clear in several public statements.

In addition, the Government's views on a gold tax have been explained in some detail by the Minister for Transport in his address to the Tax Summit on 2 July 1985.

3594. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Profits and Losses

3595. Mr MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

In view of his statement that only the profits earned by some Government businesses, such as the W.A. Development Corporation and EXIM, enabled the State instrumentalities to keep down the increases in their charges, will he please state what amount of such profits has been or will be transferred by which Government businesses to which Government instrumentalities/utilities to cover the loss situation they are going to incur on account of the deliberately kept down increases in charges?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I did not make the statement to which the member refers. For the member's information, I have for tabling a copy of my statement to the media on losses and charges. The figures and graphs contained within the statement show that the total increases in most State Government charges during the present Government's term have been below the inflation rate for the period. They also show that during the last three years of the previous Liberal-National Country Party Government nearly all charges rose by significantly more than the inflation rate for the period, some of them by more than three times the inflation rate.

(See paper No. 633.)

STRATA TITLES

Plans: Registration

3596. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) In view of the considerable hardship and financial loss affecting many strata titled property owners, will he extend the date for registering strata plans approved by local authorities prior to 30 June, 1983?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) and (2) The requirements for strata plans under the old Act and the new Act differ considerably and it is considered advisable to deal with outstanding old plans as soon as possible. If the present provisions as they stand are a real cause

of difficulty I will examine the possibility of easing the restriction concerning the local authority certificate.

STRATA TITLES

Unit Entitlements: Embargo

3597. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) In view of the many inequities which could be caused by the provision of the Strata Titles Act setting entitlements on valuation basis, will he introduce a five year embargo on the alterations of unit entitlements?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The Law Reform Commission carefully considered the question of unit entitlement in its report on the Strata Titles Act and specifically recommended provisions along the lines of those contained in the Act in order to remedy possible inequities.

WATER AUTHORITY

Financial Results

3598. Mr MENSAROS, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What is the expected result for 1985-86 by the Water Authority of Western Australia separately shown for—
 - (a) the metropolitan; and
 - (b) the country operations
 as far as revenue and expenditure goes?
- (2) What surplus/loss was expected by the Metropolitan Water Authority resulting from the 1984-85 financial year?
- (3) What is the aggregate surplus/loss of the Metropolitan Water Authority as at 30 June, 1985?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) (a) Metropolitan—approx. \$3.1 million deficit, to be financed from reserves.
- (b) Country utility operations—will require a CRF Grant in excess of \$52 million.
- (2) Current estimate is deficit of approximately \$0.4 million but figures

are still subject to final adjustments including accounting for accruals and commitments.

- (3) Subject to (2) above and after allowing for appropriations by the Board to Reserves, it is expected that the Appropriation Account will show a credit balance of roundly \$3 million.

WATER RESOURCES

Steering Committee: Report

3599. Mr MESAROS, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Which of the recommendations by the steering committee in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of Resources and Energy published in the book "Water 2000, Perspective of Australia's Water Resources for the Year 2000" does the Government accept?
- (2) Can he indicate when these accepted recommendations will be implemented?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Water 2000 report was commissioned by the Commonwealth Government to enable it to formulate its water resource policies and programmes.

This has been done and full details of that Government's approach to water resource issues were included in a statement by the Honourable Senator Peter Walsh, then Minister for Resources and Energy, in the Senate on 12 September 1984. A pamphlet incorporating this statement is available from the Australian Government Publishing Service.

The Honourable Arthur Tonkin, Minister for Water Resources, is conversant with the recommendations of the Water 2000 report, having participated in discussions during meetings of the Australian Water Resources Council when they were considered in some detail.

The recommendations are of general Australia-wide application and have not been formally considered by the Western Australian Government.

ELECTORAL: LETTERS

Ministerial Letterhead

3600. Mr MENSAROS, to the Acting Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) How many "Dear Voter" letters have been sent out on his Ministerial letterhead and signed by him as Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform so far?
- (2) Which were the areas/districts in the State to which the letters have been sent?
- (3) What was the basis for preparing the mailing list for those letters to be addressed?
- (4) Who provided for the—
 - (a) stationery;
 - (b) work preparing and printing of the letters;
 - (c) work preparing and typing the addresses;
 - (d) postage for delivery?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Approximately 2 000.
- (2) All areas.
- (3) People who have signed petitions to Parliament requesting electoral reform, academics in the field of politics, people who have requested further information about electoral reform, some trade union, religious and community leaders.
- (4) Through the "Dear Voter" letter the Government has given considerable publicity to an electoral scheme being seriously considered by the Liberal Party. Instead of complaining about the Government giving the scheme extra publicity the Opposition should be pleased unless of course the accuracy of the letter has caused them embarrassment. The electoral system in Queensland is both a national disgrace and a joke and it is therefore not surprising that the member's question pursues the distribution of a letter rather than ask the view of the Government on such a calculatedly self-interest scheme.

Promoting wider awareness and understanding of the electoral system and of the consequences of any proposed changes to it is a legitimate function of the Office of the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform.

3601. *Postponed.*

STATE FINANCE: SHORT-TERM MONEY MARKET

Western Australian Development Corporation: Earning Capacity

3602. Mr MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

What is the demonstrable improvement in interest earning of Government cash funds invested on the short term money market (expressed in an objective way of comparison) since the Western Australia Development Corporation took over from the Treasury handling these investments?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

It is not valid to compare the earning rate obtained on short term investments between one period and another to illustrate improvement or otherwise. It can merely demonstrate the difference in market rates between two periods.

SEWERAGE: COUNTRY

Consultant

3603. Mr MENSAROS, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Was it factually reported that he has received written support by the Minister for Local Government for the Country Shire Councils Association's proposal that an independent consultant be appointed to establish the relative efficiencies of country town sewerage schemes owned and operated by municipalities and those under the control of what is now the Water Authority of Western Australia?
- (2) If so, has he accepted the proposal?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2)—
 - (a) in which way is he going to select the consultant to do the inquiry;
 - (b) what will be the terms of reference;
 - (c) what date will be specified to conclude the inquiry and furnish the report?
- (4) If "No" to (2), would he give his reasons for rejecting such inquiry?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The principal reason is that the Government, before receiving this request from the Country Shire Councils Association, had decided that the relative merits of local authority and Country Towns Sewerage Act sewerage schemes would be reviewed by the Board of the Water Authority of Western Australia.

This review is to determine whether additional new local authority sewerage schemes will be subsidised and at present is not an urgent issue, as there is no proposal for such a scheme before the Government.

Also, the review already initiated involves many issues in addition to that of operating efficiency proposed by the Country Shire Councils Association. Amongst these are:

the desirability of uniform State-wide charges and policies for sewerage services;

the need for uniform control of plumbing throughout the State;

whether appropriate provision for cyclical maintenance and asset replacement should be arranged by local authorities for their sewerage schemes;

whether different subsidy arrangements are desirable, bearing in mind the changes which have taken place in the terms and interest rates of loans since the subsidy arrangements were first introduced.

Although I feel these matters can be adequately addressed by the Board of the Water Authority, I will refer this question concerning consultants to the Minister, on his return from leave, for his further consideration.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT

Floreat Park

3604. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Has the Police Department received a query by the Perth City Council regarding the permissible details of an accident which occurred on 2 December 1984 in front of 52 Alderbury Street, Floreat Park?

- (2) If so, has the department responded to this query, and if it has, would he table or let me have a copy of such response?

- (3) If no response has been sent as yet, would he please speed it up and send me a copy?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A response was sent on 30 April 1985. A copy is attached for the information of the member.
- (3) Answered by (2).

WORKS: BUILDING MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Bricks: Policy

3605. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

Would he please table or let me have the latest policy—

- (a) by the Building Management Authority; and

- (b) by Government instrumentalities who do building and construction in country areas,

regarding the compulsory specification and usage of bricks manufactured in the country for country construction jobs?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (a) and (b) There is no "compulsory specification and usage of bricks manufactured in the country for country construction jobs".

However, wherever possible, the Building Management Authority utilises local bricks subject to them being available in sufficient quantities, of adequate structural strength and of suitable colour and texture, particularly when existing brickwork must be matched.

Relevant Standard Master Specification preliminary clauses, which support the interests of country manufacturers, stipulate that:

"Materials or goods manufactured and services available in the general locality of the works shall be used in the execution of or incorporated in the works wherever such materials or goods and services are available and conform to the requirements of the specification and the cost thereof to the contractor or any of

his subcontractors does not exceed by ten per centum the cost of the equivalent materials or goods and services available from within a 100 kilometre radius of the GPO Perth excluding areas within an 8 kilometre radius of the official post office in the towns of Mandurah, Northam, Pinjarra, Toodyay or York."

"Where a trade name, brand or catalogue number is referred to in the contract documents, the contractor may substitute equivalent material or equipment provided that in the opinion of the superintendent the characteristics of type, quality, finish, appearance, method of construction and performance are not less than that specified, and are approved by the superintendent."

The Building Management Authority Materials Library retains, for reference purposes, information and samples from country brick manufacturers.

3606 and 3607. *Postponed.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: RATES

Woodlands Village

3608. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has he received a letter from the Honorary Secretary, Woodlands Village, Parkland Villas, regarding local government rates of the residents-owned units?
- (2) If so, has he replied to this request and would he please let me have a copy of his reply?
- (3) If he has not yet responded, when can a reply be expected and would he let me have a copy of his reply?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. A copy of the correspondence has been sent to the member.
- (3) Not applicable.

SEWERAGE: RATES

Woodlands Village

3609. Mr MENSAROS, to the Acting Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has he received a letter from the Honorary Secretary, Woodlands Village, Parkland Villas, regarding water sewerage and drainage rates of the residents-owned units?
- (2) If so, has he replied to this request and would he please let me have a copy of his reply?
- (3) If he has not yet responded, when can a reply be expected and would he let me have a copy of his reply?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (3) The answer to this question will be provided to the member in a letter.

LAND: NATIONAL PARKS

Marine Park: Ningaloo Reef

3610. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) When is legislation expected to be introduced to establish the Ningaloo Reef Marine Park?
- (2) Will he discuss the proposed legislation with the Shires of Exmouth and Carnarvon before it is introduced?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) When negotiations with local Shires, other relevant community groups and the Commonwealth are completed.
- (2) Yes.

LAND: NATIONAL PARKS

Marine Park: Ningaloo Reef

3611. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Has an advisory committee been established to advise on the Ningaloo Reef Marine Park?
- (2) If "Yes", when was the committee set up?
- (3) Who are the members of the committee?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) An advisory committee is in the process of being established.
- (2) Answered by (1).

- (3) I will announce the members of the committee when negotiations with Shires and local people are completed.

LAND: NATIONAL PARKS

Marine Park: Ningaloo Reef

3612. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

As a result of considerable concern expressed at a public meeting in Exmouth in 1984 relating to the proposed Ningaloo Reef Marine Park, will he be prepared to negotiate further on the two most contentious points regarding—

- (a) the northern boundary of the proposed marine park; and
- (b) the size and location of the proposed sanctuary area?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.

EDUCATION

Student Travel Subsidy Scheme

3613. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Education:

Does the Government intend to increase the Student Travel Subsidy Scheme to allow remote area students to travel to and from school four times a year when the four-term school year commences in 1986?

Mr PEARCE replied:

This matter is being considered by the Semester School Year Implementation Committee which should be making a recommendation on this particular item to me within the next month.

ENERGY: GAS

Pipeline: Spur

3614. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What progress has been made with the project to provide Carnarvon with a spur-line from the Dampier-Perth natural gas pipeline?
- (2) When is the project due to be completed?

- (3) What is the estimated cost to carry out this work?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The route for the Carnarvon lateral pipeline has been selected and design work was commenced recently. Procurement of materials will proceed during the forthcoming 12 months and construction work is planned to commence in July 1986.
- (2) The project is planned to be completed by December 1986.
- (3) The estimated cost of the project is \$9 million not including interest charges during construction.

ABATTOIRS: LAMB MARKETING BOARD

Boundaries

3615. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it a fact that the WA Lamb Marketing Board intends to control lambs in that area of the State, north of the 26th parallel, for the first time since the board commenced operations?
- (2) Is he aware that this action could jeopardise a \$600 000 project to upgrade the Gascoyne Abattoir at Carnarvon?
- (3) Will he make satisfactory arrangements to ensure that lambs slaughtered and sold in the north of the State are not subject to acquisition by the W.A. Lamb Marketing Board or to controls under the Meat Industry Authority Act?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) The acquisition powers of the Lamb Marketing Board will not be extended.

The Meat Industry Authority has been instructed to develop a special brand for lamb slaughtered north of the 26th parallel.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Commissioner: Mr Basil Atkinson

3616. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Is Mr Basil Atkinson still being remunerated as a Commissioner and as a consultant to the W.A. Tourism Commission?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

No.

WORKS: BUILDING MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Mr Shaun Fagin

3617. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Works:

(1) Is Mr Shaun Fagin still employed by either the Building Management Authority or Water Authority of Western Australia?

(2) If "Yes", when did he last report for work?

Mr McIVER replied:

(1) and (2) No.

BUSINESS: SMALL BUSINESSES

Country: Assistance

3618. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Health:

When can I expect a reply to my letter to him dated 7 May requesting assistance for small businesses in country areas to comply with new requirements under the Noise Abatement Act?

Mr HODGE replied:

A reply was forwarded to the member on 28 June 1985.

MINERAL: URANIUM

New Mines

3619. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

(1) Have any new uranium mines been approved in Western Australia in the past year?

(2) (a) Have any uranium pilot plants been approved in the past year; and

(b) if so, what processes do they use?

Mr PARKER replied:

(1) No.

(2) No pilot plants have been approved, however Total Mining is undertaking experimental solution extraction studies using weak solutes on the Manyingee uranium deposit near Onslow, under the terms of their Exploration Licence. Five network bores and 10 monitoring bores are being used.

MINERAL: URANIUM

Operating Mines

3620. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

(1) (a) Are there any uranium mines operating in Western Australia; and

(b) if so, under what conditions and controls are they operating?

(2) What uranium has been exported in 1985?

Mr PARKER replied:

(1) No.

(2) None.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: INTEREST RATES

Government Expenditure

3621. Mr COURT, to the Treasurer:

(1) Has the record levels of Government expenditure by State and Federal Governments caused interest rates to rise rapidly this year?

(2) (a) Has the State Government expressed its concern to the Federal Government about interest rates; and

(b) if so, what was their response?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) and (2) The member will be advised in writing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: INTEREST RATES

Legislation

3622. Mr COURT, to the Treasurer:

What level must housing interest rates reach before the Government will introduce legislation to control housing interest rates charged by building societies?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Government currently has no plans to introduce legislation to control housing interest rates. The member will be aware however that recently I expressed my concern at building societies seeking interest rate increases. I indicated that the Government will continue to monitor the movement of interest rates and to liaise with the societies to ensure that the

effect of the increases on home buyers is kept to a minimum.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: SOUTH WEST DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Aluminium Smelter

3623. Mr COURT, to the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) Has the South West Development Authority examined what effects the decision to not proceed with the south west aluminium smelter will have on business in the Bunbury area?

- (2) If "Yes", what are their findings?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: FREMANTLE

America's Cup: Closure

3624. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will the Fremantle harbour be closed for private and commercial vessels while shipping movements take place during the America's Cup?

- (2) If "Yes"—

- (a) what times will this be during the busy Cup period;
- (b) will this affect normal Rottnest ferry schedules;
- (c) will special provisions be made for private spectator craft;
- (d) will special provisions be made for charter vessels?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

TRAFFIC: FREMANTLE

America's Cup

3625. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will private cars be allowed into the Fremantle business district during the America's Cup?

- (2) If "No"—

- (a) When will these restrictions take effect;

- (b) Will small businesses be allowed ready access with service vehicles?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

AMERICA'S CUP

Pleasure Yachts

3626. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What facilities are being provided for visiting large pleasure yachts during the America's Cup?

- (2) (a) Will special buoys be provided for mooring purposes;

- (b) if "Yes", where?

- (3) What facilities will be provided for large pleasure and charter craft to refuel in the Fremantle area?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: MARINAS

Fremantle: Congestion

3627. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Government aware of the safety problems which have arisen with congestion at the common entrance of the three Fremantle marinas?

- (2) If "Yes", what action will be taken to rectify this problem?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

AMERICA'S CUP: CHARTER BOATS

Preference

3628. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Transport:

Will special preference be given to Western Australian charter boat operators before, during, and after the America's Cup to ensure that they have adequate facilities from which to operate?

Mr GRILL replied:

I will advise the member of the answer in writing in due course.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: GRAVING DOCK

Construction

3629. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (a) Has the Government attempted to attract private investors to construct and operate a graving dock facility in Western Australia capable of handling large commercial and defence vessels;
- (b) if "Yes", have these approaches been successful?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (a) and (b) No, but the Government is aware of docking needs for larger vessels and is considering suitable options in line with the findings of the recent Study of the Western Australian Ship Building, Ship Repair and Ship Service Industry.

**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING:
UNEMPLOYMENT**

Statistics

3630. Mr COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) How many people were unemployed in Western Australia in—
 - (a) December 1982;
 - (b) March 1983;
 - (c) September 1983;
 - (d) December 1983;
 - (e) March 1984;
 - (f) September 1984;
 - (g) December 1984;
 - (h) March 1985?

- (2) What were these figures as a percentage of the total Western Australian workforce?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) These figures are available from the publications from the Australian Bureau of Statistics to which I refer the member.

**BUSINESS: SMALL BUSINESS
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

Federal Taxation

3631. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Small Business:

Has the Small Business Development Corporation carried out any research to see what effect—

- (a) a consumption tax will have on the Cost Price Index and thus rentals tied to Cost Price Index;
- (b) the proposed capital gains tax will have on small business new investment;
- (c) the proposed consumption tax, capital gains and tax on fringe benefits will have on the restaurant industry?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (a) to (c) The Small Business Development Corporation has not sought to duplicate existing research on these matters.

The Premier has involved small business representation in his delegation to the Tax Summit, and is conscious of small business opinion in this State on taxation issues.

**STATE FINANCE: SHORT-TERM MONEY
MARKET**

*Western Australian Development Corporation:
Interest Rate*

3632. Mr COURT, to the Treasurer:

What was the market rate of interest paid by the Western Australian Development Corporation to the Treasury during the month of June for its short term investment funds?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The range of interest rates paid by the Western Australian Development Corporation to Treasury during the month of June varied depending on the day the funds were placed and the term for which they were invested. Any particular rate is therefore not relevant. However, the weighted average yield on all deposits for the month was 18.10 per cent.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: BANK

IBJ (Australia) Bank Ltd.

3633. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) How much profit did the Western Australian Development Corporation make for orchestrating the new banking licence for IBJ Australia Ltd?
- (2) When will that profit be realised?
- (3) (a) Will the Western Australian Development Corporation retain an equity interest in the new bank:
(b) what will this interest cost; and
(c) be valued at?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

Profit

3634. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) What profit is budgeted for EXIM to produce in the 1985-86 financial year?
- (2) Did it operate at a profit in the 1984-85 financial year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

DEFENCE: CADET UNITS

Funding

3635. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Defence Liaison:

Will the State Government provide additional funds and support for cadet units in Western Australia this year?

Mr BRYCE replied:

No.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTES

Day-labour Force

3636. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) On how many occasions during the past six months has the Government paid workers in its day labour forces in respect of time they were on strike?
- (2) What were the occasions?
- (3) How much has been paid?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Inquiries made within and by the Office of Industrial Relations reveal that on no occasion within the past six months have Government day labour workers been paid in respect of time they were on strike.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

CRIME: SEXUAL ASSAULT REFERRAL CENTRE

Accountability

1064. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Bearing in mind that Mesdames L. Flanagan, B. Leach, and J. Rawling, the three lay counsellors at the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, received incomes of approximately \$45 000, \$43 000, and \$32 000 respectively in the financial year just ended, what system of accountability is there to ensure that the number of hours claimed have actually been worked?
- (2) Further, what check is there to ensure that the work undertaken was actually necessary?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) The member for Kalamunda has given me no notice whatsoever of the question. He obviously is not serious about getting an answer. He could not possibly expect the Minister for Health to be involved in knowing the individual earnings of the 26 000 people who work in the health system. He must imagine that I sit in my office and make up their pay-packets every week. We have a very competent board of management that manages the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. As Minister for Health I am not directly involved in managing that hospital. If the member would like to put his request to me in writing, I will forward it to the hospital board and ask it to provide the information that he has requested.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

South-west: Policies

1065. Mr D. L. SMITH, to the Acting Premier:

What is the Government's attitude to the Opposition's development policies for the south-west referred to by the Leader of the Opposition in *The West Australian* of Saturday, 2 July?

Mr BRYCE replied:

This week's policy on the "South-West 2000" is as confused as most people in the south-west have become since the Opposition started talking about "Bunbury 2000". The Leader of the Opposition says, on the one hand, that "Bunbury 2000" will be scrapped, but on the other that the Opposition had never attacked "Bunbury 2000".

Mr Hassell: I did not say it would be scrapped.

Mr BRYCE: It is interesting that we have almost a re-run of the situation about an hour ago when the Leader of the Opposition stood in this place and told a fundamentally deliberate untruth about the well-known position of the Premier on a certain specific issue. He did not feel the slightest twinge of conscience about telling that untruth. Now he feels somebody is telling an untruth about him, and he is starting to squirm. Let us get rid of all the discomfort he might be feeling now because he will be reminded countless times between now and the next round in February or March 1986 about his position on and attitude to the development of Bunbury, and the whole of the south-west in a regional development sense. He has stuck his neck out on one of his little excursions. When on one of his little Friedmanite kicks he decided that privatisation was the flavour of the month and that he would advocate disbanding the South West Development Authority. Tomorrow he would dismantle "Bunbury 2000". He cannot have his cake and eat it too. He cannot be ideologically pure for all of his mates who follow Friedman while at the same time going to Bunbury and seeing what an outstanding success "Bunbury 2000" has been. The South West Development Authority has chalked up on the board some remarkable achievements. The Leader of the Opposition cannot face these things.

He cannot reconcile the Friedman ideology with the success of "Bunbury 2000" without going slightly crazy. We will sit back and watch what happens to him in the next six months.

CRIME: SEXUAL ASSAULT REFERRAL CENTRE

Male Victims

1066. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister for Health aware that in May of 1985 a request from a sergeant of the CIB made of an officer of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre to consult a male who had been sexually assaulted was declined and that the police officer was told to tell the male rape victim to go to another hospital?
- (2) Is the SARC available only to females who are sexually assaulted?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) The short answer to both questions of the member for Kalamunda is "No", but I feel like elaborating on that. I think this is an abuse of question time. The member for Kalamunda knows full well that there is legal action pending against him and others with respect to this matter. He is taking this opportunity to use the privilege of this House to cast aspersions on and to make allegations against all sorts of people. Frankly, I am surprised that he has done this. I thought better of him than that he would use this forum for such an unfair attack.

The attack he has made previously on Wendy Silver, a senior public servant in my department, accusing her of being partisan and biased and a member of the Australian Labor Party, is most unfair. I do not know whether she is a member of the Labor Party. The only person involved in this matter I know for a fact to be a member is Mrs Jenny Hamilton, the person for whom the member for Kalamunda is going out of his way to act as advocate. The member has misused this Parliament and has attacked the people I have appointed to inquire into this affair. They are people of the highest standing in our community. Mr Graham McDonald is a very experienced legal practitioner who has agreed to take on the chairmanship of the inquiry; Miss Lisa Newby, an adviser to the Premier,

has agreed to be a member; and Mrs Wendy Silver, an experienced social worker, is the third member of the team.

The member for Kalamunda would be well advised to stop trying to score cheap political points by using the protection of this House to slander people. Rather, he should make any submissions he wishes to make on this matter to the inquiry so that they can be dealt with in the proper way. If he continues in this fashion it will be crystal clear that all he is attempting to do is score cheap political points at the expense of those unfortunate people in the community who may happen to need the expert services provided by the Sexual Assault Referral Centre at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

TECHNOLOGY PARK

Industry Response

1067. Mrs HENDERSON, to the Minister for Technology:

With the Technology Park at Bentley due to open soon, what has been the response from local industry to the availability of this facility?

Mr BRYCE replied:

There has been a strong demand from companies seeking to transfer their activities to the new Technology Park at Bentley.

The Technology Development Authority, which is responsible for establishing the park, has advised me that many companies will be operating there by the official opening on 24 July.

In fact, some companies have already started operations at the 32 hectare park and several others are preparing their sites for occupation.

Companies already operating there include: the computer software company, Byronics; the research arm of the Western Australian Regional Computing Centre which is based at the University of Western Australia; the Productivity Promotion Council; and the Industrial Design Council.

At least 10 more will be moving in progressively during the next few weeks to utilise the facilitator block and incubator units already established.

The facilitator block is for organisations the principal business of which is to service new technology companies. Floor space in the block is already fully committed.

As well as the Productivity Promotion Council and the Industrial Design Council, other organisations which have agreed to establish in the facilitator block include: the management investment company, Westintech; the National Association of Testing Authorities; and the small business accountants, Gorey and Walsh.

The incubator units—research and development block—are for early-stage research and development companies. In addition to Byronics and the WA Regional Computing Centre, the medical research company, Laboratory Management Services, is currently transferring its operations to these units.

A local new technology company, Formulab Technology, and Chemtronics, a scientific instrument making company, will shortly be moving to the incubator units and negotiations with a further three companies are at an advanced stage.

The sale of the first commercial lot at the Technology Park has been finalised, with a local pharmaceutical company, Delta West, purchasing a 1.2 ha site. Initial construction work is expected to follow soon.

Negotiations are presently taking place over the sale of a further 5 lots.

Commercial arrangements at the park are in line with current market rates, with the exception of small research companies at the pre-commercial stage. The Technology Development Authority has tailored special assistance packages for companies in this category.

In view of all this, I can only say the response of industry has been tremendous and reinforces the success of the Government's policies in this sector.

I am pleased to be able to say to the member for Nedlands that if he meant what he said this afternoon in a state of supreme anger and pique that it was all a joke, I think he will live long enough to be able to apologise to the people who have worked long and hard—

Mr Court: I didn't mention the Technology Park this afternoon, so don't make things up. I said that DID expenditure had gone through the roof and that your technology bureaucracy had gone through the roof.

Mr BRYCE: Members opposite for a long time have perceived this subject to be a giggle and a joke, but I am happy to be able to say to them in 1985 that I will stake my political reputation on the success of technological development in this State. I look forward to the member's developing a sense of balance in his old age which will enable him to come over to this side of the House and apologise for some of the outrageous things he said in his formative years.

CRIME: INCEST

Arrest

1068. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware that in defiance of instructions to the contrary—

Points of Order

Mrs HENDERSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am mindful of your previous ruling on the foreshadowed motion, but it is my understanding that the questions the member for Kalamunda is directing to the Minister for Health are the subject of legal action in the Supreme Court and that the member is in fact using question time as a means of making statements, something which should be unacceptable to the House.

Mr THOMPSON: On the same point of order, it is true that I have received a letter suggesting that a writ may be issued against me unless I offer an apology. I was given 24 hours in which to respond to that. I did respond by saying that I would not retract or apologise. No further action has been taken.

Mr Pearce: Have you checked at the Supreme Court?

Mr THOMPSON: My solicitor checked with the solicitor who served the notice on me.

Mr PEARCE: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I recall a previous occasion in this House when a previous Speaker was asked to rule on a question of *sub judice*. The particular matter arose when the member for Kalamunda was the

Speaker and he in fact checked that it had been sworn out at the Supreme Court. It had not at that stage been served on anyone. The member, as Speaker, ruled that once the writ had been taken out with the Supreme Court—

Mr Hassell: No writ has been taken out.

Mr PEARCE: I am not in a position to say whether a writ has yet been issued, but neither is the member for Kalamunda.

Mr Hassell: He has checked.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The person whom the Opposition needs to convince about this matter is me, not the Acting Leader of the House, and I am not going to be convinced of anything except that members opposite are performing in a rowdy manner.

Mr PEARCE: I suggest the course of action that might properly be followed is one you have taken in regard to the motion; that is to say, the member for Kalamunda should put his questions on the Notice Paper so that you are able to check whether legal action has been taken. Then, if the matter is not *sub judice* an answer could be given in the normal way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I agree with the two members of the Government that it is a rather difficult position. However, precedents in this place indicate that this matter is not *sub judice* and cannot be considered such until a writ is issued. There is no evidence—in fact there is evidence to the contrary—that a writ has been issued. Until such evidence is provided to me I am afraid I must rule that the question proceed.

Questions Without Notice Resumed

Mr THOMPSON: To continue—

- (1) Is he aware that, in defiance of instructions to the contrary from the medical superintendent and head of the accident and emergency department of the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre, Jean Rawling of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre arranged a meeting between an incest victim and perpetrator so that the police could arrest the perpetrator?
- (2) Does he see this as a legitimate function of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) I regard this as a shameful misuse of question time by the member. I have no intention of aiding and abetting his muckraking and I do not intend to add anything to my previous answer.

PARLIAMENTARY LIBERAL PARTY

Non-metropolitan Members

1069. Mr HUGHES, to the Acting Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

The Leader of the Opposition has boasted in *The West Australian* of 24 June that his Liberal Party has more non-metropolitan members in State Parliament than all other parties combined. If this boast is true, how is it possible?

Mr PEARCE replied:

I am here to tell the House that the Leader of the Opposition has told the truth on one occasion. It is the case that if one takes the Parliament as a whole, the Liberal Party has more non-metropolitan members than anybody else. This is not true in the Assembly because the Labor Party holds as many non-metropolitan seats as the other parties. The Labor Party is very well represented in the country and five of the Ministry of 15 are from rural seats.

In the Legislative Council, where one would think the electors were the same as those who elect the Assembly and the votes much the same, the Liberal Party has 14 country members, the ALP has four, and the country parties have two. This comes about because of the massive malapportionment in the Legislative Council. The 14 non-metropolitan members who represent the Liberal Party hold 41.2 per cent of seats in the Legislative Council, but represent only 22 per cent of voters. The country bias which is supposed to be built into the Legislative Council is not in favour of country party representatives but a country bias in favour of the Liberal Party.

These figures only stack up because of the defection to the Liberal Party of three members who were elected to Parliament under a different guise; that is, as members of the National Country Party. I guess their country electorates will have a chance at the next election to vote on whether they like that urbanisation of their representation. Nevertheless, it is the case that the only

reason the Liberal Party can boast that it represents more non-metropolitan seats than all other parties combined in this Parliament is because of the massive malapportionment in the Legislative Council which specifically favours not just conservative parties, but the Liberal Party.

ENERGY: PRICE INCREASES

Advice

1070. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

Knowing and allowing for the Minister's excellent capacity to retain information, I ask—

- (1) What was the original advice about the recent gas and electricity price increases by the board—that is, the commissioners—of the SEC?
- (2) Was this advice in the long-term interest of the SEC and its customers?
- (3) Why did the Government not heed this advice?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (3) The member for Floreat, when he was Minister in charge of the SEC—indeed, he created the SEC in its current form—established what I consider to be the good precedent and principle which was followed by the member for Narrogin when he became Minister. I also intend to follow it. It is that commercially confidential information concerning the SEC's internal workings should not be made available.

When the member for Floreat was Minister he refused repeatedly to make that information available, as did the member for Narrogin.

It is no secret that in both last year's submission and the submission which has been put to the Government for this forthcoming year's operations, the SEC asked for a level of tariff increase which was higher than that granted by the Government. In the first year we came to Government we were faced with the situation where, because of the tariff increase allowed the previous year, the SEC faced a substantial deficit of the order of \$12 million. After only a couple of months in office the Government accepted the SEC's advice that it needed to

wipe out the deficit and recover the position because of some decisions taken by the former Government.

By the time the second, and now the third, round of tariff increases came before the Government, it was well and truly in control of the situation and aware that some other issues needed to be considered. One of our very successful policies has been, as the Deputy Premier mentioned this afternoon, the desire to keep charges down to ordinary consumers and business as part of a policy of keeping the Government out of the way of the economic recovery which has been taking place so marvellously in Western Australia during the last two years. That has been very successful. Last year the SEC— and the figure has been made public since the end of the financial year, and I am happy to do the same after the end of this current year—sought an eight per cent increase and indicated that that was what it required to get the necessary income to cover expenditure. The Government agreed to a 3.8 per cent increase, and that was achieved by cutting back some programmes and stringent cost control by me. I still approve almost every staff replacement authorisation before it goes ahead. That is a very time consuming process, but it has been successful in reducing staff numbers and costs at the SEC. Despite the fact that we have been opening up new operations such as Muja D and the pipeline, we have fewer staff than two years ago.

As a result of that and the fact that the economic strategy we pursued was so successful, there has been substantial growth in demand in the industrial and commercial sector.

Although the final figures are not available because computer crunching is going on, the SEC will come out with a small surplus at the end of the year. A small proportion of that was due to the very hot February we had and the long winter last year. The greatest growth in demand was not in the domestic sector which responds rapidly to hot summers and long winters, but the industrial and commercial area which responds not to those factors but to increased economic activity.

It is no secret that this year the SEC would have liked a higher increase than

that approved by the Government. Cabinet, in considering that submission along with all the others—as I am sure happened when the member for Floreat was a Minister—determined that the level of increase sought was not appropriate. In the light of experience last year when we were able to hold down tariffs and costs to the consumer and come in with a small surplus, although it is not yet confirmed, the Government decided it would agree to a 3.8 per cent tariff increase.

If the member is suggesting we should have agreed to a higher increase, that is a matter for him. The Government did not think it was a good idea in the current economic environment, particularly as our previous strategy had obviously worked so well.

Finally, the main driving force now in SEC tariffs is not the cost of fuel as it was in the 1970s and early 1980s—that cost has pretty well stabilised—or the cost of labour, which also has pretty well stabilised, but, rather, the question of debt servicing. The member for Narrogin spoke about management of the future and the massive expansion that was undertaken over the past five years, all of it initiated by the member for Narrogin while he was Minister. That has all now come home to roost. The SEC is now being forced to pay the debt servicing costs of that massive expansion of somewhere in the order of \$1 500 million or \$1 600 million in the space of five years. That is the major concern and it is something about which we can do absolutely nothing because the debt is there. It was incurred by our predecessors and we are trying to manage it as best we can. It is to the great credit of this Government that the SEC continues to operate as efficiently as it does and that the tariff payers of this State are getting real reductions in their charges.

FEDERAL LAW

Non-compliance: Members of Parliament

1071. Mrs BUCHANAN, to the Acting Premier:

(1) Does the Government condone the actions of members of Parliament who ad-

vocate non-compliance with possible Federal law?

- (2) In particular does the Government support the Leader of the Opposition's proposal to face prosecution rather than use a national identity card?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) It comes as a surprise to me to read that the Leader of the Opposition, who was one of the most inflexible and punitive Ministers that this State has ever known, has suddenly become interested in civil liberties in the form of his opposition to identity cards.

The Leader of the Opposition was a member of a Government which introduced some of the most oppressive legislation of any Government in Australia. I understand that yesterday, in order to engender some interest and enthusiasm into what was a flagging Press conference, he suggested that he would be burning his identity card. Presumably, in order to be consistent, the Leader of the Opposition should really destroy his Medicare card in a blaze of publicity on the steps of the Health Insurance Commission.

I do not think the Leader of the Opposition has anything to worry about unless he has a compelling sense of guilt about something, because the whole question of the identity card has been related to tax evasion and the means of throwing a net around evasion. If the Leader of the Opposition does not feel guilty he should not worry because if what happened today was a good example of what is possible, the replica of a card that was published in *The West Australian* could not possibly instil in the Leader of the Opposition the fear that he has in his mind because nobody—certainly nobody in politics—would have recognised the Leader of the Opposition from the photograph on page three because that photograph had him smiling.

MR TOM BUTLER

Industrial Relations Record

1072. Mr HASSELL, to the Acting Premier:

What has been Mr Tom Butler's record of success as industrial relations adviser to the Premier for the past two years in resolving building sites strikes,

preventing demand for illegal payments, preventing payments for strikes demanded by the Builders Labourers Federation, preventing standover tactics on building and construction sites, and protecting independent sub-contractors from being forced to make illegal payments for union membership when operating on building and construction sites?

Mr BRYCE replied:

I commence my answer by reminding all members of the House that Tom Butler seems to be at the No. 1 position on the hit list for denigration and vilification because he happens to be a financial member of the Australian Labor Party. He has been effective in his membership and has risen to the top of the organisation and holds the position of Western Australian President of the Australian Labor Party.

We have been reminded, during the afternoon, by some of the members opposite as they enjoy the luxury of being in Opposition, that we live in a political democracy. I suggest that the member who asked the question assumed all the proportions of a political Pol Pot earlier today.

In all seriousness, anybody in this society is entitled to join a political party and to publicly participate in that party, whether it be the poor old Country Party which is split three ways, the Liberal Party, the Australian Labor Party, the Australian Democrats, or anybody else. Members opposite do not seem to be able to get through their heads that they lost the last election resoundingly and that they will lose the next one for the same sorts of reasons. In fact, we expect a whole spate of retirements shortly after the next election. Many of the old fellows will not be able to face up to the long, hard struggle to get back into office around 1999.

It seems that the Liberal Party, in Opposition, has decided that it needs to use somebody as a target week in and week out. Tom Butler must have had more mentions of his name in the newspapers in the last two years than anybody else.

There is no secret at all. Tom Butler is a very fine Labor man. He is a dedicated Western Australian. He has committed

more of his life unselfishly to a worthwhile cause than most members sitting opposite would ever begin to comprehend. I find it staggering—

Mr Hassell: You find it too hard to answer the question.

Mr BRYCE: I am enjoying the answer and I hope the Leader of the Opposition is. Tom Butler is not only down-to-earth and a first-class human being, but also he is entitled to be appointed to any position to which any Government in this country, local, State, or Federal, cares to appoint him.

Mr Spriggs interjected.

Mr BRYCE: Many members on this side of the House do not agree with the decision of the member's leader to pluck him from political oblivion and make him the shadow secretary to the shadow Cabinet. We recognise that that is one hell of a step forward for Rip Van Winkle. Sir Charles Court would never have forgiven him for what he did. He will benefit simply from the passage of time. If it is good enough for the Leader of the Opposition to appoint him to that position, it is good enough for the Government of Western Australia to appoint Tom Butler to any position it thinks fit.