

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 21 August 1985

THE SPEAKER (Mr Harman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

ENVIRONMENT: DRINK CONTAINERS

Recyclable: Petition

MR TRETHOWAN (East Melville) [2.18 p.m.]: I have a petition from 62 Western Australians couched in the following terms—

To the Honourable Speaker and Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament Assembled:

We, the undersigned, wish to register our protest against the proliferation of Throwaway drink containers and their adverse impact on retail prices, the environment and employment in the recycling industry. Accordingly, we respectfully urge Parliament to encourage the use of refillable bottles and recyclable cans, to ensure MAXIMUM possible recovery of such containers and to create widespread new employment in the recycling industry, by means of legislation requiring a refundable deposit on all drink bottles and cans.

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

I certify this petition conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

(See petition No. 2.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr Barnett, leave of absence for three weeks was granted to Mr Gordon Hill (Helena) on the ground of urgent public business.

FIRE BRIGADES AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Carr (Minister for Police and Emergency Services), and read a first time.

HORTICULTURE—WINE GROWING INDUSTRY

Select Committee: Requirement to Report

On motion by Mr Troy, resolved—

That the Select Committee which was appointed during the Second Session of this Parliament to inquire into the Grape Growing Industry in Western Australia and which was, by resolution of 18 April 1985, empowered to continue its activities for the balance of the Thirty-first Parliament, is by this resolution required to report on 31 October 1985.

LAPSED BILLS: RESTORATION TO NOTICE PAPER

Council's Message: Consideration

On motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House), resolved—

That as requested by the Legislative Council in Message No. 2 this House resumes the consideration of the Bills enumerated therein; and that accordingly the "Occupiers' Liability Bill 1985", the "Parliamentary Papers Amendment Bill 1985", the "Commercial Arbitration Bill 1985", the "Liquor Amendment Bill 1985" and the "Fatal Accidents Amendment Bill 1984", be restored to the Notice Paper at the stages which they reached in the previous session of Parliament.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Conservation and Land Management) [2.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The proposed changes contained in this Bill relate to four law enforcement aspects of the Wildlife Conservation Act.

The penalties in the Act have not been changed since 1967 and are clearly in need of adjustment. This need was highlighted late last year in the case of two Americans convicted of nest-robbing. Although the eggs were reportedly worth \$75 000 on the overseas market, the maximum fine which could be imposed under the existing scale of penalties was only \$1 200. There was widespread community support for increased penalties when the proposal was announced earlier this year.

Two of the remaining changes remove anomalies relating to the possession of fauna. In the first instance, the Act currently prescribes a higher level of penalty for an offence which involves the unlawful taking of rare fauna, but does not prescribe a similar penalty for an offence which involves the unlawful possession of such fauna. The penalties for both these offences should be identical. The proposed amendments will achieve this. Secondly, it is currently an offence to possess the skin or carcase of protected fauna unless lawfully taken, but it is not an offence to possess a live specimen. The proposed amendments correct this anomaly.

The other amendment extends the time in which proceedings for offences may be made. At the present time complaints must be made within six months from the time when offences against the Act occur. This has presented problems where complex and time-consuming investigations are involved, where offenders have been difficult to trace or where serious offences are not detected within six months of the event. Similar problems were experienced under the Fisheries Act before it was amended in 1982 to extend the time to two years.

The proposed amendments will result in significant improvements in the area of wildlife law enforcement.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Old.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [2.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Agricultural Products Act 1929 provides, in section 3, for the establishment of three fruit sales advisory committees.

The role of the committees is to inquire into the size, quality and types of fruit harvested in Western Australia, to assess seasonal demand and to advise the Minister for Agriculture on any sales restriction necessary to maintain the viability of the fruit growing industry.

In recent years the industry has itself seen a need for market quality regulation and has financially supported a small team of retail trade inspectors. The inspectors administer fruit grading and packing codes, established under section 3F of the Act. The codes provide

minimum standards for fruit offered for sale on the local market. The fruit growing industry believes that this arrangement has proved successful, to the extent that the sales committees do not now formally meet, their role having been largely taken over jointly by the Western Australian Fruit Growers' Association, meeting in annual conference, and by the Western Australian Fruit Advisory Council.

At its 1984 conference, the Fruit Growers' Association resolved that sales advisory committees be abolished and that their functions and powers be transferred to the Western Australian Fruit Advisory Council. The Western Australian Fruit Advisory Council is not a statutory authority. A slight expansion of its role, to effect the requested amendments, can be arranged administratively.

The Bill provides for the repeal of sections 3A to 3C of the principal Act. Consequential upon the repeal of the sections of the Act providing for the establishment of the committees, it is appropriate to repeal section 3D of the principal Act. This section provides for the Minister to take advice from the sales advisory committees, which will not be necessary if these committees are abolished.

The Bill proposes action which is in accordance with the Government's desire to abolish all unnecessary statutory authorities.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Old.

CONTRACEPTIVES AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR HODGE (Melville—Minister for Health) [2.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Contraceptives Act to allow more retail outlets to sell condoms and so encourage their greater use as a preventive health measure to lessen the spread of AIDS.

I introduce this Bill following a strong recommendation from the Commonwealth Task Force on AIDS that the use of condoms be encouraged in an effort to lessen the spread of AIDS in the community. Professor David Pennington, head of the Commonwealth AIDS Task Force, warned bluntly that sexual practices—particularly among the "at risk" groups—will have to change if the spread of the

fatal acquired immune deficiency syndrome virus is to be slowed. He is advocating constant use of condoms by people in the high risk groups and it is reported that, as a result of his warnings, groups alarmed at the spread of the disease have launched an ambitious educational campaign to alert the public to the disease transmission risks.

In the absence of any scientific breakthrough leading to the discovery of a cure for AIDS, education campaigns in the groups at risk become the key public health option most likely to achieve any worthwhile result in the lessening of the spread of this disease. Because an individual can contract the disease without showing any symptoms for years, there is a distinct possibility of the disease being transmitted to others during this incubation period before the carrier is aware of the potential for passing on the disease.

While medical scientists have not yet found a cure for AIDS, they have identified the means by which it is transmitted and are recommending measures for slowing its spread. One of the measures recommended is the use of condoms during any sexual activity.

Transmission of the virus is effected by the transfer of semen or blood from a person having the disease to another person through physical contact of such a fluid through a break in the protective barriers of the body. Consequently, it is believed the use of condoms can lessen the likelihood of spreading the disease through sexual activity.

The State has a responsibility in this regard to allow condoms to be more readily available—especially to people in the high risk groups. At present, the Contraceptives Act limits the sale of all contraceptives to pharmacies. The amendments propose to increase the number of outlets to allow approved retail shops and all licensed premises to sell condoms without committing an offence against the Contraceptives Act. This should allow greater access to condoms by people in the high risk group by providing more convenient retail outlets and a greater period of availability per day.

The educational campaigns and greater availability of condoms to the high risk groups should go a long way in lessening the spread of AIDS. In fact, the greater availability should also help the control of other sexually transmitted diseases.

Because of the proposed amendments, the emphasis of this Act will be more on a public health protection theme than on policing the unlawful sale of contraceptives as is the emphasis of the present Act. For this reason, it is seen to be more appropriately administered by the Commissioner of Health rather than the Commissioner of Police. Appropriate amendments in this Bill will allow this change to occur.

It is proposed that retailers who wish to sell condoms should apply to the Commissioner of Health for a permit to make these sales. Sales by vending machines will not be permitted.

An advisory committee will be formed to examine and make a recommendation on each application received. It is proposed the advisory committee be chaired by the Director of the Communicable Disease Control Branch of the Health Department, or his nominee, and comprise representatives of the Department of Consumer Affairs, the Pharmacy Guild, the Retail Traders Association, the Family Planning Association of WA and a member of the public.

Upon the approval of the commissioner, a permit will be issued in respect of a particular person and named premises and this may contain conditions applicable to sales of condoms. Once issued, a permit will not have to be renewed each year and can be surrendered by the holder at any time or revoked by the commissioner if conditions on the permit are not observed or if the permit holder ceases to occupy the premises concerned.

The Bill contains the usual but necessary provisions detailing the committee's functions, voting procedures, members' terms of appointments and the methods of making application and approving of permits. Power is provided to revoke a permit or surrender it and for a person aggrieved by a decision on a permit to appeal to the Minister. Because the police will not be involved in the general administration of the Act, nor in always conducting any prosecutions, power is provided to authorise other persons or classes of persons to carry out the monitoring of the provisions of the Act and conduct any prosecutions considered necessary. Provision has been left, however, for a police officer to still prosecute on behalf of the department when so authorised.

It is believed the measures in this Bill will provide significant assistance in the fight against the spread of AIDS through the general community.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Williams.

GAS STANDARDS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR PARKER (Fremantle—Minister for Minerals and Energy) [2.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to amend the Gas Standards Act 1972-79 to control the sale, hire or advertising for sale or hire of any gas appliances which have not been approved by a recognised body and also prohibit from sale or hire, gas appliances which have previously been approved and which no longer meet present-day standards.

When the Gas Standards Act came into force in 1972, the market for gas appliances was limited. The small number of gas appliance suppliers in Western Australia tended to supply appliances which predominantly had been approved by the Australian Gas Association—AGA—or in the case of liquefied petroleum gas, by the Australian Liquefied Petroleum Gas Association—ALPGA. These suppliers were usually gas appliance specialists or were experienced in the supply, installation and use of gas appliances generally.

The majority of gas appliances sold in Australia are approved by the AGA or ALPGA, which are merely associations of persons representing all sectors of the industry; neither is a statutory body. As such they do not have any statutory powers and therefore cannot require that all gas appliances, which are sold or hired or advertised for sale or hire, have the mark of approval of the relevant body.

Since 1972, the demand for gas, and hence gas appliances, has grown considerably within the State to the extent that domestic gas appliances are now available through many retail outlets, including departmental stores.

Today the knowledge and awareness of the required standards in the gas industry by many of the sales personnel is no longer as good as previously was the case. As a result the State Energy Commission and the gas industry have become very concerned as to the safety of gas appliance users in particular and the public in general.

In order to ensure that the uninformed potential gas customer may be protected from purchasing or hiring any kind of gas appliance which does not have a current approval rating and which may or may not be safe, the Govern-

ment has accepted that amendments to the Gas Standards Act should be introduced to this House as a matter of urgency.

In the interests of safety there is a need to ensure that appliances sold or hired have previously been tested and approved by a responsible body or authority. There is also a need to prohibit from sale or hire, gas appliances which have previously been approved and which no longer meet present day standards.

Installation of only those gas appliances which have been approved by AGA, ALPGA, the commission or individually by a gas inspector appointed by the SEC, is a requirement of the gas standards regulations which were introduced in 1983. Indeed it is an offence under those regulations to "install" a non-approved appliance, but of course the term "install" does not include "sale" or "hire". There is therefore no provision within the existing legislation which prohibits or restricts a person from selling or hiring or advertising for sale or hire any gas appliance which has not been approved by a recognised body. Consequently a person can purchase an unapproved gas appliance only to find that legally it cannot be installed.

The gas standards regulations include provisions relating to LPG appliances in fixed installations. I have recently been made aware that there are various LPG appliances for the leisure industry coming from different sources both within and outside Australia which do not require to be installed and which are entering the market without a recognised mark of approval. Again, there is a clear need to ensure that such gas appliances are approved before they are sold or hired.

I wish to make it quite clear that there is no suggestion that the approval system applied by the AGA or ALPGA is in any way inadequate or inefficient, but as I have already stated, neither the AGA nor ALPGA is a statutory body, having statutory powers.

These matters have been discussed with the different sectors of the gas industry and meet with their support.

I now propose to deal with the Bill in three parts—

- (a) Members of the House will see that the Bill prohibits the sale, hire, lease or the advertising for sale, hire or lease of gas appliances which have not been approved by the SEC. Provision is

made for all appliances which have been so approved to be suitably marked, stamped or labelled.

- (b) The Bill details the procedure to be followed by a person seeking approval for a gas appliance. However, in order not to duplicate testing work which has already been undertaken by the AGA and ALPGA provision is made in the Bill for the automatic approval by the SEC of gas appliances which have been approved by the AGA or ALPGA and which meet the commission's requirements. Members of the House will no doubt agree that this is a most important factor in that it will help to minimise the cost to the Western Australian community of the testing and approval of appliances.

Provision has also been included in the Bill enabling the Governor to make regulations prohibiting the fraudulent or improper use of marks signifying the approval of the commission.

The Bill also provides for the publication in the *Government Gazette* of a list of approved gas appliances. In the event that the commission is of the opinion that a gas appliance or type or class of gas appliance which has been approved or a component used or designed to be used in connection with a gas appliance or in connection with a gas installation, is or is likely to become unsafe or dangerous in use, the commission may by order published in the *Government Gazette* prohibit the sale, hire or use of such gas equipment or impose conditions and restrictions on such sale, hire or use. A person failing to comply with any such order commits an offence.

Members of the House will be aware of the problems which have arisen regarding approved gas water heaters which have been installed unflued or flued ineffectively and which, since 1973, have been instrumental in 12 known fatalities in this State. Their further sale should therefore be prohibited in line with the provisions of the recently amended gas standards regulations which prohibit their installation.

As the Government fully recognises the importance of these matters, the Bill provides for the imposition of a penalty of \$2 000 or imprisonment for six months or both on any person convicted of breaching these new provisions.

- (c) The opportunity has also been taken by the Government to review the existing provisions of the Gas Standards Act relating to the penalties which may be imposed on gas undertakers, appliance manufacturers and gas installers convicted of breaches of the Act. Clearly the penalties imposed in 1972 are no longer appropriate and should be amended to correspond with those which can be imposed under the new provisions.

This Bill therefore proposes to increase the maximum penalties which may be imposed throughout the Act so as to more properly reflect the serious nature of these offences.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr MacKinnon (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 20 August.

MR TROY (Mundaring) [2.46 p.m.]: I believe this Address-in-Reply debate is the appropriate time to clear up some of the deliberate and misleading information advanced by Opposition spokesmen, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, since the Government announced in June this year its tariffs and charges services to apply in 1985-86.

Members of the community—both the household sector and the business sector—not only appreciate the early announcement of tariffs so that it can aid their budgetary considerations at the earliest possible time, but also welcome the Government's sincerity in keeping its word to follow three essential principles in holding down those charges.

I refer to the stated objectives of that cost containment process.

They are, first, the stringent cost containment measures in authorities, including the holding down of certain programmes to improve the economic climate; second, improving the economic climate to ensure revenue gener-

ation is not bearing directly on the community through cost increases passed directly on to that community; and, third, diversifying and supplementing traditional sources of State Government revenue without directly impinging on taxpayers.

I might just add that in my view a significant additional factor emerges from that announcement, which is that the early announcement of tariffs influences the local government sector. Local government is without doubt an emerging and important third sphere of government, and this State Government's decision to bring forward those announcements has had a big bearing on the overall household and business costs and the influence that local government has upon them.

It is clearly evident that we are showing the leadership necessary in the area of cost containment; and the overall response to that lead from local government evidenced this year is very strongly supportive of those moves.

One can ask: What constitutes tariffs and charges? The whole basis of the divergence of opinion, of the respective claims, and of the widely contrasting views of the Government and the Opposition in this matter, really boils down to what one defines as tariffs and charges. Without any form of apology, the Government interprets tariffs and charges to be that level of assessment applied for certain community services provided. I refer to the trading element of Government operations in providing community services and to the element that has a direct burden on the household or business as an operational cost. That basis of comparison clearly reveals the enormous success the Government has achieved over the past three years.

Let us cast our minds back for a moment to the Burke Government's inheritance in 1983. Members in this place will remember the financial position inherited by the Burke Government when it came to office. That position was clearly stated by the Premier in his 1983-84 Budget speech when he said—

Members will recall that when the 1982-83 Budget was presented to this House last September, it was estimated to be a balanced Budget.

However, when we took office only five months later, the situation had deteriorated alarmingly, to the extent that the State faced an estimated deficit for the

year of \$21 million—a figure that only a few weeks later had blown out to more than \$30 million.

Urgent financial stringencies implemented by the new Government and more buoyant revenue collections in the later months of the year resulted in the deficit being cut back to \$14.2 million by the end of the financial year.

The Premier quite fairly acknowledged that the O'Connor Government, despite its concealment of the State's true financial position leading up to the 1983 election, had been partly in that position because of certain factors beyond its control, and I refer to the economic stupidity of the Fraser-Howard Federal Government. It is rather interesting to see the manoeuvring currently going on in the Federal Liberal Party between Mr Howard and Mr Peacock where Mr Howard is continually pushing his barrow, making sure that he beats Mr Peacock to the draw in making economic statements, those statements rarely reflecting the line that Mr Peacock wishes to take. One can only dread the thought of Mr Howard ever regaining the reins of economic management of this country. Without doubt, Mr Howard goes down on record as being one of the greatest non-achievers as a Federal Treasurer.

In Western Australia our Opposition leader, who has scoured the world in search of new ideas to counter a Government which has proved conclusively its ability to manage the State's economy responsibly with an appropriate level of innovativeness, is left to select a concept of the Thatcher Government, an academic's privatisation model, without adaptation, as the best it can offer this State. It does not recognise the wide differences of geographic and social features between Western Australia and the United Kingdom.

I suggest members of the Opposition go to the library and obtain a copy of this document. It is unbelievably poor in its application to Western Australia. This initiative is nothing short of a move by a desperate man to win at all costs, ignoring the adverse impact the move will have on thousands of people across this State, particularly in country areas about which the Leader of the Opposition purports to be so concerned.

Yesterday's sudden rush of interest by Opposition members to speak in this debate was noted, but not one of them had the courage to question the direction their leader—a totally city-oriented man—took on this issue. I ask

those members: Where is that so often acclaimed independence of thought in the Opposition parties?

I now turn more directly to the question of increases in tariffs and charges which occurred in this State over the last few years. In the Premier's 1983 Budget address he drew attention to two options State Governments had to overcome the difficulty of the decay in State economic powers. One option was to adopt the traditional role; that is, a political defence, the well-trying and somewhat worn-out historical method that had been used by Governments in this State over many decades. Alternatively, the States could undertake a more aggressive entrepreneurial role, a technique the community could perhaps have expected of a Liberal rather than a Labor Government.

The first Burke Budget adopted both options in setting four principles—to balance the Budget, to build a firm foundation for economic recovery, to impinge as lightly as possible on the taxpayer consistent with financial responsibility, and to make way for the implementation of new programmes that the Government was elected to pursue. Almost two years since that statement by the Premier, this Government can look back with pride on the achievement of all those goals.

Let me dwell a little on the principle as it relates to tariffs and charges over that three-year period. The Government wanted to impinge as lightly as possible on the taxpayer, consistent with financial responsibility. An examination of those charges bearing directly on household and business operations provides the following comparisons between the Burke Government's performance from 1983-84 through to 1985-86 and the Court-O'Connor stable's performance from 1980-81 through to 1982-83.

Two points need to be borne in mind when making these comparisons. The CPI figure for the three-year period has been calculated by the State Treasury in its analysis and an estimate for the 1985-86 year of seven per cent is included. That figure was used by the Commonwealth at the recent Premiers' Conference.

Mr MacKinnon: They used 8½ per cent in the Budget last night.

Mr TROY: Did they? Figures have been adjusted to exclude hospital and medical services because of the distortionary effect of the introduction of Medicare on the CPI. Members will be very interested to learn that over that period of the Court-O'Connor term from 1980-

81 to 1982-83, the CPI figure came out at 30.6 per cent. That contrasts with the Burke Government's term in office from 1983-84 through to the end of 1985-86, when the figure is expected to be 21 per cent. I have a table here which reflects the charges in summary form and, Mr Speaker, I will seek your permission to have these figures included in *Hansard* after I have proceeded through them.

The SPEAKER: You will have to obtain leave of the House.

Mr TROY: I will seek leave at the appropriate time.

Electricity charges, particularly domestic electricity charges, during the three-year term of the Court-O'Connor Government increased by 50 per cent on the domestic scale against the CPI increase of 30.6 per cent, somewhere in the order of 20 per cent above the CPI. By comparison, the Burke Government's three-year term of office will see electricity charges increase by 23.8 per cent against a CPI increase of 21 per cent.

Several members interjected:

Mr TROY: I do not know from where members of the Opposition obtain their figures, but I am quite happy with these because my source is a reliable one. We see an increase of 3.8 per cent for the year 1985-86 and that follows on from the same level of increase of 1984-85. The 3.8 per cent increase, now occurring twice consecutively, is the lowest increase experienced in the last six years.

Mr MacKinnon: What about 1983-84?

Mr TROY: I am quite happy to repeat my figures. Comparing the three-year average shows an increase of 50 per cent for the Liberal Government and an increase of 23.8 per cent for our Government. There lies the answer. "Only slightly above that 3.8 per cent" is in fact only slightly above half of the CPI forecast for 1985-86 of seven per cent. These figures reveal that the cumulative increase in electricity charges is almost in line with the CPI. In fact, the cumulative effect is 23.8 per cent and the CPI is 21 per cent. Bearing in mind the position the SEC was forced into as a result of the north-west gas deal forced on it by the previous Government, its performance over the three year period has been superb.

I now address the important area of country electricity charges. The SEC's policy of charging uniform tariffs across the State indicates that this year a subsidy in the order of \$60 million is being applied.

On the question of commercial users, a complete review of the SEC's charges has been undertaken by the SEC; it has been forwarded to the Minister, and in turn it has been released to the public for comment. Members will be aware of that report which has been in the outside display cabinet for the last few weeks.

In essence, commercial electricity rates have moved in step with domestic rates. That means that over the past three years they have kept almost in line with the CPI or very close to it.

Let us compare domestic gas charges. The increase in the period of the Court-O'Connor Government was 58.2 per cent, almost 30 percentage points above the CPI for the same period. In the years 1983-84 to 1985-86 under the Burke Government the increase will be 24.7 per cent compared with a CPI increase of 21 per cent. Again the Burke Government's increases in gas charges have been almost in line with the inflation rate, while it was substantially more than the inflation rate in the previous three years.

Let us look now at metropolitan water charges. The domestic charges can be broken into two sectors: Firstly, the fixed charges which increased by 90 per cent during the three years of the Court-O'Connor Government. By contrast, the increase in these charges under the Burke Government is approaching 10.5 per cent. This year the increase is a mere 2.4 per cent—from \$82 to \$84 for the standard household charge. Consumption charges increased by 63 per cent in the three years of the Court-O'Connor Government; by contrast they will be held down to 22.6 per cent during the Burke Government's term of office. In case members opposite are wondering how those figures are calculated, I point out that they relate to a consumption level of 600 kilolitres. Domestic consumption above 150 kilolitres was charged at the rate of 37c a kilolitre in 1984-85, a 2.8 per cent increase. From July this year a new sliding scale of consumption charges was introduced. A charge of 38c per kilolitre will apply for consumption of between 150 and 600 kilolitres.

I ask members to bear in mind that that is pretty significant for the average household because average domestic consumption is in the order of 380 kilolitres a year. That sliding scale also provides an encouragement to water conservation. I point out that for a consumption level between 600 and 1 000 kilolitres the charge rises from 38c to 39c per kilolitre, and above 1 000 kilolitres the charge is 40c per kilolitre.

I turn now to the non-residential consumers of metropolitan water who are particularly important, especially in the small business area. Water rates for non-residential consumers have not been increased for properties with a GRV below \$4 000 in the current year. Members should bear in mind that there is a three-year phased introduction of these values. The rate in the dollar has been adjusted as follows: In 1984-85 it was 6.4c in the dollar; in 1985-86 the rate will be 6c in the dollar below \$4 000, while above \$4 000 the rate will drop to 5.25c in the dollar. Linked to that is the question of pay-for-service, pay-for-use.

Over the past three years close attention has been given to reducing charges for the business and commercial sectors, especially small business. Great attention has been given to removing the previous iniquitous system which forced a small stallholder whose premise had a handbasin to pay several thousand dollars for a water supply. That has been changed to a much fairer system of pay-for-service, pay-for-use. No doubt it has been welcomed by that sector.

Water rates have decreased by about 30 per cent in real terms over the three-year period of the Burke Government. This has been coupled with a big reduction in excessive and unnecessary water allowances which applied to most of those properties. Those allowances are now down to 10 per cent of the original level of allowance for water. At the same time a large majority of business and commercial properties have received a significant benefit from those changes.

I will draw out a special example applying to my electorate and other metropolitan fringe electorates which arose as a result of the pay-for-service, pay-for-use scheme being gradually implemented. Subsequent to the recent round of changes the Government was advised, following representations to my office, of a problem emerging with low value properties.

In those non-residential areas the water allowances were being cut well below the 150 kilolitres allowed for residential service. Many were set in the order of 60 to 80 kilolitres, and on top of that they were forced to pay for excess water use. Obviously the pay-for-service, pay-for-use scheme had got to a point where it was severely disadvantaging the holders of low valuation property. Thanks to the interest of the Minister for Water Resources and the officers of the Water Authority the matter was examined closely and they came up with a new option. Properties in this category will now receive a 50 per cent allowance granted under the

old system up to a maximum of 400 kilolitres. The alternative to that scheme will be the standard 10 per cent allowance which applies in all other areas where pay-for-service, pay-for-use applies. The greater of either of those two options will be applicable.

I would like to place on record my appreciation of the support given by the Minister and officers of the Water Authority in that development.

Let us look now at metropolitan sewerage rates and return to the three-year comparisons I was making. Under the Court-O'Connor Government charges increased by 90 per cent, or three times the CPI increase for that period. During the period of the Burke Government the increase is between 16.6 per cent and 18 per cent, depending on the property valuation. That is a stark contrast, as members opposite would have to admit.

Sewerage rates in the 1985-86 year will increase by 2.9 per cent, again well below the forecast CPI figure of seven per cent. The rate in the dollar has been lowered from 6.4c to 5.75c. That is linked with the phasing-in of property valuations over the three-year period. One might want to know what the overall revenue increase to the Water Authority has been as a result of the new charges. I will come to that in a moment.

Let us look now at metropolitan drainage rates and country water rates. During the three-year term of the Court-O'Connor Government, metropolitan drainage rates increased by 21 per cent compared with an increase of 10.3 per cent under the Burke Government. In 1985-86 there will be no increase at all. The change is linked to the reduction of the rate in the dollar from 1.09c to 1c.

Country water, sewerage and drainage charges will increase this year by 2.9 per cent which is well below the CPI figure, in fact less than half the forecast CPI figure for this coming year.

Mr MacKinnon: Is that the increase in the rate?

Mr TROY: That is the increase.

If one looks at the three-year comparison, one sees that under the Court-O'Connor Government the increase in country water charges was 101 per cent. Under the Burke Government it is 24 per cent. The total revenue collection by the Water Authority will increase by 2.9 per cent this year. Everyone would agree that that is constraint in its fullest form.

I turn now to State Housing Commission rentals which provide an interesting contrast, and take as my example a three-bedroomed home. The increase in rents for that type of property under the Court-O'Connor Government was 41.4 per cent. In the Burke Government's three-year term of office it will be 18.6 per cent.

In 1985-86, the increase will be 3.9 per cent which will be the lowest increase for six years. That increase will apply from 2 September. There is no rent increase for age pensioners wrapped up in that exercise and it is the second consecutive year of falls in State Housing Commission rents in real dollar terms.

I wish to draw to members' attention some interesting figures which point out the stark contrast emerging between the public and private sectors. These figures provide a good comparison with the Opposition's privatisation scheme announced recently. The Master Builders Association's figures for a three-bedroom home show a rental increase of 8.2 per cent to 30 March 1985 and indicate an average weekly rental of \$90.45 for private rental accommodation. The weekly average rent for State Housing Commission accommodation is \$58.70 a week.

During its period in office, the Government has ceased action commenced by the previous Government to remove the subsidy on the north-west State Housing Commission rentals.

There was a 105 per cent increase in State fuel taxes during the period of the Court and O'Connor Governments. By contrast, the Burke Government has increased State fuel taxes by 17.3 per cent. With due acknowledgement, the Court and O'Connor Governments were involved in a relatively small increase by their standards in the price of diesel fuel. That increase was 13.3 per cent. The increase during the Burke period of Government has been 16.1 per cent.

In relation to transport, the Minister for Transport has gone to great pains to explain that the State fuel levy is not a tax going straight to Consolidated Revenue to be used for other purposes. The whole of the levy is being used for road making and maintenance. That levy represents an income of \$46 million to be used for that purpose. Its removal will have a disastrous affect on the State's road network.

A matter of significance to be considered at this stage is the question of deregulation of the transport system. If that system does not have the roads to operate on, how long will it be before owners are forced to use rail again?

There was a 16.1 per cent increase in motor licence fees in the period of the Court and O'Connor Governments, and there has been a 10.7 per cent increase in the time of the Burke Government. There has been no increase in vehicle licence fees in 1985-86.

In looking at the figures for motor vehicle third party insurance one will see that there was a 176 per cent increase in the period of the Court and O'Connor Governments and no increase in the time of the Burke Government. The Burke Government has been more than zealous in requesting that increases by the third party insurers in relation to their operating costs be kept to a minimum. That is a credit to the Government. It has kept its finger on that matter and there is no question that the public are benefiting.

I admit that zoning has been introduced in relation to the Metropolitan Transport Trust charges which make comparisons difficult. However, I think it is fair to say that, on a three-zone basis, the increases for the period of the Court and O'Connor Governments were up by 42 per cent and the increase in the time of the Burke Government has been 9.09 per cent. No increase will occur in the financial year 1985-86.

Perhaps an explanation on the three-year comparison is warranted because of the complications caused by the new zoning structure. That structure was introduced to correct certain anomalies on the pay-as-you-use principle. There were certain inequities in the system. There have been no effective increases since 1974 despite the costs that have gone into that area. The basis for recovery of expenditure by fare paying was inequitable. One cannot ignore the many developments that occurred over the last ten years in the time of the previous Governments and I feel they should accept some responsibility for not addressing the problems involved in the operations of the MTT.

By leave of the House the following document was incorporated—

MAJOR STATE GOVERNMENT CHARGES: THE RECORD OF THE BURKE GOVERNMENT 1983-84 TO 1985-86 COMPARED WITH THE RECORD OF THE COURT/O'CONNOR GOVERNMENTS 1980-81 TO 1982-83

CHARGE	C.P.O.* %	Court/ O'Connor %	Burke %	C.P.I.* %
Electricity (domestic)	30.6	50	23.8	21

Gas (domestic)	58.2	24.7
Metro water (domestic):		
—fixed charge	90	10.5
—consumption charge	63	22.6
Metro sewerage (domestic)	90	16.6-18
Metro drainage (domestic)	21	10.3
Country water (domestic)	101	24
SHC rents (3-brm house)	41.4	18.6
State fuel Tax:		
—petrol	105	17.3
—diesel	13.3	16.1
Car licences	16.1	10.7
Vehicle third party insurance	176	nil
MTT fares (adult)	42.8-100	nil-9.09
Westrail freights	various	various
Westrail passenger fares	n.a.	13
Stateships freights (East/West service scheduled rates)	40	16.5

*To ensure comparability, both the C.P.I. figures have been adjusted by the State Treasury to exclude hospital and medical services because of the distortionary effect of the introduction of Medicare. The figure for the Court/O'Connor period is from July 1, 1980 to June 30, 1983 and the figure for the Burke period is from July 1, 1983 to June 30, 1986. The latter figure is, of course, an estimate, based on an assumed 1985-86 C.P.I. figure of 7 per cent. This was the figure used by the Commonwealth at the recent Premiers' Conference in calculating grants to the States.

Mr TROY: In conclusion, I come back to comparing figures with those supplied by the Leader of the Opposition. There is no doubt that he has conveniently broadened his definitions of tariffs and charges to include revenue from an expanding economy in this State. I do not think many people would fall for that trick. The Opposition has spoken about the Government pulling the wool over the eyes of the public, but the public is not falling for that trick. One of the objectives of the Burke Government has been to encourage the economic upturn. That is clearly evidenced by the revenue that has come from heightened economic activity.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.17 p.m.]: Today the member for Mundaring has indicated to the Parliament why he will serve only one term in this Parliament. For example, he does not have the ability to write his own speeches or even to do his own research. After 2½ years in this Parliament he still reads his speeches word for word. Not only that, but also he makes speeches that are way off the mark. He quotes, *ad nauseam*, statistics to Parliament and, as everybody knows, there are statistics, statistics, and damn lies. I will prove to him why the people of Western Australia will not have the wool pulled over their eyes and why they will not be misled by people like the member for

Mundaring who has had the misfortune today to be asked to serve up to the Parliament matters as directed by his political masters.

I recently visited a country town and I was approached by a group of business people who own a small office block in that town. They expressed to me their concern about their water and sewerage charges. They said that they had noted the advertisements in the newspaper in which the Premier had tried to convince the public that everything was fine in the garden. These businessmen gave me the figures indicating the charges which they have had to pay, supposedly being assisted by this Government. In October 1983 their water and sewerage rates combined totalled \$1 680.03. I will not blame the present Government for anything prior to 1983 as it only came to office in February 1983 and whatever happened before then was not its responsibility. Those businessmen have had only two assessments since that time. The first in October 1984 totalled \$2 352.08. This year they received their assessment payable on the last day of August 1985 and, significantly, only 10 months after the first assessment. The amount of that assessment was \$3 292.91. I repeat those figures for the benefit of the member for Mundaring. The first amount was \$1 680.03 payable by 100 per cent but also it had the the amount payable was \$3 292.91. If my maths are roughly correct, that is an increase of 100 per cent in less than two years. Not only was the Government happy to increase the rate payable by 100 per cent but it also had the cheek to advance the date payable by two months. Even blind Freddy would know that even if the rate was kept at exactly the same figure, by advancing the payment date by two months, the rate payable is increased quite significantly.

The member for Mundaring would have us believe that general increases in this area have been 2.9 per cent. Those people are not going to have the wool pulled over their eyes. They are concerned at the way they are being treated by the Government and will not be misled.

I will turn now to the matter I want to raise today. The headline in today's newspaper focused, and rightly so, on the Federal Government's Budget which was brought down by Treasurer Paul Keating in the Federal Parliament last night. The headline in yesterday's paper focused on South Africa and on the sanctions that the Federal Government will impose against that country.

I indicate to this Parliament that I totally oppose the moves undertaken by the Federal Government. In 1975, by courtesy of Rotary International, I was fortunate to undertake a six-week tour of South Africa which enabled me to look first-hand at the situation in that country. I admit that the tour was 10 years ago, but it certainly opened my eyes to the problems in that country. I came back to Western Australia with a greater understanding of the problems, but I did not come back with the answers to those problems. However, I did return from that trip totally opposed to apartheid. I had lengthy discussions with the people with whom I stayed in South Africa about the alternatives available to the South African Government to handle the problems.

The answer from Australia's viewpoint is not to ostracise South Africa by implementing trade and sporting sanctions, but to try to change the mind of the South African Government. I did not agree with the policy of the Fraser Government in relation to this matter, and I certainly do not agree with the policy of the Hawke Labor Government. The action taken by the Federal Government will not hasten a change and, in my opinion, it will slow down the rate of change in South Africa.

If we want to help the problem in South Africa we should talk rationally with South Africans of whatever race and endeavour to encourage and assist them to arrive at a proper solution. It is hypocritical of the Federal Government to announce trade sanctions against South Africa when at the very same time sporting activities between Australia and Eastern Bloc countries are taking place; and the Federal Government condones trading with those countries on a daily basis despite the fact that the restrictions that are placed on people living in Eastern Bloc countries are worse than the restrictions placed on South Africans. Why is it not possible for people in Eastern Bloc countries to travel out of their country of their own free will? What do we do about it? We do nothing.

What did we do about the invasion of Afghanistan by the Russians except to have a partial Olympic boycott? We have done nothing, yet we have trade sanctions against South Africa. The world has been saddened by activities in South Africa in recent weeks. I am also saddened, but the solution is not to isolate the problem and ostracise South Africa. The answer is to try to help the South Africans with what is a complex problem. This Government and the Federal Government should be taking

action to do that. However, they are not doing so, and we are left with a situation where people are standing by while ships are not allowed into ports and this is adding to the bad reputation around the world today of our water front. As far as ports are concerned, we are entering into an era when Australia will have the only ship-free ports in the world.

I repeat that I oppose apartheid and I also oppose trade sanctions against South Africa which, I believe, will do absolutely nothing to speed the rate of change in South Africa which we would all like to see. South Africa has significantly slowed down that change. It is time that all Governments in Australia made statements in support of that position.

Mr Clarko: What about Sri Lanka?

Mr MacKINNON: If one were to look around the world and be consistent he would find many examples. However, Governments do not wish to be consistent.

Last night Treasurer Paul Keating brought down the Federal Budget and today, rightly so, it was the main item in the newspaper. It is a Budget which continues to shape Australia in the Hawke mould, particularly as far as taxation is concerned.

If members recall debates in this House about the so-called accord between the Labor Party and the ACTU they will understand what I am talking about because in that document I remember having read the words "redistribution of income" 14 times and not once having read the word "profit". The latest Federal Budget has continued the process of the redistribution of income according to the Hawke socialist plan.

Significantly, the Federal Budget highlighted four main issues. Firstly, it indicated clearly to all Australians that there is to be no tax relief whatsoever provided by the Federal Government. In fact, it indicated under this Budget, ahead of proposed changes, that there will be real tax increases this financial year. We must remember that the tax changes to be announced in either September or October will not apply, according to the Prime Minister, until next financial year. Therefore, the financial year in which we are now in and in which the Budget handed down last night will address shows that there is no tax relief but, in fact, there will be real tax increases which I will explain later in my speech. Both these matters have been endorsed by the Premier of this State who is obviously happy to see that Australians and Western Australians are not given any tax

relief after they were promised such relief by the Prime Minister who said, "Trust me"! They are now facing real tax increases.

The second important fact contained in the Budget is that all those difficult decisions—for example, capital gains tax, death duties, and fringe benefits—have been deferred for a short time. I guess that the opinion polls have shown the Prime Minister where he stands and he must recover some of those votes before he can implement such changes. It is important to note that all the proposed changes are supported by the Premier of Western Australia.

The Budget also highlighted the total hypocrisy of this Premier as far as the issue of fuel tax is concerned. I will explain this shortly.

Finally, while it was pleasing to be told that the Federal deficit will be reduced it was also significant to learn that all the Budget deficit has done is to put Australia further into debt; as I will also explain later.

Mr Davies: You do not have to be Einstein to work that out.

Mr MacKINNON: I advise the Minister that that debt will not be borne by him, but by myself and certainly by my children.

Mr Davies: How will I be able to dodge that?

Mr MacKINNON: The Minister will be able to dodge that because of his age. He will not be receiving an income for much longer. The debt that is being built up in this country will be hanging around for much longer than the Minister and probably me.

I turn now to the first point I raised. The most significant factor in the Federal Budget was that no tax relief will be provided this year despite promises to the contrary. Mr Hawke said publicly, "Trust me and I will provide tax relief." However, there has been no tax relief and, in fact, higher levels of taxation will be paid by all. I will give details to the House, and perhaps the member for Mundaring would like to listen to the statistics I will quote.

In 1982-83 taxation revenue collected by the Federal Government was \$40 834 million. As the Hawke Labor Government was elected at the beginning of March 1983, we will not blame it for that figure. We merely use it as our benchmark. The 1985-86 estimate of taxation revenue is \$58 627 million which, in terms that people can understand quite clearly, represents an increase of 44 per cent in three years. I refer to some statistics cited by the member for Mundaring and which have been quite clearly publicised by the Premier. Inflation over the

same three years has been 21 per cent. Thus, the Hawke Labor Government has imposed taxation on the community at a rate double that of inflation. I remind the House that the Burke Labor Government is even worse than that. It has brought down only two Budgets and has increased taxation by 43 per cent. That increase will obviously be more than 50 per cent when the next Budget is brought down. Those figures speak for themselves, but worse is to come.

The tax threshold at which a taxpayer moves into the next taxation bracket has remained static. Thousands of middle income earners will now pay a higher rate of tax this year as inflation takes their incomes to higher taxation brackets. The Premier and I were both at a breakfast this morning. He would have heard a speaker at the breakfast indicate that if those thresholds had been indexed to the rate of inflation since 1955 we would not hit the 60c in the dollar bracket in 1985 unless our income was over \$400 000. That will give the House an idea of how things have degenerated. People earning about \$35 000—what would today be termed middle income in anybody's language—are in the highest income tax bracket. That is inexcusable.

No tax relief has been given in the Budget. In fact, there are real tax increases for most Australians. That is the situation that is applauded by our Premier. In today's *The West Australian*, the Premier was reported as follows—

He congratulated the Federal Government "for sticking to its planned economic path in the face of criticism from many quarters".

That planned economic path is designed to redistribute resources from the productive sectors to the non-productive sectors. Quite clearly there is to be no tax relief and real tax paid is to be increased, supported by the Premier of Western Australia.

As I indicated earlier, we have seen a temporary deferral of the capital gains tax, death duties and the fringe benefits tax. I wonder why the imposition of those taxes was deferred. I suspect they were deferred because there will be an election in both South Australia and Western Australia prior to 1 July next year. The statement that those taxes would not be introduced until 1 July next year had nothing to do with the difficulty in administration of those taxation measures; it had everything to do with the political implications thereof.

We on this side of the House oppose quite vehemently capital gains taxes, death duties and the fringe benefits tax as it has been proposed. The capital gains tax is nothing more nor less than a savage tax on small businesses and, in particular, the rural community of this State. The rural backlash is already strong, but it will be increased significantly if a capital gains tax or death duties are imposed.

There seems to be no understanding by the Prime Minister, the Premier or any other person sitting on the other side of the House that the only real incentive left to business is the hope of a capital gain when one sells a business. The Prime Minister, the Premier and those opposite do not understand that the Opposition is opposed in principle to capital gains taxes no matter what their form. Neither do they understand that if we are to get taxation under control we must first get expenditure under control. As John Howard has said, tax reform as proposed by the Hawke Labor Government and talked about by the Burke Labor Government is merely shuffling the deck chairs on the *Titanic*. Such tax reform will do nothing to stop the sinking of the ship.

The proposed fringe benefit tax to be imposed on the employer is, as the member for South Perth would say, discriminatory in the extreme. It represents a double payroll tax. The State Government lauds the fact that it has made a reduction in the rate of payroll tax. A fringe benefits tax would impose a double payroll tax. The Government has very little to say about that. It mouths words about the implications for housing in the north-west but would we exempt from a fringe benefits or perks tax housing in the north-west, the south-west, or anywhere else? Administration of such a tax will be very expensive. In fact, the determining of what is and what is not a perk will be extremely expensive and difficult.

The only answer to real tax reform is expenditure control. We do not want the Premier of this State to hedge by saying that we will have a capital gains tax provided it takes into account a, b, c, d and e. The Opposition does not want a capital gains tax at all. We want expenditure control and real tax reform. The people of Western Australia will certainly give the Premier that indication at the first available opportunity.

The Federal Budget made a very small contribution to the plight of the rural sector. I hope that my colleague, the member for Katanning-Roe, will go into detail on that later. The 2.4c a litre rebate of excise on diesel fuel is—

Mr Peter Jones: Pathetic!

Mr MacKINNON: As my colleague, the member for Narrogin says, that rebate is a pathetic contribution. It also highlights the hypocrisy of our Premier with respect to fuel costs. In August 1983, just after the first Budget of the Government described by my Tasmanian colleague as the "Hawke socialist Government", the Premier wrote in the "Political Notes" column in *The West Australian* of Thursday, 25 August 1983—

However, the increase in the fuel costs is of concern because the burden will not be spread equally, but will fall more heavily on country people and businesses.

Thus, in 1983 the Premier expressed concern about increases in fuel costs.

At the breakfast I attended this morning, the Premier said, "I welcome what has happened with respect to the 2.4c, but more relief should have been provided." More relief can be provided by the State Government. More relief will be provided when we are returned to office. We have given a commitment that the State fuel levy will be abolished on our return to Government. All that this Government can do through people like the member for Mundaring and the Minister for Transport is tell us that we cannot abolish the levy because that would affect the road funding programme. We have made a commitment that abolition of the fuel excise levy will not interfere with the road funding programme.

We shall abolish the fuel tax and shall maintain road funding in this State. There has been a clear cop-out by the Premier who before and since the last election has been travelling around the country mouthing platitudes about fuel tax but has done absolutely nothing about them. The Premier has the power in his hands to give real relief to match the Commonwealth's action and to give a further lead to the Commonwealth to reduce the tax even more. He says that it cannot be done because it will affect the road funding programme. The Opposition has given the commitment that it will not affect the road funding programme and that it will provide real relief in this area. The solution to the Premier's concern lies squarely at his feet, he should pick up the ball and run with it before he is rolled over by the backlash that is mounting daily in the rural areas.

The Federal Budget, again supported by the Premier, continues to mortgage our future. I am surprised that the Premier as a family man is not concerned at the growing indebtedness of

this country. I studied economics at university but it is not necessary to have done so to understand that when money is borrowed it has to be paid back. The more one goes into debt the more it costs to service the debt and the less money is available to service other needs in the community.

The figures I will now quote are taken directly from the Federal Budget papers. In 1982-83 in regard to debt servicing as published the Federal Budget, the amount of funds allocated for this purpose as a proportion of total Commonwealth outlay was 6.7 per cent. In 1985-86 the amount allocated to debt servicing as a proportion of total outlay is estimated at 9.7 per cent. Had we not had that increase in the order of \$2 000 million a year, imagine the tax relief that could have been given to the community. Had we not put ourselves into hock by 45 per cent in those three years, the situation would be quite different.

The Budget deficit has been cut back in real terms but despite that fact—and I take my figures directly from the Budget papers—the third largest outlay as a proportion of the total GDP is public debt interest. It ranks equally with health costs in this country. We are spending more on servicing debt than on defence, more at a Commonwealth level than on education, and five times more than is spent on housing.

My main concern about the public debt and the deficit is that we are supposedly—if we listen to Federal and State Government advisers—in a state of economic recovery. Times are supposedly good, things are looking up and everything is bright. If things are looking bright, what will happen when they look grim? What reserves shall we have to fall back on? The only option available will be to further increase that debt and place ourselves further into hock until such time that it is inevitable that we shall have to take significant cuts in our standard of living to put things right. That is happening in some ways today. The Treasurer admitted that the workers in this country must take real wage cuts in the next two years and that situation has been caused by the bad economic management of the Commonwealth Government.

Amendment to Motion

In the light of these facts I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the Address-in-Reply:

But we regret to advise Your Excellency that the Government has failed to protect the taxation interests of Western Australians, and in particular:

- (a) has endorsed a Federal budget which will ensure a continuation of high levels of taxation;
- (b) has supported those elements of the Federal taxation proposal (Option C) which include the proposition of capital gains taxation, death duties and a tax on employee benefits;
- (c) has opposed the removal of the State fuel franchise levy; and
- (d) has supported policies which have massively increased the total public debt, and has resulted in an increasing percentage of revenue being committed to public debt servicing.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [3.45 p.m.]: I second the amendment. It contains a number of elements which indicate a very real concern about the direction this State Government is taking in terms of its attitude to taxation. It is those attitudes I want to explore.

If the State Government were to exercise whatever influence it has in Canberra and was prepared to take up the issues in a public way it is possible that things might have been different. The Government has not been prepared to do so. It has not taken a stand or been willing to respond to its own inquiries as to the attitudes of Western Australians on taxation.

The first point in the amendment moved by my colleague is that the Government has endorsed a Federal Budget which will ensure a continuation of high levels of taxation. A report in *The West Australian* this morning—I do not believe it has been contradicted—states the following—

The WA Premier, Mr Burke, said last night that the Budget was an economically conservative document which promoted growth and a fairer society.

He congratulated the Federal Government "for sticking to its planned economic path in the face of criticism from many quarters."

Mr Burke said that the Federal Government had been rewarded with a surprisingly low deficit of \$4.9 billion, supported by a real increase in outlays of only 1.3 per cent.

The concessions to primary producers were particularly welcome in WA.

He was delighted that a gold tax was not imposed.

That was a very neat summary of the Premier's attitude and since that statement he has been on the radio attacking anyone who questions the Budget.

Let us consider the question of the deficit of \$4.9 billion upon which the Premier is congratulating the Federal Government. Let us point out a simple fact: We are loading our young people with a phenomenal liability for the future. No attempt has been made by the Federal Labor Government to do anything about that liability. It is no credit to the Federal Government that it has lowered the deficit to \$4.9 billion; it is a condemnation of it that it has spent or proposes to spend \$4.9 billion more than it raises in revenue. Let it be remembered that the \$4.9 billion deficit will take Australia's total accumulated debt to \$100 billion, that is, \$100 000 million. In relation to our young people, who are supposed to be the subject of some concern and compassion in this Budget, I point out a simple fact: The \$100 000 million accumulated debt now saddling Australia represents \$20 000 for every Australian under the age of 20 years. Why pick on this group? Very simply because they are the people who will have to pay it back. They will be saddled with the debt. It is a real debt, not a paper one; it is not a magical debt just because it has been incurred by Government. The Premier of this State is commending the Federal Government for spending \$4.9 billion more than it has.

The other thing which the Premier did was to praise the Government for having increased outlays by only 1.3 per cent in real terms. Of course there should have been a reduction in outlays. The situation in which we go on increasing Federal Government spending is something which should have been stopped and reversed.

Then look at the impact of that! On the one hand there is a reduction in the deficit to what the Premier thinks of as only \$4.9 billion. On the other hand there is an increase in expenditure. What does that mean? Simply that there is a massive increase in collections of taxation,

and that is what the Premier is supporting—an increase on a substantial basis of collections in taxation. At a time when the nation desperately needs less Government expenditure and more incentive, more profitability, there is an increase in the collection of taxation.

I suppose it is inevitable that the Burke Government should support that because it follows the pattern of this Federal Government which has increased massively the collections of taxation. This Budget estimates an increase in the collections of PAYE tax of more than 13 per cent. Some of that might come from a growth in employment, but that in turn depends on all the other Budget factors coming to pass as predicted by the Treasurer, and there is very real reason to doubt the possibility of that occurring.

The simple truth is that this Budget increases expenditure, increases the collections of taxation, and at the same time offers no tax relief whatever. What is absolutely certain now is that when we see the other half of the Budget we will see the rest of the nasties coming out. We almost certainly will see a capital gains tax. We will certainly see an employee benefit tax, which is, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition so accurately said, a double payroll tax. We will see a persecution of taxpayers. A massive expenditure is incurred in this Budget for a whole raft of staff, I think about 800—

Mr Williams: It is 900.

Mr HASSELL: Nine hundred, is it? That is for the Taxation Office to persecute taxpayers. It is a sad commentary that the best this Federal Government can do, an action which is so completely supported by the Premier of this State, is to increase the persecution of taxpayers, as if there has not been enough of that already in recent years.

Let me say to the House very clearly that before this financial year is out people in Australia will rise up in anger about this deliberately structured plan to get hold of taxpayers and make their lives miserable; to question their entitlements, and put them through the hoops over every claim they make.

We have seen already the introduction of the abolition of the so-called negative gearing. That is the first of these taxes, and it is not opposed by the Premier of this State. We will see further taxes come in with the support of the Premier of this State.

Let me remind the House what the Premier said at the taxation summit. This was his speech on 1 July 1985 to the national tax summit—

The Western Australian Government believes the Commonwealth's preferred option provides the framework—I repeat, the framework—within which reform is best addressed.

What was that framework? It was for the introduction of a particularly tough consumption tax, the introduction of a capital gains tax, the abolition of negative gearing, and the introduction of the double payroll tax. The Premier went on record at the national tax summit as saying he believed those taxes form a framework for reform. He is not going to be allowed to forget the fact that he is in support of those taxes.

He goes on to say—

And in this context, if the package includes a capital tax, consideration should be given to various modifications or options.

It is very clear that the Premier supports a capital gains tax, a consumption tax, the abolition of negative gearing, and the introduction of double payroll tax, and he makes no bones about that.

He put it very clearly on the record when he said in the *North West Telegraph* of 26 June 1985—

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

That clearly spells out the story.

There is also the interpretation of the Premier's stance at the taxation summit in *The Australian* of 2 July. The headline reads—

Burke supports Option C, but calls for changes.

The article goes on—

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

There is the position. Where he is talking about the capital gains tax, he talks about some exceptions. Where he is talking about "only qualifications"; where he is talking about consumption tax, he is talking about a tax on perks he is talking about making an exception

for the iron ore industry. That is because he was visiting the north-west and the Pilbara at the time, and he was in one of the Labor seats.

The only place where the Premier put things straight was when he was talking about the gold tax and he said, "We do not want a gold tax in any circumstances."

One can contrast his position. When he talks about the gold tax he makes his position clear. When he talks about the capital gains tax his position is clear, he supports it. He is right to oppose the gold tax, as you would well know, Mr Deputy Speaker, but he would have been right if he had opposed the capital gains tax. He would have been right to oppose the perks tax because it is not a perks tax. It is not a tax on perks, it is a double tax on expenditure made to employees. It is a doubling of payroll tax. But that has been supported by the Premier of this State. The people of this State will not be allowed to forget that the Premier of this State is supporting a capital gains tax and the doubling of the payroll tax, as employers are hit with this taxation on payments they make to their employees.

The situation is very unsatisfactory when the State is represented by a Government which will not even take in any ideas from opinions it has obtained from its own inquiries. I refer to the inquiries undertaken by the Government when it was investigating the attitude of the public of Western Australia to taxation. When it made those inquiries it had the clearest indication from an overwhelming majority that people were opposed to capital gains tax, and they were opposed to death duties. Member should not forget that the capital gains tax proposed by the Federal Government increases the element of death duties because it imposes a tax on the basis of notional profits as an assumed disposition in the case of death.

All these things are to the detriment of the Western Australian people. What the Western Australian people desperately needed from the tax summit was real tax relief. Real tax relief would have been a reduction in taxation.

There can be no reduction in taxation until there is a reduction in expenditure. There is no reduction of expenditure in the Budget; there is only an increase in expenditure, and that has been praised by the Premier of Western Australia. The Premier has committed himself to the support of increases in expenditure by saying, "Well, it is very good that Mr Keating has been able to restrain himself to this extent." The Premier of the State should have

said very clearly that there should have been a reduction in real terms in Federal expenditure because it is not only what Western Australia needs, it is also what every other State in Australia needs.

That is why we on this side of the House have made the commitment to abolish the fuel franchise levy and the financial institutions duty, and in doing so, impose a real restraint on the Government of Western Australia. The Premier is living off a one-off windfall, on money obtained from Barrow Island. No doubt we will see all sorts of goodies pop up in the Budget and all sorts of packages for the Labor Party's marginal seats in an attempt to buy votes for the election; but there will not be a commitment to restraint such as the one made by the Liberal Party of this State.

When we said we would abolish the State fuel franchise levy, the Premier came out immediately and attacked the proposition. Notwithstanding that criticism, the Premier has the capacity to abolish that levy by being prepared to exercise just a modicum of restraint.

I refer to the Premier's Press release No. 285 dated 28 July 1985, which states as follows—

The Premier, Brian Burke, today called on Liberal Leader Mr Bill Hassell to reconsider and explain in detail his proposed abolition of the State fuel levy.

Then he went on to say, adopting his usual fearmongering tactics, that it would cost the State and that people would lose out on road funding. I demonstrated yesterday that nobody was going to lose out on anything; all that will happen is that a good deal of waste and duplication will be eliminated without undermining any services of this State. The abolition of the levy will put the State Government in the position of being disadvantaged, by way of reduced income. No-one will be disadvantaged by the abolition of the State fuel franchise levy, except that the Government will have to restrain its expenditure, extravagances and waste. Yet this Government has come out hot and strong against the proposal. As I said, the Premier rushed out a Press release—he could not get it off the presses quickly enough—and a few days later, at the Country Shire Councils Association conference a letter was distributed which has since been sent to every councillor in the State setting out in great detail why it is simply impossible to restrain the level of State

expenditure which would be necessary as a result of getting rid of the State fuel franchise levy.

All I am saying in support of a very clear amendment is simply, that by endorsing the Federal Budget—which is a bad Budget; we have not seen the end of its badness, because we have still to cop the new taxes which will come down next month—this Government has failed to protect the interests of Western Australia in relation to taxation. This Government has endorsed option C which was put up at the Tax Summit, and it has endorsed the taxes foreshadowed by option C.

If all this was not enough, when the Premier came back from the Tax Summit his statement recorded in the newspaper was to the effect that Mr Hawke and Mr Keating were the best things Australia had going for it. The Tax Summit was a complete debacle and waste of time. The Government did not have the courage to carry through its own plans, not because it could not get support for some of those measures from some of the people there but because the ACTU vetoed them. It was as simple as that: The union movement vetoed them. The Premier failed this State, and failed to represent the results of his own inquiry into the attitude of the Western Australian people towards taxation. He has now endorsed a Budget which will do us no good at all and which carries on in the wrong direction, as in previous years. The Premier will reap the rewards of being so friendly with Mr Hawke, Mr Keating and the ACTU. He will no doubt receive accolades but the price he will pay with the people of this State and Australia as they realise what he is endorsing and what he is doing will be very high indeed.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balgownie—Premier) [4.06 p.m.]: I do not wish to take the full time allotted to me to answer the points made by the Leader of the Opposition, because with all due respect to his arguments it was a fairly long and tired refrain made once again in its fairly negative and non-constructive fashion. I do not want to take the opportunity presented to put to the House the positive side of the Budget as we perceive it and then make the important point that I think needs to be made on all sides of the political spectrum about the discounting of wages or the devaluation of the Australian dollar and the retention of the benefits of that devaluation.

The first point of consideration should be the size of the deficit. The predicted deficit of \$4.919 billion in the Budget brought down by

Mr Keating last night is 2.1 per cent of the GDP. That compares with 3.3 per cent in 1984-85, and 4.3 per cent in 1983-84.

The Budget deficit for the last year of the Fraser Government was 2.7 per cent of the GDP.

Mr Laurance: Did you get thrown out of office?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I think that was part of the reason the Fraser Government was thrown out.

Mr Hassell: It has been two years since then and there have been thousands upon thousands of dollars added to the deficit.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition did not listen because I read the following statistics: In 1984-85, the deficit was 3.3 per cent of the GDP; in 1983-84 it was 4.3 per cent of the GDP. I tried to explain to the House that in terms of the GDP, the Budget deficit is falling pleasingly. Members of the Opposition may say that the deficit is not falling quickly enough and that it is still of dangerous proportions but they cannot argue with the direction in which it is moving because if one compares it with the last year the Liberal Party was nationally responsible for this country's economy, as a proportion of GDP, one sees Labor's Budget deficit is lower. The Fraser Budget of 1983-84 contained a deficit of 4.3 per cent of GDP.

Mr Laurance: That is a hell of an increase.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The election was held in December 1983 so that was the last Fraser Budget; I do not want to be unfair, because that was the back-end of Fraser. I am taking the last four years of the Fraser Government and the present year of the Hawke Government in order to obtain a fair comparison. However, if members opposite wish to take the last Fraser Budget—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not trying to score a political point; I am trying to point out to members opposite that they may argue that it is too great a proportion and that it is dangerously large, but they cannot argue that the Budget brought down by the Hawke Government is not going in the right direction. Members opposite have just been hoist with their own petard to the extent that their criticism of the Hawke Government, as vocal as it is, really rings hollow when one considers the performance of the Federal Liberal Government that went uncriticised by its colleagues in this State.

It is very important to compare the domestic deficit that is predicted in the present Budget, with that which Malcolm Fraser was responsible for recording in his last full year as Prime Minister. The domestic deficit predicted in the Federal Budget brought down last night is \$1.4 billion, and that is \$1 billion less than in the last full year of the Fraser Government.

Mr Hassell: What is the projected deficit?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: \$4.919 billion. For the first time in 17 years the Federal Government has met the constraints of the trilogy so that the taxation as a share of GDP—

Mr MacKinnon: The trilogy was an invention of the Prime Minister.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Whatever the trilogy means, it has for the first time in 17 years met the financial estimates. The deficit has been wound back remarkably well to less than \$5 billion.

Mr Clarko: That is the worst deficit this country has ever seen, apart from his other two deficits.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Members are contradicting each other on that side of the Parliament now. I am trying to make a point, although of course I should just engage in the sort of negative slanging that the Opposition seems to find comfortable. I am trying to seriously draw out some of the positive aspects from the Budget presented last evening. The one I was touching upon was the matter of constraints upon the Federal Government, which for the first time have been met by a Federal Government.

In addition to that, the Leader of the Opposition makes great play out of the fact that real outlays will rise by 1.4 per cent. He says that what we need is a real reduction. There are not many economic commentators who would support him in that, but let me point out to him the inflexibility that Governments face.

No-one would say that in the area of defence, for example, we do not need to provide more resources to ensure that this country is adequately defended. In that area an increase of 3.1 per cent in real terms was made in the Keating Budget last evening. The Leader of the Opposition is, by implication at least, saying that we need to pull back on defence and to reduce spending in real terms. Defence is such a big proportion of the National Government's outlays that it is difficult to go past it when considering where reductions should be made.

If the Leader of the Opposition believes we should be cutting back in defence spending, then he is at odds with the Government of this State, because we believe that to be one area where real increases can be justified.

The compelling point is that in Federal budgetary terms a real increase of 1.3 to 1.4 per cent in total outlays is an unheard of prudence, an unheard of caution in expenditure terms—unheard of prudentially or cautionary during the time of Liberal Governments.

Mr Clarko: That is because it is on the highest level it has ever been. It is like having a man nine feet tall and saying it is only half an inch more.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Fraser Government never met the trilogy, so in terms of increases in real outlays—

Mr Trethowan: Can you confirm that the Fraser Government never met that restraint in terms of total outlays?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am sorry, I do not have the percentages, but I can tell the member as far as the trilogy is concerned and the restraints imposed on the Federal Government, the Fraser Government never met that.

Several members interjected.

Mr Hassell: It is getting uncomfortable!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not getting uncomfortable at all, but if the Leader of the Opposition wants a political slanging match, that is what we will revert to. The member for East Melville asked me whether I could confirm that the Fraser Government never met that restraint in terms of total outlays. I said I did not have the percentage increases. He then said that on two occasions it meant a restraint, a ceiling of two per cent. I am not trying to run away from the argument but I do not have the figures.

Mr Trethowan: That is quite contrary to what you said a moment ago.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is not, but if the member for East Melville wants to carry on that argument I do not have the statistics that he perhaps refers to. If he would pass them to his leader, perhaps the argument could be solved.

As I indicated previously, the increase of 1.3 to 1.4 per cent in real growth in total outlays is something of which the Federal Government can rightly be proud.

Mr Clarko: That is only because it is a small percentage—it is the biggest figure that this country has had in real terms. That is why it is a small percentage.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This sort of result is similar to the situation which existed in this State last year, when our total expenditure increased to 6.8 per cent, and it is commendable. One may argue that it is not severe enough. One may argue, as did the Leader of the Opposition, that there should be a real reduction in Government outlays. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to argue that, he should propose where those reductions should be made, whether in defence, education, immigration—

Mr Clarko: The Medicare system.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Karrinyup now starts to be more precise. He wants real reductions in health. I can tell the House that one of the most difficult things for any State Government is to wind back health expenditures, and as far as that area is concerned it is intractable; it is an area in which people have been taught, quite rightly I presume, to expect a certain level of treatment.

Mr Clarko: I said Medicare, and you say health. Be honest, everybody in this room is listening to you, and you twisted it to health. It is the worst health system we have had.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As far as the arguments by the Opposition are concerned, they fall desperately short of being anything more than extremely negative, and members of the Opposition are being extremely indefinite as to where the reduction will come from. There can be no real reduction in expenditure. It is all very well for the Opposition to say it wants real reductions in expenditure and then sit back. Where does the Opposition want them?

Mr Clarko: Medicare.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Divorcing Medicare from the health system, if that is possible—

Mr Clarko: Change the system—it is a rotten one. We had a better system 10 years ago.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Karrinyup wants no reductions, he wants a change in Medicare.

Whether the Opposition likes it or not, we have had two solid years of economic growth.

Mr Clarko: It had nothing to do with the Labor Government. It was a result of two things, the American economy and the breaking of the drought.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We have had two years of sound economic growth, but that is nothing to do with the Labor Government.

Mr Clarko: That's right, it had nothing to do with the Labor Government.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I said it had nothing to do with the Labor Government. I am agreeing with the member just to shut him up. I try to agree with the member for Karrinyup, but even that does not shut him up!

We have had two years of solid economic growth for which we take no credit. Secondly, we have had a pleasing decline in the number of unemployed. Now far be it from the Government to take any credit!

Mr Clarko: Tell us what the Government did.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I suggest that the member for Karrinyup reduce the number of his interjections.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have tried seriously to point out the aspects of the conservative economic strategy contained in the Budget: (1) The lower deficit; (2) the meeting of the trilogy; and (3) the reduction of the inevitable previously anticipated increase in total Government outlays nationally. I have also tried to stress that we have had a period of satisfactory economic growth, during which all of the economic indicators relating to retail sales, to fixed private capital investment, to the creation of jobs—

Mr Laurance: What about interest rates?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes, interest rates too. In all of these areas there has been a satisfactory reflection of an economic strategy which appears to be working.

The recovery appears to be set firmly in place and it really is quite mean of the Opposition to pay no tribute at all to any of the achievements of the present Federal Government in that area.

What I want to do now in conclusion is to make one very serious point which I think was not made by the Opposition. I hope we can reach some agreement upon this point within our community, and I refer to the need to discount the coming two wage rounds for the effect of the devaluation of the Australian dollar.

It is of critical importance to accept the argument that lies behind the Federal Treasurer's statement during his Budget address last night. If we wish to forgo completely the benefits of devaluation that came from the floating of the Australian dollar, we will lock ourselves into growth rates of between 2.5 and 3.5 per cent

and we will lock ourselves into a complete inability to run an independent wages or prices policy or an independent economic strategy in this country.

Quite simply put, if we do not succeed in persuading the Federal arbitration commission to defer or discount the coming two wage rounds what we will do is lock ourselves into, probably, the American economy, but certainly a major world economy—probably Japan's—from which we will not be able to break through and this will confiscate from us the ability to run an independent economic strategy.

The key point made in the Federal Treasurer's speech last night was simply this: On the current trading balance situation, the proportion that Australian industry presently enjoys internationally is unsatisfactory. The only way we can increase our market share is to improve our competitiveness. That is the compelling argument behind the Treasurer's address made last evening. To improve our competitiveness and accept our market share, which will give us the capacity to make sure that real living standards do not fall, we need to discount the next two wage rounds for the effect of the falling Australian dollar.

I think I have made it perfectly clear that I accept the amendment moved by the Opposition as being fairly poorly worded and an attempt to engage in some sort of political slinging match in a negative way on an important issue. I have tried to stress the important aspects of the Federal Government's Budget and to highlight in conservative economic thinking some of the more desirable features of it.

I have touched on what I think is the most important thing to be taken up following the Budget, and that is the need to discount the next two wage rounds to avoid the loss completely of the effect of devaluation and to seek an improved market share for Australian industry.

I will make one or two other comments about important matters in the Federal Budget. As a State Government we support the Federal Government's proposition that the financial attraction to young people to leave school or to leave a tertiary institution and to take up the dole should be taken away, and its removal was long overdue. We also support the traineeships that the Federal Government defined in some detail, and we also support the assistance that was given to primary producers, notwithstand-

ing the fact that I am on public record as having said that I believe more assistance could rightly have been given and have been justified.

Mr Hassell: You didn't say that in the paper this morning.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I said it this morning at a public meeting. I did not say a lot of things I have said today in the paper this morning.

Mr Hassell: You said it was welcome.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is welcome. As I said this morning, the argument is not one about direction but about quantum. I am not trying to duck the issue. What I am saying is what I said this morning, which is that the assistance is welcome and a step in the right direction. I said on radio last night and I said this morning that I thought more could have been done. But accepting the constraints imposed upon itself by the Federal Government, I believe it has achieved a great deal.

I reject the amendment moved by the Opposition.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House).

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform) [4.27 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

There are some four broad objectives addressed in this Bill. The first is to provide a better service to electors; the second is to introduce some new initiatives into the State electoral system; the third is to align, as far as is practicable, certain State enrolment procedures with those of the Commonwealth; and the fourth is to streamline or modernise various administrative areas of the Act.

It is not my intention to mention every proposal contained in the 70 clauses as some cannot be said to be of any great significance. However, a set of explanatory notes has been issued to members in which every proposed amendment has been described and I trust this will prove to be helpful.

Let me say that in none of these proposals is the security of our electoral system adversely affected.

Of the four more significant groups of proposals I turn firstly to the objective of providing a better service to electors. The Govern-

ment is firm in its commitment to encourage people to enrol and to vote and wishes this Act to assist electors wherever possible.

To this end the Bill contains the following proposals.

Two concepts are designed to make it easier for people to show their voting intention and to reduce the number of informal votes. The choice of a simplified way of marking the ballot paper is the first of these, proposed through amendment to section 128. Optional preferential voting will be allowed where a voter must mark a first preference and may mark a second or further preference if that is desired. Nothing is taken away, because a voter who marks preferences for all candidates has cast a valid vote, as under current law. I sincerely hope that we do not have to put up with any false nonsense about paving the way to either first-past-the-post or voluntary voting. These are not our policy, intention, or proposal.

The Government believes that electors will be pleased with this reform. When offered a choice between numbering a preference for every candidate or simply a "one" beside the party of their choice, 85 per cent of voters chose the simplified method at the most recent Senate election. The results of a Morgan Gallup Poll published in *The Bulletin* of 12 February this year showed that optional preferential voting was preferred by 66 per cent of Australians. Amongst Liberal voters 60 per cent wanted it while only 35 per cent of these people wished to retain the obligatory marking of all preferences. Grass roots attitudes to electoral reform are well known to be years ahead of the current leadership of the Liberal Party in Western Australia.

In the 1983 State election only 1.56 per cent of preferences were distributed in the Assembly and only 5.6 per cent were distributed in the Council. In other words, well over 90 per cent of electors were compelled to mark preferences that were never examined. Voters are often forced to make a pointless choice between candidates about whom the voter can feel equal abhorrence or complete indifference. Where a contest is likely to be close, voters and political parties will be a lot more interested and then the importance of marking all preferences will be clear.

In another endeavour to reduce the informal vote below the current levels of 2.8 per cent for the Assembly and 3.7 per cent for the Council, clause 57 contemplates the allowance of a vote up to the point of error. Provided a voter has

marked a first preference, a repeated preference or a gap in the order of preferences will not invalidate a vote. Honest but trivial mistakes such as these should be retained in the count so far as the voter's intention is clear, and this is an extension of the wish expressed in the existing section 139(D) and in the Commonwealth Act.

Both of the proposals to make voting easier are similar to the Commonwealth legislation and ensure that any confusion will not work to disadvantage anyone in a State election.

It is proposed to amend sections 139 and 140 by repeal and substitution to focus attention on the real issue which is the voter's intention. The broad effect of restructuring these sections would be to allow other than the strict use of numerals. Of course it will be a condition that the elector's intention be clear which is why no mention is included of accepting a vote marked with a cross in a two-candidate contest because that is an example of a clear intention.

What I believe will be a further substantial aid to electors is contained in the proposition in clause 27. This long overdue piece of commonsense is the inclusion of party designations of candidates on ballot papers. Naturally the inclusion of party designation is at the option of the particular candidate and is achievable by straightforward procedures. Primarily the instruction would be contained in the candidate's nomination paper. Of course I can understand that some members of some political parties would be so ashamed of their party's name that they may not want it alongside their own name.

Party endorsements would be confirmed by an appointed party official countersigning the instruction, by the candidate's name being included in the appropriate party statement of the names of endorsed candidates lodged with the Chief Electoral Officer, or by inquiry by the Chief Electoral Officer. Certain prohibitions are proposed under section 78B, including designations that contain more than six words, those that are obscene, are similar to another party name or acronym, contain more than the words "independent" or "independent party", or suggest Royal patronage or contain the word "Royal".

Clause 56 proposes that certain errors or omissions by polling officials in transcribing party designations onto ballot papers will not lead to informality. However the proposal does not contemplate conferring formality where a

gross error occurs such as inclusion of the wrong party designation against a candidate's name.

It is proposed that life be made a little easier for electors attending at a polling place. For instance, it is intended to remove the present provisions of section 119 that give the right to scrutineers to demand additional questions of electors. I believe that section 118 together with the amended section 119 will afford ample opportunity for the identity of the elector to be determined and sufficient remedy to a scrutineer in whose mind doubt remains. The proposals would leave State procedures somewhat similar to those of the Commonwealth but would permit greater assistance to State electors.

It is neither dignified nor proper that scrutineers be privy to the voting intentions or instructions of electors as is at present mandatory in the section 129 provisions enabling assistance to voters.

Clause 51 is designed to remove the right, indeed obligation, of scrutineers to be present while a voter is being assisted in completing ballot papers. The section will still provide that a polling officer, in the presence of either a person nominated by the elector or another polling officer, shall assist that elector. The Government trusts these people to perform these duties with integrity. I do not believe electors requiring assistance ought to be subject to the immediate gaze of possibly several scrutineers. Scrutineers have a vital and undeniable place in our electoral system but not to undo the secrecy of the vote.

I may say that those of us who were around in the time of the disputed election in Kimberley will never forget the misuse of scrutineers by the Liberal Party at the time when people were flown up from the south in order to deprive many people of their lawful vote. That finding was made by Mr Justice Smith of the Supreme Court. We certainly agree that scrutineers have an important place, but they do not have a right in our opinion to decide what questions will be asked of electors who are obviously entitled to vote. That action by the Liberal Party in the Kimberley election is to the eternal shame of the Liberal Party in Western Australia.

The same clause proposes that how-to-vote cards may form an adequate indication of voting intention by an elector seeking assistance.

It is intended to give electors increased and better facilities in the matter of postal voting. Proposals include that grounds for eligibility for such a vote be extended to those electors on emergency duty or committed to employment during polling hours.

Electors who by reason of permanent disablement or religious belief are unable to attend at a polling place will be entitled to be registered as general postal voters and would thus automatically receive postal ballot papers before an election.

Additional issuing officers are proposed, those being officers appointed by the Minister on the recommendation of the Chief Electoral Officer. It is envisaged that such appointees would be persons of such experience and skill that their services would be of benefit to electors generally. Provided satisfactory working arrangements could be settled Australian Electoral returning officers could well be appointed as issuing officers under these proposals.

By the proposed rearrangement of certain of the provisions of section 90 electors may apply orally in person for postal votes with fewer formalities to complete than at present. This would be a welcome relief to those who do not like completing unnecessary forms, and would in fact be in essence no different from what voters do to get a vote on election day.

The Bill contains the concept that postal votes received by the Chief Electoral Officer up to 9.00 a.m. on the Tuesday following polling day are admissible provided they are completed and posted prior to close of the poll. The purpose of this amendment is to take into account the many votes being disregarded simply because of changes in Australia Post sorting schedules that prevent votes posted well prior to poll closure from being sorted and collected in time for admission.

The final significant factor in elector service relating to postal voting is the proposal to allow issuing officers to issue duplicate ballot papers in the event of loss or destruction. The present provisions can cause unnecessary distress to people who are disfranchised because the original ballot paper is irreplaceable.

Those people unable to make any mark will be able to enrol and vote under proposals contained in clauses 13 and 69. Although I would prefer a world in which such provisions were not necessary, these proposals make clear that assistance to handicapped people should

be extended to enrolment or any electoral duty in the same way as assistance is already possible in voting.

The second objective of the Bill is to introduce new initiatives. A group of these initiatives relate to information and services to members of Parliament and candidates.

Clause 8 proposes that the Chief Electoral Officer provide copies of the latest printed rolls to members and certain other people and organisations. Rolls in order of addresses are also to be provided to political parties once during each Parliament.

In order that more meaningful interpretation may be given to election results it is proposed that returning officers be required to allocate preferences until only two candidates remain notwithstanding that a candidate has been elected on an earlier count.

It is also proposed that returning officers be given the option of recounting all primary votes prior to distributing preferences. The Court of Disputed Returns for the Mundaring District made clear that such a practice was not in accordance with the Electoral Act. I believe that most members who have been involved in close elections would prefer a recheck of primaries prior to distribution of preferences rather than after it.

A different concept for the forfeiture of candidates' deposits is contemplated in clause 29. It is proposed that deposits be forfeited unless the candidate achieves above 10 per cent of the total first preference votes cast. At present the forfeiture applies if the candidate fails to poll 20 per cent of the votes polled by the leading candidate.

So the criteria that apply vary according to whether one is in a closely-voted electorate or not, and candidates receiving the same percentage of the total valid votes cast may in one case forfeit their moneys, and in another not forfeit them depending on how many votes the leading candidate polls. That is quite clearly inequitable.

The application of the proposed 10 per cent threshold to the 1983 State election 26 deposits were forfeited. The present rule is not very fair because a candidate with 2 500 votes could lose his or her deposit in a two candidate contest in a safe electorate but with 2 500 votes could easily retain it in a closely contested electorate where a large group of candidates offered themselves.

If accepted clause 42 would allow candidates to appoint scrutineers to each issuing point in a polling place. Clause 54 would enable the appointment of a number of scrutineers to attend the count, the number per candidate not to exceed the number of officers engaged on the scrutiny.

Further miscellaneous initiatives are proposed and I shall outline them briefly.

The Bill contains several clauses which streamline the schedule of events for State elections. There are alterations to both sequence of events and the times involved which result in a reduction of 14 days which corrects what is an excessively long period by comparison with other States. People do not wish election campaigns to drag on for the length of time unnecessarily forced on us by this Act.

The Government believes that the proposed schedule is practicable, workable, and acceptable to the electorate. It is in fact a couple of days longer than the Commonwealth's minimum period.

In view of the success of the present Commonwealth/State co-operative enrolment procedure, and the more accurate rolls which have resulted from that, the notice of roll closure proposed will give electors time to check their enrolments.

To give adequate notice to electors of the closure of the rolls, that event will occur at 4.00 p.m. on the eighth day after the writ. The hour of nomination will be 4.00 p.m. on the day of nominations. Members will note the similarity with the Commonwealth where experience shows that this schedule is practicable and acceptable to all parties.

As a matter of interest members may note that maximum periods between writ and nomination, and nomination and polling day, have been reduced from 45 days each to 35 and 40 days respectively. This is simply designed to ensure time to count the votes within the 90 day span from writ to return of writ imposed by section 72.

It is proposed that polls close at 6.00 p.m. instead of the present 8.00 p.m. The polls have closed at 6.00 p.m. in other States for some time now, and in the Commonwealth commencing at the 1984 election. There has been little evidence that earlier closure has caused problems in the electorate.

In fact the present late close of polls means that there are long delays and on election day everyone is looking for an early answer. On

election night in future we should have much earlier results and a more accurate indication of the outcome.

The Government has been of the view for some time that the correct way to determine tied votes is by way of lot and not by the casting vote of the returning officer. This principle applies at any stage of the count and proposals for a method to separate equality are contained in the Bill.

Other situations require also that a random selection be made and the procedure is set out in the proposed schedule to the Act. The plan is that names of candidates be placed in opaque hollow spheres and the spheres drawn at random from a ballot box. This procedure would apply also in determining the order of candidates' names on the ballot papers as required by section 86. Incidentally, I do not think we should require our State electoral officers to suffer the indignity of being blindfolded when conducting these draws as is required of their Commonwealth counterparts.

I might add that the reason for the placing of the names in the spheres is that it has been shown quite conclusively when they are placed in envelopes and then in a container in order to shake them around that, in fact, the envelopes stay in the same position, and there is no sorting and random selection. I really think it will be a better way of doing it. Members can test the method of using envelopes themselves in order to see for themselves that the envelopes do not move.

Mr Rushton: Couldn't the returning officer put the names on them?

Mr TONKIN: At present it is laid down in the Act as to how the returning officer can do it and this amendment will give him permission to do it another way.

Clause 67 of the Bill proposes the introduction of the offence of misleading and deceptive publication. The Bill has been drafted along the lines of the equivalent section of the Commonwealth Act. The provision relates to the publication or distribution of material likely to mislead or deceive an elector in the casting of his or her vote, or that is likely to induce an elector to complete a ballot paper contrary to the directions on the ballot paper.

Further proposals are that the occupation of electors should be omitted from electoral rolls, that chief polling places be specifically advertised as a guide for candidates lodging nominations, that votes issued following dec-

larations under sections 119 and 122 of eligibility to vote be placed in envelopes for subsequent checking, and that power be given to adjourn polling for up to 21 days at declared special institutes and hospitals and remote area polling stations as applies in the case of ordinary polling places.

The third objective of the Bill is to align State and Commonwealth enrolment provisions as far as is practicable. It is particularly important that this be achieved because of the current operation of the co-operative enrolment procedure.

I believe it is simpler and more logical to draw the State and Commonwealth enrolment qualifications as close together as is consistent with our own sense of what is fair and right.

There are four such areas that the Bill addresses.

One such proposal is contained in clause 4. Here the intention is to repeal the section 17 requirement that to be eligible for enrolment a person must have lived in Australia for six months. The importance of this qualification in any event has diminished since Australian citizenship became, to all intents and purposes, a prerequisite to enrolment.

The other three proposals are contained in clause 5 in which three new sections are inserted. These proposals firstly seek to confer upon 17-year-olds entitlement to claim enrolment. Such enrolment would not be compulsory and would be provisional in so far as the right to vote and to be enrolled for an election is extended only to those who will have attained 18 years of age by polling day.

I have often been concerned at the injustice which occurs at the present time; that is, that on polling day a person may be 18 years of age and required by law to vote. However, he cannot vote because the rolls have closed two or three weeks prior to the election and even though he applied to go on the roll he was told that he could not do so. Therefore, this amendment will provide, as applies to the Commonwealth Act, that people can provisionally enrol before polling day if they attain the age of 18 by polling day. They have the right to vote and it is their legal right.

The second proposal within this clause is designed to enable people without a permanent residence within the State to enrol. Such persons are termed itinerant electors. There are alternatives available to such electors who may

enrol for district of birth, last place of entitlement to enrol, closest connection, or electorate in which next of kin is enrolled.

The clause finally proposes continued enrolment for those electors temporarily leaving the State. There is a practical difference here between State and Commonwealth as for obvious reasons the Commonwealth Act refers to overseas electors whereas ours will refer to electors absent from the State. Otherwise the provisions are substantially the same. In the proposals relating to both itinerant electors and those temporarily absent from the State there are safeguards against such arrangements being indeterminate without review. For instance, the elector's name would be removed from the roll by reason of failure to vote or apply for a postal vote at a general election.

The final objective of this Bill is to tidy up some areas of general administration that tend to have fallen into disuse or impracticability due to changing facilities, techniques, and times.

The term "Christian name" appearing throughout the Act is to be changed to the less culturally specific "Christian or given name."

Several quaint old-fashioned assumptions about women and marriage are presently a part of the Act. Under clauses 15 and 16 the term "maiden name" is replaced by "name prior to marriage" and it is made clear that married women have a choice about which surname shall appear on the roll.

It is proposed that appeals against registrar's objections to claims and enrolments, the procedures for which are set out in sections 47 and 48, are dealt with by the registrar in the first instance. At present the registrar has no statutory alternative to placing such appeals before a magistrate even though the registrar is fully satisfied that the appeal is well-founded. The proposal simply allows the registrar to discontinue the objection in those circumstances. Of course, if the grounds are not so accepted by the registrar the appeal will be referred to a magistrate as at present.

Clause 17 proposes methods by which modern technology may be applied in the construction and maintenance of electoral rolls.

The Act in its present form requires some unnecessary administrative procedures to be performed and these can be terminated under the proposals.

Present procedures for informing the public of polling places are not well-structured. For example, section 75 seems to envisage the ad-

vertising of polling places in conjunction with advertising receipt of the writ. Although electoral officials have managed to comply with the law in the past, the Act is somewhat untidy. Clauses 23 and 24 propose a better balanced format in that the obligation to publish polling places is removed from the section covering advertising receipt of the writ, at which early time this is difficult, and is relocated in a section of its own in proper sequence. Nothing in the proposals changes the present formal method of appointment of polling places by the Minister by notice in the *Government Gazette*.

The proposed section 75A requires that the chief polling places are advertised as soon as is practicable after the receipt of the writ and that the full list be published in a newspaper or by placards or otherwise at least once before polling day. There is no diminution of service to electors in these proposals.

The provisions for non-voter follow-up procedures were somewhat elderly and were well suited to those days when the number of electors per district were in the hundreds or low thousands.

To allow sensible administration of the compulsory voting provisions the following proposals are made—

The requirement for the unified roll of voters to be prepared in duplicate would be removed because a single roll is all that is required in practical terms. Certain time-consuming and excessive administrative formalities in the maintenance of records would be removed, without loss of completeness or accuracy. At present people may be fined for giving inadequate reasons for failing to vote. It is proposed that people may also be fined for failing to reply or properly fill out the "please explain" form. The Chief Electoral Officer may at present only launch a prosecution against such people when they may prefer the option of paying the fine rather than going to court. Electors retain the right to take the matter to court if they wish.

This Bill is an important part of the Government's electoral reform programme. Promises made to Western Australian electors are contained in many clauses and the proposals build on from the start made in 1983 when a single card witnessed by any citizen became all that was required for enrolment for both State and Commonwealth elections. The main result of that reform was that our rolls had something like 100 000 names added to them, or a 13 per

cent increase, which demonstrates that the rolls upon which the last State election was based were disgracefully inaccurate. Our legislation should assist electors to enrol and to vote and these two processes, central to a democratic community, should be made as easy and straightforward as is possible.

I guess that is where the Government parts company most noticeably with the Opposition, in its belief that it is the Government's duty to make it as easy as possible to vote and to make the right to vote as accessible as possible. State and Commonwealth electoral arrangements should, where possible, be similar. The rich experience of the people in the State Electoral Department has identified many improvements to assist electors and to make the 1907 Act more efficient. I pay tribute to the chief electoral officer, Mr Ray Shaw, and his staff for many of the proposals that have come forward. These proposals are a result of their rich experience over many years. There is no doubt that the people of Western Australia have been richly and well served by the Electoral Department of the State, and its only deficiency, to which I referred earlier, was the result of policies of the previous Government and cannot be laid at the door of the officers who serve in the Electoral Department.

The goal of these proposals is to reform the Act so that it may better assist voters, candidates, members, and political parties. The Bill achieves these goals and is consistent with maintaining fairness and complete faith in the electoral process.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Mensaros.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform) [4.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The principal reason for this Bill coming before the House is to introduce into the State's distribution of electoral boundaries procedures provision to make opportunity for inputs earlier in the process than at present.

The Act at present simply requires the electoral commissioners to inquire, recommend, and publish proposed alterations, and thereafter consider written objections before presenting their recommendations. Generally

participation by interested parties is limited, and, in practical terms, quite late in the process.

Though there seems to be no hindrance under the Statute for people to present their views prior to the commissioners' publishing their proposals, when the Act is silent the presentation of such views may be seen by some as tantamount to improper influence. Thus possibly helpful and innovative material may well be denied to the commissioners.

The proposals require the commissioners to invite suggestions relating to the distribution of boundaries, to invite comments on them, and to consider such suggestions and comments. The time schedules proposed are these—

Suggestions to be received by the commissioners within 30 days of the notice of invitation. Copies of these suggestions are to be made public.

Comments on the above suggestions to be in hand within the next 14 days.

Commissioners' initial proposals to be published within 42 days of expiry of the comment period above.

Objections to the initial redistribution proposals may be made within 30 days of their publication.

After the commissioners have considered the objections, the fixed redistribution is to be presented to the Governor within 60 days of the close of the period for objections.

The Act also requires the publication of the redistribution. The whole redistribution process could take approximately six months under these proposals.

By making the initial suggestions available to the public and inviting further comments on these suggestions the participants will probably provide the commissioners with insights as a result of this cross-examination process. The initial proposals made by the commissioners are subject to a similar process of scrutiny and comment. The overall effect is intended to be the production of a better and therefore accepted redistribution. Electoral commissioners should continue to draw on other sources of information and assistance in their work if they believe this will help them.

To use the word "acceptance" in relation to any redistribution within the parameters of this Act must be heavily qualified. The term "acceptance" is qualified by an Act which presently prescribes gerrymandered boundaries

and enforces malapportioned enrolments and until such time as these features are reformed there can never be full acceptance of any redistribution.

I turn now to a further objective of the Bill.

The second proviso to section 7 of the Electoral Districts Act requires the commissioners to give due consideration to community of interest, means of communication and distance from the capital, physical features, and existing boundaries of districts.

The Bill contains the proposal in clause 6 that the trend of demographic changes be included with these criteria. Electoral commissioners appear to have given some consideration to the trend of demographic change in past redistributions even though the Act has been silent on this significant matter. This is desirable so that the number of disruptive redistributions may be minimised. For example, in the most recent redistribution of boundaries which took place in 1981, the range of enrolments struck by the electoral commissioners was 14 per cent in the metropolitan area.

Joondalup was set 8.5 per cent below the metropolitan quota while Melville was set 5.5 per cent above. Where growth was predictable in districts such as Joondalup and Murdoch, enrolments should have all been set low and in fact were in 1981. Districts like Victoria Park, Clontarf, and Nollamara are now well below average and should therefore have been set higher in the beginning instead of being set below the average as they were.

Keeping in mind that this Act permits a margin of allowance of 15 per cent above or below the average enrolment in the agricultural, mining, and pastoral area, the 1981 redistribution figures show that the range of enrolments there was 16.3 per cent. Warren was set seven per cent below the agricultural, mining, and pastoral quota while Avon was set 9.3 per cent above. Dale, Mitchell, and Mandurah are now high and should have begun life among the lowest enrolment districts, but the highest growth area of Dale commenced life with an enrolment already above average. If information was available about population trends, seats like Warren should never have been set low initially because their lack of growth has meant that they are now well below average.

I trust that it is apparent from these remarks that a key reason for preparing this sensible addition to the criteria for redistribution is to

encourage the commissioners to bring forward a set of boundaries that is likely to remain accurate for a longer period.

The 10 per cent margin of allowance can assist in achieving this goal in normal population trends.

Enrolments are significant because the only evidence which may bring about a redistribution is when at an election eight or more districts exceed their enrolment quotas by more than 20 per cent. The force of this provision was proved in 1961 when a reluctant Liberal Government—surprise, surprise—was forced by the Supreme Court to a redistribution. It is because the Act uses strict enrolment criteria to make and unmake electoral redistributions that the Act should endorse commonsense and make clear that the electoral commissioners are to take the trend of demographic changes into account.

The proposals would re-order the Act into this sequence—

Appointment of Commissioners—Section 2

Commencement of Distribution Process—Section 2A

Commissioners' Functions and the Process Selection—Section 3

Bases and Criteria for Distribution—Section 4-9

Promulgation and Commencement of Recommendations—Section 11

Requirement for Absolute Majority for Amendment to Act—Section 13

Schedule of Statutory Boundaries—Schedules 1 and 2.

The mechanism proposed for achievement of this is to insert section 2A, repeal and re-enact section 3, repeal section 10 and transfer its purpose to section 3, repeal and re-enact section 11, and repeal section 12 and transfer its contents in part to sections 2A and 11.

Nobody should think, because this Bill does not remedy the fundamental defects of the Electoral Districts Act, that the Government resiles from its determination and responsibility to legislate the principles and machinery of a fair electoral system.

The Electoral Districts Act as it stands makes unfair discrimination between citizens of this State into the law. The Act reserves also to Parliament the drawing of the actual electoral boundaries of: The four districts and two provinces in the North-West-Murchison-Eyre area,

the boundary of the agricultural, mining, and pastoral area, and the boundary of the metropolitan area. A political party in control of both Houses of Parliament, as the Liberal Party was in 1981, has drawn electoral boundaries and determined the allocation of the numbers of districts and provinces. This is a disgraceful situation which has been cynically exploited. Personally, I find it hard to understand how members can sit in this House knowing that by their fingers on the crayon they are only sitting in this place because they have dishonestly prescribed those boundaries. Measures to guarantee to every elector the right to a vote equal in value to any other vote and to ensure all electoral boundaries are drawn by electoral commissioners were a part of the rejected Fair Representation Bill of 1984.

This Bill proposes amendments which do not affect representation to Parliament. The amendments therefore do not deal with the democratic allocation of power, but rather with less central matters. It is the belief of the Government that the people should have the opportunity to participate more in the redistribution process and that there are many people in our community who have the knowledge to make useful contributions. The legitimacy of the power of Parliament will be marginally enhanced by inviting greater public participation in the electoral redistribution process.

But the proposed amendments are not the substantial reforms that are vital. Like spackle on a cracked wall they make the house better looking and more livable but they do not attend to the faulty foundations which produced the crack. The main task of reform of representation to Parliament remains and will continue to be among the top priorities of this Government.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Mensaros.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY

Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR OLD (Katanning-Roe) [5.01 p.m.]: I was quite amazed at the figures cited by the Premier relating to the percentage of GDP of the deficits of past Governments, and while I do not dispute their accuracy I do question his sincerity in not going back a little further. His figures clearly showed that the Hawke Labor Government was practising some efficiency. However, let us look at the records of the past

three Federal Governments. The Whitlam Government's average increase of Budget outlays was 10 per cent per annum. This is probably—and I hope, historically—an all-time record. The seven Budgets brought down by the Fraser Government averaged increases of 2.1 per cent per annum, while the past two Budgets, excluding the present one, of the Hawke Government averaged increases of 7.1 per cent per annum. During the Fraser years the Labor Opposition perpetrated a con trick on the electors of Australia when a first-run Budget from the Fraser Government was leaked. That first-run Budget showed a deficit of something like \$9 billion. The previous highest deficit was \$4.4 billion, although, despite the assertions of the Premier, the first-run was even higher than that. The \$9 billion, as I say, was a first-run Budget. I would be prepared to bet that the first-run Budget of the one just being considered by the Government of Western Australia would have been quite horrendous.

If the Premier denies that I would challenge him to table his first-run Budget and let the public have a look at the way budgeting is carried out. A first-run Budget is a bid by Ministers on behalf of their departments for a slice of the action and naturally they come in pretty heavily. By the time the Budget has been before the Cabinet three or four times it decreases to a figure which becomes almost the final figure. Thus Mr Hawke was able to say to the public of Australia, "Look, Fraser's Budget is going for a \$9 billion deficit. I can do it for \$7 billion". Bear in mind the fact that the previous highest deficit was \$4.4 billion. Unfortunately, the electors of Australia fell for Mr Hawke's ploy. The first Budget deficit of the Hawke Government was \$7.9 billion. Of course, it is very easy to improve on that record and it is easy for the Premier to cite a few figures and then tell this Parliament how well the Hawke Government is going. The Hawke Government may have brought the deficit down, but so it should have; it had plenty of room to move. Any Government that could not bring that deficit down is not worthy of being called a Government.

The Premier was quick to point out that the deficit in the last Fraser Budget represented 4.3 per cent of GDP. That is not quite right. The deficit in the first Hawke Budget was 4.3 per cent, the next was 3.3 per cent and the following was 2.1 per cent of GDP. Prior to that the deficit was 2.7 per cent of GDP. The highest deficit previously was the 4.9 per cent during the Whitlam era, preceded by 4.1 per cent; and

that figure was preceded by 0.5 of a per cent. Thus, to say that the Hawke Government's Budget is an exercise in good budgeting is to mislead this House.

I want to make a few remarks on some of the items which affect the rural industry and primary industry generally. The full rebate on diesel fuel of 2.4c is being hailed as a great coup by this Government, and by people throughout Australia who do not know what they are talking about. This 2.4c rebate applies only to farmers and fishermen. All it does is to restore their rightful exemptions from excise on diesel fuel—something which has been recognised in recent years. The cost to the Government will be \$25 million this year and \$46 million in a full year. There are 170 000 farmers in Australia. One must bear in mind that this rebate applies to fishermen as well as to farmers, but I have excluded fishermen for the purpose of this exercise. Thus this rebate represents a figure of approximately \$270 for every farmer in a full year. What a great rebate that is to an industry which is on its knees!

When the Liberal Party came out with a proposal to abolish the fuel franchise levy of 2.17c a litre on petrol and about 3.9c on distillate, our opponents expressed great derision. At one stage they claimed that this proposal would benefit farmers in this State by something in the order of only \$600 per farmer. Now our opponents are lauding a move by the Federal Government to give farmers an average rebate of only \$270. If one takes the fishermen into account when making the calculations, the return will probably be more like \$230 or \$240. What a great rebate that is!

The tariff on agricultural chemicals remains, and that is one of the highest inputs today in the agricultural industry. I believe the Government made a good move when it declared it would replace the tariff on farm machinery with a subsidy or a bounty, but there was no commitment to ease the tariff on agricultural chemicals.

In the words of the Federal Treasurer, there is a "disposition" to relieve the situation. A disposition does not put one cent into the pockets of the farming community. In my opinion a disposition is an excuse for not doing anything, and until the Federal Government is prepared to pick up the ball on tariffs generally and run with it, we are not going to get anywhere in efforts to ease the problems facing the farming community.

The price of chemicals has to be looked at very seriously by the Federal Government, and the tariff impost on chemicals has to be very seriously curtailed before any relief can be felt by the farming industry.

The Federal Government has allocated \$7 million over four years for marketing assistance to the meat and livestock industries. A cartoon in *The Australian* this morning had a fellow with a banner up reading "What meat industry?". It will soon be too late, far too late, to help that industry. In the first year—the remainder of this year—\$1 million has been allocated at a time of absolute necessity for a maximum input by the Federal Government. I would be interested to know, and I have not yet been able to find out, where this \$7 million is to come from. I would be prepared almost to bet that it is coming from the levy being imposed on mutton and beef, in which case the Commonwealth is giving nothing to the industry.

Let us assume the Commonwealth is taking this \$7 million from Consolidated Revenue. To me, in that case, the amount is a drop in the bucket. If the Commonwealth is not getting it from Consolidated Revenue, but is in fact getting it from the levy which has been placed on red meat, then it is giving the farming community nothing.

After all, where does the Commonwealth Government get its money to give to industry? It does not earn any money itself. It spends it. It is the States that earn the money, and under federation the taxing powers go to the Commonwealth, which then makes a big fellow of itself by talking about what it is prepared to give away. The Minister for Agriculture here would well know that when we have an emergency of some sort within an industry and the necessity arises to compensate the industry for a declared disease on a fixed formula, the Commonwealth provides 50 per cent and the States provide the other 50 per cent on an agreed formula. Actually the States give all the money because, as I have said, the Commonwealth has nothing to give—nothing except the States' money.

It is disappointing that the wine tax is to continue. This tax has been greatly publicised over the last 12 months because of the hardship being experienced by the wine industry in WA. Our wine industry is the last in a shunting line, because the Eastern States were hit very hard by imports of wine from the EEC, wines which were subject to minimal, if any, import duty under the general agreement on trade and tar-

iffs. In turn, wine from the Eastern States was shunted into WA. The WA wine industry had nowhere to go and it has been at the mercy of cheap imported wines.

On top of all that, the wine industry was hit with the impost of a 10 per cent sales tax. This has proved to be a very difficult thing to handle. This is especially so for makers of quality red wines, where they are prepared and in fact required—if they have any respect for the trade—to rack their wines for some years. I would have thought that as a meaningful measure the Commonwealth would repeal that tax which, after all, does not bring in much money for the Commonwealth's coffers.

No change was made to indirect taxes when one was really expecting that there might be a diminution of indirect tax which would have benefited all people and all industries. Despite the fact that the Commonwealth Government has abandoned its so-called tax summit, it has taken no firm grasp of indirect taxes either to ease income tax or to give a direct easing of indirect taxes and keep income tax at present levels.

Leave granted to continue speech at a later stage of the sitting.

Debate thus adjourned.

[Questions taken.]

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 p.m.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr OLD: One of the problems we see looming is an increase in the rate of inflation. There is no doubt that the Federal Budget has a slight inflationary tendency to it and it is expected that inflation will rise to 8 per cent. I hope we are not now on the old treadmill and heading back to double-figure inflation; it is not very far off.

Inflation is a great enemy of marketing and it is a double-edged sword in that we have had some sort of advantage in marketing overseas with the devalued dollar. Nevertheless, despite this fact the inflationary trend will have a harmful effect on overseas marketing.

We are all aware that most overseas contracts today are written in US dollars and that our dollar was devalued against the US dollar and that this has been of some benefit to us. However, inflation will negate that, and with the parlous situation in rural industries today the last thing we want is something that will knock us back in overseas marketing.

Finally, I will comment on a remark the Leader of the Opposition made in seconding this amendment. That was the surprise at the amount of money budgeted for expenditure and for revenue. The amount of expenditure has risen by \$5 billion and the amount of revenue has risen by \$7 billion, which makes it very easy for the Government to reduce the deficit without actually reducing spending.

The puzzle is, where does the extra revenue come from? I would sound a note of caution here. We virtually have a mini Budget coming up, inasmuch as we have not yet been told what the taxation situation will be. It seems to me to be perfectly obvious that the Government's option for a capital gains tax must have been well and truly decided prior to the Budget's being brought down, because where this extra income will come from is currently a matter for conjecture.

If, in fact, the Government does introduce this iniquitous capital gains tax it will become a probate tax as far as the rural industry is concerned. This has been canvassed prior to tonight, but the fact is that when the Government paper was put forward prior to the tax summit, it was clearly indicated that capital gains would only be applied after a certain date, and it would be applied at the date of realisation of an asset. On the death of an owner of property the asset is deemed to have been realised and therefore primary producers, or any people trying to preserve property for their successors, will find that on the realisation of that asset—which is on the death of the owner—their successors will be liable for a component of capital gains tax.

This is an iniquitous way for the Government of the day to introduce an estate duty, something which was abandoned as being counter-productive right throughout Australia. It is something which I thought we had finished talking about, but obviously the current Government finds it a new field for taxation, one which has been left alone for some years and which will again bring a tremendous amount of misery and further failures in what could be reasonably viable estates in the future—if not in the immediate future then certainly over the next few years.

I have pleasure in supporting the amendment.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [7.22 p.m.]: I cannot resist the temptation to make some comments on this amendment to the Address-

in-Reply, because the subject of the amendment is one of the most important matters which can come before Parliament.

I would like to speak on parts (b) and (d) of the motion, which refer to a capital gains tax and the increasing debt servicing of public debts generally.

The capital gains tax, as proposed and described in option C of the Federal Government's options on tax reform, and as it was presented and discussed at the grandstanding of the Federal Government which is now called "summitry", is the worst possible kind of taxation one could imagine. I think it is even worse than payroll tax, which both sides of the House agree is a necessary revenue raiser although it is a very bad tax. It is worse because it is a definite disincentive to investment, to all kinds of businesses, and to any enterprise. Contrary to the belief of some people who would like to believe that it only affects the big capitalists and wealthy people—and of course it does affect them as well—it affects everyone, and proportionately and relatively it affects the small man much more than it does the big capitalists or perhaps even speculators.

Very few people think about the average example. In the metropolitan area one might find a small businessman having a barber's shop, for example, which he built up from a comparatively young age. At the time it did not cost him much as he might have rented some premises in a not very expensive part of the town or in a suburb. Gradually, possibly by hire purchase agreements, he purchased all the equipment he needed, built up a clientele, and spent virtually all his life serving his customers, earning comparatively small amounts of money as earnings go. When he reaches the stage of thinking of retiring and wants to transfer his business to his son or to whoever has been active in helping him in the business, then of course he is subject to capital gains tax. This means that his life savings and the real value of his work, which was not reflected in his earnings made during his occupation in the exercise of his career, will lose value to a very large extent.

It is natural that as people advance in their trades, careers, or professions, they successively receive more income. Of course, because of this they are getting into a higher income tax bracket, and as the capital gains tax applies in the highest bracket of income tax, the person could find that he could lose 48 per cent or even 60 per cent of his life's earnings.

Another example, which has already been pointed out by others but is worthwhile emphasising, is that of farming. The farmer's situation is even worse. Even if a farm has been built up from originally undeveloped land, even if it has been gradually reaching its value, or if it has been purchased, but not as a capital value or an investment, it never has a return equivalent to the return invested in other areas, such as investment in a bank, a financial institution or a building society, or cash trust units. Where it is invested in farming property the return is possibly the smallest earned anywhere. The value of this farm is not being offset for the return but is being invested or built up because it is the lifestyle desired by the person who has the farm.

The same thing happens to the farmer as it does to the barber; he earns money, sometimes very little. He might be in debt himself. He might spend most of his earnings in repaying the original capital which was borrowed on mortgage. When he reaches the stage of paying that mortgage off, the value of his farm property dissipates again because of the capital gains tax. It catches up with him and does not allow his successors to continue the same lifestyle.

Of course the counterargument to a capital gains tax is that other countries have it, including the United States which is the bastion of free enterprise and capitalism, and that country has the greatest number of small and big businesses. That argument is very nebulous, however, because most people just accept that statement at face value. If we examine what sort of capital gains tax exists in the United States we immediately find an enormous difference between what exists there and the tax proposed under option C in Australia. Let us look at the differences.

Firstly, the capital gains tax in the United States is levied at a very low and flat level—presently 20 per cent—and the President, Mr Reagan, has already proposed to Congress that the rate should be lowered to 17.5 per cent. Secondly, gains tax does not apply in every case as is proposed in Australia. It does not apply, for instance, in the important case where a taxpayer replaces his asset. He might sell an asset, whether a barber's shop or farm, to use the examples I have given previously, and replace it with another asset which equally helps him to make a living. No capital gains tax will apply because it is a replacement, and it

does not matter whether he replaces the asset within 12 months or any particular time from the original acquisition.

Thirdly, capital gains tax in the United States is subject to numerous deductions—I made thorough studies of this on my last visit there a few months ago—so that through the life span of the asset which is part of the taxpayer's property the tax is sometimes brought down to virtually nothing. Fourthly, capital gains tax does not apply in case of death, and it is not applicable in most cases on gifts. So one can see there is a vast difference between the two types of capital gains tax. The tax imposed in the United States cannot be compared with that proposed in Australia, and in some cases it is much better than our income tax system because under our Income Tax Assessment Act a person who sells a property within a year of acquiring it is subject to income tax. Under Option C that would be replaced by a capital gains tax. But if a person did that in the United States and replaced the asset he has sold he would not be subject to tax.

The other vast difference is that under the Australian proposal the tax will be levied according to the maximum bracket of income in which the taxpayer finds himself. In the United States capital gains is levied at a flat rate. In Canada the situation is not very much different.

The other point which is properly raised in the amendment relates to the enormous danger of increased debt servicing charges. Other members have given statistics and I do not want to spend time on this, but I would like to emphasise the desirability of finding some way by which Federal Governments and State Government instrumentalities which are in a position to borrow money not by virtue of legislation and with the force of a Statute, but by sheer administrative discretionary action, should face some curb on this capacity and discretionary power to borrow. I have mentioned this in another debate some time ago but it is worthwhile repeating because the Federal Government and State instrumentalities would find it very easy to engage in a most irresponsible way, if they wished to, in obtaining money unnoticed by the electorate in the case of Government, or the consumer of the instrumentality.

In the case of the Government the borrowing may be used to finance social service handouts or other types of handouts to electors. In the case of Government instrumentalities—the utility which is supplying power or water or

similar services—these borrowings often flow through in the scale of charges to the consumer. Once these bodies borrow money they have the cash flow. They can be irresponsible because servicing the borrowing does not begin until the following year and it will accumulate thereafter. The people who then have to pay for it by way of higher taxes and charges will not remember what they are paying for or who has caused the higher charges or taxes they are incurring.

It is quite amazing to me that commentators on last night's Federal Budget praised the Treasurer for lowering the yearly debt projection. We have reached the stage where an evil if not exercised in the same way and to a similar extent becomes a virtue. It is almost as though a court reporter were to report that an accused who had been before the court three times was worthy of praise on this latest occasion because he had stolen much less than on the previous two occasions. That is what it means when we praise the Federal Budget for incurring a lower debt. That debt still must be serviced in future, and it accumulates with every dollar borrowed every year instead of abating.

I repeat what I have said previously, and I know no more notice will be taken of it now than it was before, that it would be very desirable to have some sort of statutory limit on Government borrowing. That applies equally to both Federal Government borrowing and that by State Government instrumentalities. If a reasonable limit were set the Government or the instrumentality could only operate within that limit. They would not be able to borrow more with their discretionary powers and hoodwink the consumer or elector by doing something for which those people must pay later.

I am not thinking of the type of curb which exists in the United States where the Congress or the legislature has the ultimate say on borrowing. That would not suit our Westminster system. I am thinking seriously of something which could be done within our system, particularly if the two political parties in our system agreed and said, "All right, in the next period of Government we will limit the borrowing capacity of the Government by Statute to 'X' amount of dollars." That would be calculated in an economic way taking into account inflation, the money supply and a number of factors. That does not exclude the Government from bringing in legislation because it will have a majority. But if it did it would be obvious to electors that the Govern-

ment wanted more money. The Government need not be afraid if it could explain why it wanted the money. If the Government were able to explain to the people in the electorate that it was taking this action to create a better atmosphere at the next election, the electorate would be in a position to judge whether it was worthwhile to pay more to have this benefit.

Several members interjected.

Mr Pearce: Have you apologised to the Education Department for your incorrect statement?

Mr MENSAROS: I will answer that on another occasion.

The present situation is that the Government can borrow and as I have said, the electors, upon whom the Government depends, are not being notified of the reason for such borrowing. They only realise the consequences at a later stage—they do not realise for what and by whom the borrowing has been incurred on their behalf.

I support the amendment to the motion because it correctly points out the shortcomings which the economy suffers. Even if it does fall under the control of the Federal Government, the State Government has a duty to fight against it.

MR McNEE (Mt Marshall) [7.42 p.m.]: I do not want to be critical of the Government, but I have some compassion for it because I realise that it does not know a great deal about business.

Today we are confronted with an intolerable situation. Outside this House there is a feeling of absolute despondency. Can members of the Government imagine that business people in my electorate are saying, "Why should I worry—I am confronted with noise abatement regulations, with four weeks' annual leave for my employees plus a 17.5 per cent annual leave loading. I would be better off if I could reverse the role and become a member of my staff and my staff could become the boss"? There is a continual attack by the Government on the employer.

I guess the people were lulled into a false sense of security because of what the Prime Minister said during the last elections. He said, "Trust me, let us pull Australia together." On 16 February 1983 the Prime Minister said that the Federal Government would not impose a capital gains tax. For a number of years he has been doing his best to dismantle Western Australia.

During the lead-up to the last State election the Leader of the Labor Party, the now Premier, said, "I am the best new leader." I remind members of the Government what their leader said because it is important. He also said, "I will balance the Budget without increasing taxes"—we all know how wrong that was.

Mr MacKinnon: What did he say about petrol prices?

Mr McNEE: That is an interesting question because the Premier said many things about petrol prices. Prior to the last election members of the Labor Party came to my electorate and told my electors that if their party was successful it would make sure that petrol in the country areas was the same price as that in the city. We know what happened—the price was increased! In a moment of weakness the Labor Party said that it would reduce fuel by 3c a litre. Australia has the second or third highest fuel price in the world. The electors of Western Australia have come to learn that Labor Governments are high taxing Governments.

Some of my electors have said that if they are able to make finance available of \$2 000 or \$10 000 to their farms this year that will be the commitment towards their farms next year. One of the reasons they are suggesting this is that money is so expensive to borrow.

Mr Court: The interest rate is five per cent higher than last year.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McNEE: I was not discussing the high rise buildings at Scarborough, but if the member for Scarborough wants me to I will debate it later.

The current position is that accountants are undertaking reassessments of taxation returns in order to ascertain farmers and businessmen's position in regard to tax. I guess that will make Mr Keating cross. Last year he said that farmers were tax avoiders and that they had brought the taxation profession into disrepute. He will have the opportunity to make those same remarks again.

This Government and this Premier have today supported the Federal Government's proposed taxation package. I am sure that included in the taxation package to be brought down in September will be a capital gains tax.

A capital gains tax will be non-productive, it will reduce a person's incentive to add to his assets, it will remove a person's ability to pro-

vide for his retirement, and it will kill the incentive of small business, which will result in the loss of many jobs.

This Government talks about creating jobs. I do not know whether it has actually created jobs but it pretends that it has. One thing of which I am sure is that this Government has created lots of positions for advisers. However, it must remember that the greatest number of jobs are created by small business, yet, together with the Commonwealth Government, this Government wants to impose a capital gains tax on the small business community. Many people work long hours to earn sufficient money in the hope that it will provide them with a small business, which in turn will provide them with a capital gain. However, along comes the Federal Government and says, "We will place a capital gains tax on small business." Worse still is that the Federal Government wants to introduce death duties.

A capital gains tax could put many farming properties out of business. That is precisely what could happen because it is a tax that is incredibly unfair. It makes no allowance for the amount of effort put into the property by the people establishing it. The same applies to businesses; the tax will drive people out of business. It is a tax on incentive.

Mr Pearce: Any small businessman worth his salt is not worried about capital gains, he is looking for a viable business.

Mr McNEE: The Minister for Education displays his ignorance. Where is the small business that is making these handsome profits?

Mr Pearce: Your display of ignorance amounts to indecent exposure.

Mr Read interjected.

Mr McNEE: The member for Mandurah will have an opportunity to speak. I suspect the Government has done the same with that member as it has done with the Minister for Agriculture; that is, it has told the member to sit down and keep quiet. If the member wishes to speak he should get to his feet, but not try to do so during my time.

The Government is killing business and let there be no mistake about it. I want the world to know; I want the people out there to know just exactly what the Government's policies are.

Mr Wilson: I think they can all hear you.

Mr McNEE: I am glad about that. They will hear a great deal more before the election, because I will be out there telling them. I want there to be no mistake about that.

Mr Burkett: Your parents certainly made a mistake.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McNEE: I suggest that the member for Scarborough should not tease me. If he does I will not be responsible next time. That is the first warning. Next time the member will not get a warning and I will not be so gentle on him.

If this capital gains tax, on which the Labor Governments are so keen, is introduced, God help the young widow of the person who inadvertently dies. That is something we cannot organise. In that case the business involved could be placed under great stress by a capital gains tax and the net result would probably be that the business would go under.

Even worse than that is the situation of a person with a hobby such as restoring aeroplanes or old motorcars. The Government would claim a capital gains tax on such activities. I wonder whether it would tax a child's stamp collection. I am sure it would.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education will remain silent. I cannot hear the member for Mt Marshall.

Mr McNEE: That is what the capital gains tax will do. Perhaps the Minister for Education has a child who has a hobby of stamp collecting, matchbox collecting, or something similar. I understand the Premier has a stamp collection and that too will attract a capital gains tax. Government members do not appear to understand that. They have never been involved in business. Their business has been to bash the boss and grab another dollar. They do not understand that people have to work, risk capital, and borrow money to succeed in business. When Government members see those people succeed, they seem to become cross and jealous and believe they should have a share. They call it redistribution of wealth.

Last night we had the other joke—the Federal Budget was introduced. The Press—probably because it does not understand the situation either—produced a headline to the effect that there was a big deal for

farmers in the Budget. I tell members that the big deal will give the average farmer \$400 from the Commonwealth Government.

I was in Canberra on 1 July, together with 40 000 farmers. I watched the Prime Minister; I listened, and I heard him say that in the context of the Budget he would give farmers relief from fuel prices.

Mr Taylor: He did too.

Mr McNEE: Let us consider what he did. He has given back to the farmers what he took away; it is just manipulation. He was the man to index fuel prices. The Hawke Government took away the freight equalisation. I want the people out there to remember that. They may have forgotten. The Government has handed back a miserable 2.4c and this State Government finds it impossible to hand back anything. Absolutely nothing has been given to the farmers; the Government has stood by and given reasons why nothing can be done. The Prime Minister has talked a load of nonsense about giving relief from fuel prices.

I want members to understand clearly that the Hawke Government has taken these things away and it has made no real attempt to assist the farmers. It has promised a harvester bounty; that would be good if people could afford to buy harvesters. In any event the bounty does not take effect until 1 January which is after the harvest starts in November.

I refer now to the record public debt. That, of course, is creating a real problem because the Commonwealth Government has not addressed the vital issue which concerns this nation; that is, the high interest rate imposed. As long as we have the incompetent financial management of these Governments we shall continue in that situation. That is the real problem with which we are confronted, but the Government is ignoring it. It tries to make people believe that it is helping the community, but it is not doing so. Those people who are not involved have been told the wrong story. The help given to the rural and fishing industries is an absolute insult.

The State Government has made no attempt to make any representations at all or to develop any policies to help these industries. It has stood by, thrown its hands in the air, and said that nothing can be done.

To recap, we are heading for a situation where we have record levels of unemployment created. There will be record levels of small

businesses and farmers going to the wall under the principles espoused by the Federal Government.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is winding up his speech.

Mr McNEE: In supporting the amendment, I ask the State Government to take every opportunity to impress upon the Federal Government the seriousness of the situation.

MR EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [8.01 p.m.]: I would like to answer the member for Mt Marshall—

Mr Laurance: What about the subsidy on—

Several members interjected.

Mr Taylor: He has not even started.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr EVANS: To answer the member for Mt Marshall, he suggested there has been a lack of representation on the part of the State Government, especially in relation to rural finance. I was surprised not to see many members from the Opposition attending the Rural and Allied Industry Conference in May when papers were put together which assisted in the presentation of this State Government's case to the taxation summit.

An Opposition member: A lot of good it did.

Mr EVANS: It may have done a little better had some members of the Opposition, in a professional way, taken some expert advice and guidance from those who attended the seminar.

Mr Peter Jones: Who was invited to the seminar?

Mr EVANS: Professor Dixon was the key speaker.

Mr Peter Jones: Did I have a chance to go?

Mr EVANS: I am certain the member did. The rural industry council canvassed it far and wide. I should like to make the member for Mt Marshall aware of a Press release. It is attributed to me and it reads—

The Western Australian Minister for Agriculture, Mr Evans, said today the moves announced in the Federal Budget designed to help primary producers were particularly welcome in WA.

Mr Evans said the reduction in the excise on diesel and replacement of the tariffs on some farm machinery was the sort of action the Western Australian Government had been fighting for for more than 12 months.

I agree with the member for Katanning-Roe when he said that while this might be a step in the right direction, it certainly did not go far enough.

Let me ensure that the member for Mt Marshall gets the record straight. While most submissions to the tax summit concentrated on income tax, we ran a major review of fuel costs and tariffs. The submission was put together at the instigation of major rural groups, and the emphasis has now paid off to that degree. However, the measures announced by Mr Keating could not alone solve the problems facing the rural industry.

That is fairly plain. Today's paper attributes a statement to Mr Keating. The point is made that farm costs are rising. Farm costs will rise by six per cent in 1985-86 and the real net value of rural production will fall by 22 per cent. The State and Federal Governments cannot be blamed for the decline in export prices for rural products. As far as that goes, if it had not been for the Government's policies, farmers in the wheatbelt would probably be living on boiled rabbit stew.

We saw a little about the policies of the Fraser Government, of McEwan and Anthony—and the drubbing Ian Sinclair received—on the "Four Corners" programme the other night. That reveals where the blame should be.

I would like to say this: More can be done, and more will have to be done. This State Government will continue to press for a proper review of tariffs and an ongoing examination of the fuel pricing policy.

Let me remind this House that the biggest single action taken with regard to tariffs for probably 50 years was taken by the Whitlam Government. There was an across-the-board reduction of 25 per cent, and the cost of that was about 50 000 additional unemployed. So it must be remembered that if one takes one action in macro-economics, one has to have regard to the dislocation which might arise in other sections. Judgments must be made. However, I make the point that while this Budget shows that achievements can be made, they are certainly not sufficient to satisfy this Government in this case.

Mr MacKinnon: Do something about it.

Mr EVANS: We certainly will. May I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when he talks so glibly about reducing the State levy on fuel, why he makes no reference to the \$90 million it would probably cost this State to

match funds from the Commonwealth? Where does he propose to get the money to offset that? Regard must be had to the facts.

I reiterate, as indicated in that Press release and the supplementary remarks, this Government will hold on course ensuring that the move that has been heralded as being more than satisfactory to protect the economic recovery of this nation will continue and we will support the rural community of this State to ensure an even better deal is achieved.

MR COURT (Nedlands) [8.09 p.m.]: I fully support this amendment. The tax debate has been a pretty enlightening experience for members of Parliament over the last year because, apart from the Labor Party's stand over the last six months, it has brought many politicians out of the woodwork. We have now seen their true positions on some of these issues of taxation.

Mr Bateman: It shows how gutless your mob were. In all that time they did nothing.

Mr COURT: I must admit that I was hoping the member for Canning might be watching TV when I rose to speak.

One person this debate has bought out of the woodwork is the Premier, because he has now said that he supports the capital gains tax and a new tax on fringe benefits. The Premier was on radio this morning saying that those people who were trying to create scare tactics in the community about these proposals by saying that we would be worse off with what was to come after the Budget—he was referring to the tax proposals that are to come down in September—did not know what they were talking about. He was saying that it would not have any effect this year. Perhaps it will not have any effect this year, but once the Federal Government introduces a capital gains tax and puts in place a tax on fringe benefits, I ask members to consider what will happen a few years down the track. When the Government has a capital gains tax in place it will have achieved exactly what it wants.

Labor Governments, both federally and in the States, have proved themselves to be very good at playing tricks. This a short-term trick and this taxation trick is just another one. The long and short of it is that after this debate on taxation—which has seen their party pulled to pieces—we will end up with some of the worst aspects of all those different proposals they have publicly floated.

The Federal Budget is irrelevant. The tax proposal which is going to follow this Budget is the thing we have to be afraid of. It might be all

right this evening, the day after the bringing down of the Federal Budget, for members opposite to be interjecting and saying that there is nothing wrong with a capital gains tax or a tax on fringe benefits, but when this proposal is brought down in September they will see what trouble they will really have.

Mr Bateman: At least they have done something.

Mr COURT: What a great thing to do—bring in a new form of taxation!

Let us consider some of these forms of taxation. The member for Mt Marshall has already explained the capital gains tax and its effect.

When the Minister for Education talks about small business he should be very careful, because single-handedly he has tried to put a lot of small business people out of business. He should keep his head pretty low. Later we might get on to what is going on in the Education Department and its effect on small business.

The Minister for Small Business does not seem to understand what effect the introduction of a capital gains tax is going to have on the small business sector. Earlier today I asked him whether he had arranged for the Small Business Development Corporation to inquire into the effects of a capital gains tax on the small business sector, to which he replied "No." This is despite the fact that, as Deputy Premier, he organised a tax hot line which cost thousands of dollars and which showed that a capital gains tax was one of the major concerns facing the business community. Yet the Government is openly supporting a capital gains tax. What is the point of having a Small Business Development Corporation if the Government is not prepared to take action to try to get rid of these taxes the Federal Government is wanting to introduce? There is just no fight in this Government on this question, just as there is no fight in it on the proposed fringe benefits tax.

The Minister for Education says that small business people should not have to rely on a capital gains tax not being introduced. I have news for the Minister: The great majority of small business people find that all they have left after many years of hard work is not the lavish wages the Minister seems to think they earn, but merely a small nest egg for their retirement. And this Government wants to take away that nest egg. It is obvious that the Minister for Education and all other Government members do not understand what would be the

effect of a capital gains tax on people operating in the small business sector. Government members seem to think that if someone is in business he is making a large profit.

Members opposite should have read the article in tonight's *Daily News* which made the point that it was very difficult being in the small business field and indicated just how many of those people have problems simply surviving.

Mr Taylor: As you know so much about the effects of a capital gains tax, tell us how it will work.

Mr COURT: If the member had read the papers brought down by the Federal Treasurer he would understand how it would work. We are going to make sure that the people of Kalgoorlie know that the member for Kalgoorlie openly supports a capital gains tax.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I have at least one member over here interjecting and another member over there interjecting. I have given the call to the member for Nedlands and I cannot listen to him with all these interjections.

Mr COURT: I appreciate the opportunity to stand in this place and put on record just what is going to happen with a capital gains tax and, what is more, to inform the member for Kalgoorlie that we will make sure his electorate knows exactly how a capital gains tax will work. The Federal Government is to introduce a capital gains tax and it will try to tell the people of Australia that it will be an innocent and harmless tax. The people will be told that it will be indexed for the effects of inflation and will bring in only a small amount of money.

However, the member for Kalgoorlie knows that down the track—when it comes to calculating capital gains, when people will have to take into account improvements effected to the different capital items being taxed—this is going to be a very difficult tax to work out actuarially. A few years down the track this tax will raise a lot of money. It will be a very complex tax to collect. In the event, the Government will probably introduce a flat 20 per cent tax. The member for Kalgoorlie seems to be indicating that he likes the idea of a capital gains tax being introduced.

Mr Taylor: I don't recall saying that.

Mr COURT: Now he is trying to backtrack. Does the member support a capital gains tax?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Nedlands would be a lot better advised to ask questions of and direct remarks to the Chair rather than directly to other members.

Mr COURT: The experience in the United States is very interesting. The US Government reduced its capital gains tax and found that the immediate impact on new investment in business was quite startling. That is an example of what happens when Governments get rid of disincentives in business.

In this country the Prime Minister is deciding to do the exact opposite. The more noise members opposite make about the introduction of such a tax and about supporting it, the better it is for us and the easier it will be for us to win Government at the next election. There are some 70 000 small businesses in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! Try to give the member for Nedlands a go.

Mr COURT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Government is taking on thousands of hard-working, independent, free-thinking people who understand only too well what this Government is trying to do with them. It is not a redistribution of wealth. It will be a straightout confiscation of wealth for those people who put many hours into building up their businesses.

Mr Bertram: It only collects a few bob.

Mr COURT: It only collects a few bob the first year; then it starts going up. I am proud of the fact that I have been involved in a number of small businesses. I have nothing to hide; which is more than some Ministers can say.

Mr Pearce: Come on! The accounts of your boat business would not bear too close an examination.

Mr COURT: That was a stupid thing for the Minister to say. Is he making an allegation?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COURT: Members opposite obviously know very little about business activities.

Mr Taylor: One thing the Minister for Education is not is an allegator!

Mr Old: What a stupid, inane remark to make.

Mr COURT: Yes, it was. My second point is in regard to what might be called a tax double whammy—a tax on fringe benefits. We have just heard all that noise from Government

members supporting capital gains tax. Do Government members support this tax on fringe benefits?

Mr Bertram: We certainly do. Do you?

Mr COURT: That is what we like to hear. I do not support the Government's tax on fringe benefits.

Mr Bertram: I would not expect you to either.

Mr COURT: This tax has obviously been dreamt up by Labor advisers in big cities who do not understand why fringe benefits need to be paid. Certainly those members opposite who represent electorates in remote regions know only too well that fringe benefits need to be paid to attract people to work in those areas.

Mr Pearce: How remote is Nedlands?

Mr COURT: It might be all right for Government members to joke, but I am sure those members representing remote regions understand. The member for Kalgoorlie, for example, will know that many people are paid fringe benefits to encourage them to travel to and work in the Kalgoorlie area. The Pilbara is a classic example.

Mr Pearce: How many people in your electorate are paid fringe benefits? Three miles from Perth!

Mr COURT: The Minister for Education has just made the typical sort of interjection we have come to expect from him.

Look at the people working in the Pilbara. They require those fringe benefits to encourage them to work in that region.

Mr Pearce: What about the people who work in Nedlands and get fringe benefits?

Mr Old: What sort of fringe benefits would you like to see taxed?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! This debate is getting down to the standard of lounge room chitchat. It is not the type of debate which I would have thought would emanate from the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia. The member for Nedlands.

Mr Old: It would not be allowed in my lounge room.

The SPEAKER: I would like those mumbings, wherever they came from—I do not know from where they emanated—

Mr Old: Mr Speaker, they emanated from me. I said those remarks would not be allowed in my lounge room. It is not lounge room chitchat.

The SPEAKER: There is no call for those remarks.

Mr Old: It was purely an observation, Sir.

Mr Pearce: It is a strong argument for corporal punishment.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am trying to have this debate proceed so that the member can have a chance to make his speech. The member for Nedlands.

Mr COURT: I am running out of time and I do want to make some additional points.

The Labor Party tends to want to attack the tall poppies who are receiving these fringe benefits, but actually they are attacking many of their traditional supporters. The Government seems to be too frightened to directly make them pay for it, so it is going to make employers pay for it and that is where the crunch will come. The Government will take this cowardly action, and will put the burden on to the employers, and make them shift it across to the employees. That is where the Government will run into all sorts of problems. Members opposite will not be so smug when they have to start bearing the brunt of both these two new taxes—the capital gains tax and the tax on fringe benefits. If the Government wants to try to somehow say that fringe benefits which are paid as part of an award are exempt—if the Government wants to pull that trick—it will have a riot on its hands from the small business community across Australia. Those people might see it as a trick to try to get more people to operate under awards, but the backlash the Government will get from the small business community will be similar to the backlash which it is now experiencing with the rural community.

Finally, I want to make special mention of the restaurant industry. We hear a lot these days about how we should encourage tourism and the hospitality industry. A great part of our service industry in this State now is represented by the restaurant industry and I, together with the shadow Minister for Tourism, have met many people involved in the restaurant industry and they have become very concerned about these tax proposals. They will be hit with a capital gains tax. These people work hard to build up their businesses and at the end of the day, when they sell their businesses, they can reap some benefit from them. This tax on benefits has come about because the Government wants to get stuck into the people who are having business lunches and the like. Obviously people joke about business lunches, but

they are a very important part of their businesses. At a recent meeting attended by about 150 restaurateurs who were very concerned about this proposal, estimates were made of how many restaurants and how many people would be put out of business by the Federal Government's tax proposals. It is very sad because our restaurant industry has a really good future if it is not taxed out of existence. Federally, it is said the tax threatens 10 500 jobs and in this State the industry is saying that 250 restaurants in Perth may be forced to close if the Government's Federal tax proposals are implemented.

Mr Taylor: I think they were talking about the indirect taxes, weren't they?

Mr COURT: They were talking about three taxes—the consumer tax, the capital gains tax, and the tax on fringe benefits.

Mr Taylor: Tell the whole truth, right.

Mr COURT: The important tax is the tax on fringe benefits because this is the tax which will dissuade everyone except Government employees from using restaurants. It will affect the restaurant industry because it will increase its costs by some 50 per cent.

Mr Taylor: You were telling us about America a while ago.

Mr COURT: The member is just showing his ignorance about what these proposals will do.

Mr Taylor: Tell us about American business lunches. Tell us what happens in America with the tax on business lunches.

Mr COURT: Do not let Government members talk about people using business lunches. The Government seems to be quite willing to use the taxpayers' funds to organise its luncheon meetings, and that in itself is a scandal. The taxpayers' funds of this State are being used to organise Labor Party luncheons. To think that in the same breath the Government will talk to small business people about this tax! The Premier has openly said his office is being used to organise these lunches.

Mr Troy: What lunches?

Mr COURT: All those decision-makers' luncheons are organised by the Department of Premier and Cabinet and their cost borne by the taxpayers of this State.

Mr Pearce: That is rubbish.

Mr COURT: That is the truth.

Mr Pearce: It is not true.

Mr Old: They are hurting, hurting!

Mr COURT: They do not like this. I put forward a final plea on behalf of the restaurant industry of this State.

Mr Pearce: Restaurants benefit a lot from those decision-makers' luncheons. They are worth a lot of money to small businesses.

Mr COURT: I would have thought that the restaurant industry would receive a bit of support in regard to exemption from capital gains and fringe benefit taxes, but it is obvious the restaurant industry will be ignored again.

MR RUSHTON (Dale) [8.30 p.m.]: Regrettably, the standard of conduct in this House has deteriorated as has been witnessed by the interjections and utterances by members on the other side of this Chamber. This amendment, which I fully support, is very timely. It allows any impartial observer to see very clearly the differences between private enterprise and the socialist approach. It allows people to consider the effects of the introduction of a capital gains tax, death duties, and other taxes proposed by the Federal Government. The Labor Party has been clearly identified as supporting those taxes. The Premier's charade of purporting to encourage private enterprise and of being its friend has been exposed in his comment that he supports a capital gains tax. A capital gains tax is a bit like saying one is only a little pregnant. Being pregnant is fairly potent and one cannot stop it when it starts.

The Labor Party's objective is to redistribute income, wealth, and economic power with the emphasis being on economic power. The motion with which we are dealing and the responses that we have had from the Premier and his supporters indicate very clearly that the posturing by the Premier as the champion of small business is but a charade.

One might ask what is the Labor Party's objective in seeking this economic power. It is the central control of power over its citizens. How will it achieve that? It will be very easy. It will remove the incentive for people to strive to advance themselves in any way they choose and seek to make the individual dependent on the State.

Mr Pearce: Are you reading this or are you referring to copious notes?

Mr RUSHTON: No, not even copious notes. The attack on the sub-contract system by the Labor Party has been very forceful. It represents a direct attack on the right of the people to strive and advance themselves.

Mr Pearce: Who wrote those copious notes?

Mr RUSHTON: One would have to believe that the standards of this House have dropped. The Minister for Education is doing nothing to improve the decorum of this House. It has degenerated to a standard that one would rarely find in any part of the community.

Mr Pearce: At least I have not reduced the attendance.

Mr RUSHTON: What improvements to the debate is the Minister making with those utterances? Any fair-minded person would believe that he could not control his tongue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It would be a good idea if the member for Dale ignored the interjections.

Mr RUSHTON: Does that mean that the Minister can interject as much as he likes and I have no protection?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member wishes to answer the interjections I will allow the interjections to go on. If the member ignores the interjections I will offer him the protection of the Chair.

Mr RUSHTON: I was indicating to the House that the attack upon private enterprise by the present Federal Government, supported by the State Government, will cause nothing but harm. What it is seeking to do is to put the power in this country into a few men's hands. I suggest that the proposed new taxes are basically antifamily and antiincentive. Anybody realises that a capital gains tax is wrong. In many cases, a capital gain enables young people to get started. Many young people leave school and have the desire to create a way of life for themselves. Many start new businesses. Unfortunately, today, the tax burdens are so high that it is very difficult for a young family to make that start. What we now see is the latest move in preventing them from making that start.

In many cases, those young people buy small houses. That would be echoed in the lives of many members in this Chamber. They have bought houses and small businesses and have worked, together with their wives or husbands, to build up an asset. In striving as they do, they often deprive themselves and their children of many of the worldly benefits. They go without in order to increase the value of their assets, eventually in the hope of being able to make enough money to do something else with their lives. It has the multiplier effect of creating

employment, adding to production, and the selling of goods. That is most desirable for our economy in the free society in which we live.

In contrast, the Premier, for political gain, has come out very strongly in encouraging small business and wishing it every success. However, in the next breath he turns around and supports the introduction of a capital gains tax. The kindest thing one could say of him is that he does not understand how small business is created. At worst, one can say that he is being totally hypocritical in his actions. The Premier's motives will be seen through by people who have striven and who wish to strive to achieve something in life. Many of our friends, family and associates are finding it more and more difficult to get started in small business. I think members of this House should recognise that. That is the reason that I wholeheartedly support the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's amendment. It enables us to state with great sincerity that we believe in a system that has allowed this country to reach the standards in which we live today. Where would we be without the personal endeavours of individuals? This Government is attacking those endeavours with this capital gains tax. It is a disincentive and will contribute to increasing unemployment. It will destroy the unity of the family and will increase the dependence of the individual on the State. I suggest that the endeavour of any Government that respects the right of the individual should be to encourage its people to be independent of the State. The way to achieve this laudable objective is to reduce the cost of Federal, State, and local government. That is done by reducing the costs of those three arms of Government.

I ask the House to consider how a young person can start up a business these days in view of the extra burdens that are loaded upon him. Such a result is contrary to what we have known in this country. Private enterprise has been the developing factor and has provided the incentive to make things go in the way they should. The hypocrisy of the Federal Government and the Labor movement's approach is shown in the way Labor puts to the people by way of clever media presentation the argument that it encourages the private sector. It pretends that it believes that the private sector has the means to lead us back to a state of employment far better than we have at present. Labor Governments are exposed for their hypocrisy in, on the one hand, indicating their wish to encourage the private sector and on the other hand loading private enterprise with burdens that it cannot carry.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [8.41 p.m.]: I also support the Opposition's amendment to the Address-in-Reply. It is an ideal opportunity to raise matters which are of very great importance to the people of this State. The time is appropriate following hard on the heels of last night's Federal Budget.

The first part of the Opposition's amendment states—

... the Government has failed to protect the taxation interests of Western Australians, and in particular:

- (a) has endorsed a Federal Budget which will ensure a continuation of high levels of taxation;

Last night's Budget was really a Clayton's Budget; it was the Budget you have when you are not having a Budget. The real Budget is to come in a few week's time, in September. That is when the real blow will fall.

As Opposition speakers have already pointed out, in September Western Australians will realise how hard they have been hit by this Government. It has also been adequately demonstrated that that will take away from a great number of the wealth producers of this country the incentive to do the hard things necessary to run businesses and employ people. That is the frustrating thing about where we as a country are heading at the moment.

Despite what the Government and its Federal colleagues say, any short-term economic gains have been brought about mainly by fortuitous circumstances which have been outlined already. I refer to the turnaround in the American economy to which I will return in relation to another point.

Mr Wilson: Don't you welcome those?

Mr LAURANCE: Yes, I do. I will make a further point about the American economy in a moment. I hope that the Minister for Housing will be here to hear that.

Mr Wilson: I do not think I will be because I do not think you are worth listening to.

Mr LAURANCE: The Minister can keep his radio tuned in. Another fortuitous circumstance was the breaking of the drought. I am sure that the Prime Minister cannot claim credit for that. The third fortuitous circumstance was the wages pause which was put in place by the previous Government. That Government was vilified around the countryside and paid the supreme penalty of losing office. However, it left in place the wages pause which has contributed a great deal towards any

economic success that the Hawke Government can claim. It provided the funds that were used to prop up many of the very short-term employment schemes for which the Prime Minister has claimed a great deal of credit. The funds that were needed for those employment programmes were provided by the wages pause put in place by the previous Government. Those are some of the economic circumstances that have fallen into the lap of the Federal Government.

I return to a matter raised earlier in this debate; namely the economic management of this country and Budget deficits. The Premier bought into this argument. He gave us a number of figures which seemed to indicate that the deficits have been wound back. Let us consider the situation portrayed by the Federal Treasurer last night in his delivery of the Budget and also portrayed by a number of speakers and interjectors from the Government side during this debate this evening. They have indicated that the Federal Budget deficit was much bigger under the previous Liberal Administration than it has been under the present Labor Government. That is totally false because it is based on a false premise. Before it came into office the Labor Party made a trumped-up charge that the first-run Budget figures of the last Fraser Budget would give a deficit of something like \$9.6 billion.

Mr Taylor: And who provided that information to the Hawke Government? None other than John Stone. John Stone, Secretary to the Treasury, provided that information without even being asked.

Mr LAURANCE: Everybody has it. This Government has it too. But the facts are that that particular deficit was \$4.5 billion. The projected or first-run figures should not be taken into account. The bloke who is running off at the mouth at the moment, himself a former Treasury official, knows that when departments put in their bids they blow them out. They put in for as much as possible and know that their bids will be cut back. However, the Labor people around Australia took that figure as the official recorded deficit. The real figure was nowhere near that. It was \$4.5 billion.

The Hawke Government in its first year blew out the deficit to something like \$7.5 billion to \$8 billion. It nearly doubled it. The Prime Minister did a great con job in his early days when he was good at that sort of thing—unlike his present situation in which his popularity has fallen to zero. He was able to convince the Australian public that he had done a good job

and been responsible when in fact he had created probably the biggest percentage jump in our deficit in any one year in the country's history.

Mr Watt: Did they happen to say last night what percentage of the Budget would be spent on servicing the deficit?

Mr LAURANCE: I am not sure about whether the Premier gave that figure, but I point out that the figures that were used are very misleading mainly because an inflated deficit figure was taken as the base point. I refer to the first-run figures and not the actual Budget deficit. The point the member for Albany makes is right. Paragraph (d) of the Opposition's amendment to the motion refers to it. Public debt servicing is a burden that is becoming increasingly intolerable in this country.

Paragraph (a) of the Opposition's amendment leads in to paragraph (b) which talks about those parts of the option C tax package that is to come forward within the next few weeks. We have heard about the elements that package contains. The Australian public are very apprehensive about what is to be imposed upon them.

The elements of that tax package include the imposition of a capital gains tax, death duties and a tax on employee benefits. As I predicted, the Minister for Housing has left during my contribution to this debate.

Mr Tonkin: I suppose he is scared of you.

Mr LAURANCE: I am sure he is not, but because of an earlier interjection I wanted him to hear what I have to say on this matter.

Mr Tonkin: We all have egos.

Mr LAURANCE: He was interjecting at the time. I said that a turnaround in the American economy was one of the fortuitous circumstances that the Hawke Government inherited. One of the reasons for the turnaround in the American economy was that a number of economic factors that were detracting from it were unshackled by President Reagan.

The US has a form of capital gains tax. It was substantially increased in 1969 and private investment in that country fell off by 40 per cent. Capital gains tax had a dramatic impact on the level of private investment and it is easily demonstrated that some of the downturn in the American economy can be attributed to additional taxes such as a capital gains tax.

That situation could happen anywhere. If those taxes are increased, then the people who would otherwise make investment decisions will be starved of capital and will be discouraged from investing. If the Labor Government of this State wants to turn off the tap and disadvantage the economy, then I suggest that it goes right ahead and imposes a capital gains tax. The State Labor Government will not do this, but the Federal Labor Government will.

The State Government, including the Premier, has indicated that it is in favour of a capital gains tax. The Government will see from day one that the minute a capital gains tax is imposed, people who would otherwise invest in a productive capacity and in employment generating projects will lose incentive and will not invest. The Government will find that it will take a change of government—a Government formed by members of the Liberal Party—to come along and take those economic shackles off, a government which will later on see the benefits of investment rising again. It will not be the first time that this has happened; it has happened before in other countries. A dramatic example is that of the US in the early 1970s. After the introduction of a capital gains tax in 1969, it took until President Reagan came along before the clock was turned back and the ratchet started to turn the other way, lifting the shackles from business and reducing the capital gains tax. These things stimulated the American economy and brought forward investment. The benefits of this, in turn, have flowed to the Australian economy.

Mr Bertram: Did they abolish the capital gains tax?

Mr LAURANCE: No, but the American Government substantially reduced it. That sort of thing can be demonstrated easily. However, if the Labor Government wishes to turn off the tap of economic investment, it should go right ahead and impose a capital gains tax. The difficulties of running a successful business in Australia today, taking on the costs of employing people, not only the direct costs in wages but also the on-costs of employing every worker, and the worry that is attached to that, are such that one must ask oneself, "Why would people want to do it?" Every day must see fewer people become interested in running their own business.

Mr Tonkin: More people in Western Australia—10 000 new businesses have been created.

Mr LAURANCE: I hope the Government can maintain that sort of record but if a capital gains tax is introduced, the Government will find that this situation will go sour indeed. I should think that the State Government would be the first to stand up in order to protect what it calls "a good record" and that it would be the first to turn down a capital gains tax in order to maintain that good record. However, should the State Government bring in the sort of taxes that have been proposed by its Federal counterpart—

Mr Tonkin: Income is income is income.

Mr LAURANCE: Well, it is becoming harder for people to produce that income and the incentives to do so are becoming fewer. There are fewer incentives to employ and to try to create wealth.

Government members interjected.

Mr LAURANCE: The Government knows that this was happening under its system. The tap has been turned off even harder now and so incentives are becoming fewer and the opportunities for people to run successful business are disappearing.

Mr Tonkin: If a man earns \$250 a week and is taxed upon it, and another man makes \$16 million in one day and isn't taxed, you commend that, do you?

Mr LAURANCE: No, I do not. How do you propose to change that?

Mr Tonkin: It can be changed, as I say, by income is income is income. If you earn money, you should pay tax on it.

Mr LAURANCE: Yes, but the Government is totally concerned with the redistribution of wealth.

Mr Tonkin: We are after everyone paying their fair share.

Mr LAURANCE: What I am saying to you is that the whole thrust of this Budget—which has increased the real level of taxation paid by employers and employees—has been to "get" at business people. One of the biggest increases was the employment of 900 additional people to harrass the business community of this nation. These were Gestapo tactics. In fact I think there are only going to be random checks on PAYE taxpayers now, and a lot more effort will be put into checking up on the business community.

The Government can make it harder for those people, but as Labor Governments know, there will be more and more welfare recipients all the time—there will be more people benefit-

ing from Government handouts and fewer people creating the wealth to pay for those benefits. Even so, the tax level and the demands upon those people and the investigations into their business affairs will increase. I say to the Government that this will mean that the productive base of this country will be eroded. Thus a capital gains tax will have a detrimental effect on our economy because it will strike at the very heart of the reason that people want to amass wealth. The Government must give people the opportunity to create wealth. It is not just the possible introduction of a tax, but also the abolition of negative gearing, and so on, that has been available to people.

Mr Tonkin: What about the bloke who goes out to work for \$300 a week, he wants to amass wealth too.

Mr LAURANCE: Sure, and he will amass wealth if given more incentive to go into business. That is why we should encourage those who want to go into business.

Mr Tonkin: Well we do.

Mr LAURANCE: Not through these taxation laws! A capital gains tax will only add to the difficulties.

Mr Bertram: What are you in favour of?

Mr LAURANCE: I am in favour of the Hong Kong system of a flat rate of tax. It works extraordinarily well. It is also very easy to devise a policy whereby one does not pay tax on money in the hands of a company and then force the profits to be distributed. However, once these profits were distributed, a Labor Government would tax them again in the hands of the individual. That is totally unfair.

Mr Bertram: Did you make your taxation ideas known to the previous Federal Government?

Mr LAURANCE: Yes I did, on many occasions. In fact some of them were accepted. The 30-20 rule on insurance claims was one that I campaigned for and actually changed.

In the time remaining to me I would like to talk on the subject of fuel because that is a very important part of this debate. The Government stands condemned for opposing the removal of the State fuel franchise levy as put forward by the Opposition. Here is a positive move to lower fuel prices and we have seen this Government, despite the trumpeting before the last election and some phony legislation that came before the Parliament early in the life of this Government, increase fuel prices to a far greater level than has ever been experienced in

this State's history. This is the highest fuel pricing Government this State has ever had and when we on this side of the House said that we would try to do something about that, this Government opposed us.

The indexing of the fuel excise and the removal of the freight subsidies have occurred in the past month. In just four weeks we have seen a situation in which the people in the remote parts of my electorate have lost a freight subsidy of 4c a litre and now they have been given 2c a litre back in the Budget. As one can imagine, they are not overjoyed about that. These people had 4c taken away from them a month ago and 2c returned to them last night—how much is that helping the farmers and primary producers of this nation? How much was the freight subsidy costing anyway? It was a pitance. Fuel excise raises hundreds of millions of dollars and to try to equalise the freight to remote areas was costing something like \$40 million. The Federal Government just removed that concession overnight.

Let us have a look now at the final part of our amendment. Paragraph (d) refers to the State Government's support of policies which have massively increased the total public debt, and which have resulted in an increasing percentage of revenue being committed to public debt servicing. This is a great worry for the nation because our children will have to service this debt. We all know that in recent years the public debt has increased alarmingly and the proportion of the Budget required to service that debt increases every year. In its first two years the Hawke Government was profligate in its deficits and if it is now getting on top of that situation, it is not before time. All of that is added to the total public debt serviced by the Government.

The point I make is that it is a very difficult situation to turn around and it will take bold Governments to do so. There is some evidence around the world that Governments are willing to confront that problem and that they are getting off the welfare hike. That is not an easy thing to do. This Government has not been able to do it. It will be a very difficult task but at least the Opposition has made some commitment to go down the path. We have heard from the prophets of doom on the Government side that this will not work, but we believe there are examples around the world where it is working. We are prepared to go in that direction in order to reduce the levels of public debt and the levels of taxation. In about six months' time we

shall have the opportunity to demonstrate to the people of Western Australia that we will achieve that aim.

I support the amendment.

MR PETER JONES (Narrogin) [9.02 p.m.]: The contribution made by the Minister for Agriculture tonight cannot go unacknowledged. He sat there last night and listened to the comments made regarding the man he employs to guide the destinies of the meat industry in this State.

Mr Evans: I do not employ him.

MR PETER JONES: Is the Minister for Agriculture now saying that this man is not part of the statutory authority responsible to him and a member of the authority appointed by him?

Mr Tonkin: The Governor appointed him.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr EVANS: I wonder what this drivel has to do with the amendment before the House?

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: I must admit to having similar thoughts on the matter but I wanted to give the member some time to develop an argument that may be related to the matter before the House. If this matter cannot be related I ask the member for Narrogin to quickly move on and continue with the matter before the House.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

MR PETER JONES: The amendment relates to cost and last night the Minister for Agriculture was silent in relation to a person who is involved in his responsibility and who, with his thuggery, contributed to the increasing costs and decreasing viability of primary producers in this State. Tonight the Minister spoke and we have a situation where the paucity of support for the agricultural industry offered in last night's Federal Budget is defended.

Mr Evans: I do not defend it.

MR PETER JONES: The Minister for Agriculture read from a statement that someone had given him which defended what had been done.

Mr Evans: I quoted from a Press release to make sure that you know what is being said.

MR PETER JONES: The Minister for Agriculture is quoting from his policy paper, *The West Australian*. The Minister referred to

the seminar held last May and suggested that the member for Mt Marshall and others should have attended that seminar.

Mr Evans: It would have done them a power of good.

MR PETER JONES: Why did the Minister not invite members of the Opposition?

Mr Evans: The RAIC advertised it widely.

MR PETER JONES: The simple fact is that in relation to the comments that have been made regarding the Federal Budget and the impact on costs, taxes, and charges a promise was made and an expectation created. That expectation has been betrayed; it is as simple as that. The Minister for Agriculture cannot defend what has been done with expressions of false sympathy; it does no good. It goes nowhere near satisfying the expectations that were created. The Government, of which this Minister is a member, was asked by the Primary Industry Association, the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, the Opposition, and many other people, to deregulate transport. That was one of the key requests in the submission given to the Government by those farmers who marched and met in front of Parliament House. It was among the various proposals and petitions presented. Immediately following that submission the call for deregulation on transport, which was put forward and documented as to what it would mean to and how much it would assist the agricultural industries in this State, was attacked.

Point of Order

Mr EVANS: Would the Deputy Speaker like me to read the amendment before the House so that he can make a further judgment on the nonsense the member for Narrogin is speaking?

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: There is no point of order.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

MR PETER JONES: I can understand the Minister's embarrassment about costs, taxes, and charges, and that is what we are talking about. It was documented in the submission giving exact details of what deregulation of transport would mean to the level of costs, taxes, and charges in the rural industry. Westrail immediately and publicly said that it could not be done. It said that it could not relieve the cost burden in the rural industry because it would mean loss of jobs, dearer freight, and other things.

In this Chamber the Minister for Transport stood and said that if the wool transport industry were deregulated it would mean the loss of 100 jobs in Albany. I pursued that by way of questions and he told me how those jobs would be lost. Right up to the time when public pressure had reacted to the costs in the rural community and the way in which the State and Federal Governments have supported the imposition of the taxes set out in paragraph (b) of the amendment, it was said quite clearly that deregulation could not be achieved. Thank heavens we did not fall for it and the pressure remained. The Government in this State, having denied the petition put to it, now supports those elements within the Federal Government's option C which will impose a capital gains tax.

Mr Evans: Is there a capital gains tax?

Mr PETER JONES: Yes.

Mr Evans: Is that precisely stated?

Mr PETER JONES: Has the Minister not read what is being considered? I have seen the statement that the Federal Government is considering this tax.

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: If the Minister wants to interject I would be delighted to hear him say there will be no capital gains tax.

Let us talk about another of the taxes referred to here. Last night we were talking about noise abatement regulations. The only thing which makes me support them is that it might shut some members up.

Take the question of taxation to be imposed on allowances and employee benefits. I do not know why the member for Pilbara has not been standing up and clearly expressing her opposition to a tax on employee benefits.

Mrs Buchanan: I have done that publicly.

Mr Bridge: She did it where it should have been done, at the tax summit.

Mr PETER JONES: At the tax summit? The Premier expressed support for the principle of tax being imposed on employee benefits and allowances.

Mr Bridge: I said she did it where it should have been done; never mind about anybody else.

Mr PETER JONES: The member for the Pilbara is then different from—

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: If the member is opposed to it we are on the same side. We are both opposed because the member for Kimberley and the member for Pilbara say they are opposed to it. Why do members not make certain their leader is? The member for Pilbara knows very well what it will mean in her electorate.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr PETER JONES: The member for Pilbara knows what it will mean and she is right to oppose it.

Mrs Buchanan: I am not opposed to a tax on perks, I have made that quite clear. The situation in the Pilbara is quite different.

Mr PETER JONES: The member has lived in a subsidised house yet she does not mind that benefit being taxed.

Mr Bertram: You do not want your perks taxed.

Mr PETER JONES: Virtually everybody in the Pilbara receives some form of assistance in one way or another, whether in the form of housing, transport, power, water, or whatever.

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: The member has stated she is in favour of those perks being taxed.

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: I have said I am not in favour of their being taxed.

Mrs Buchanan: I have strongly stated that there should be some special consideration for the people of the Pilbara.

Mr PETER JONES: They are to be let off; is that right?

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: Up in the north?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Who is making this speech?

Mr PETER JONES: What the member for Pilbara is saying is that there is a special case for consideration in the Pilbara. I agree with her, but what happens about schoolteachers and public servants in the Eastern Goldfields? Do they have a case?

Mrs Buchanan: I put forward a case for the people in the Pilbara, and no doubt other members have done the same for their areas. It is not up to me to represent other members.

Mr PETER JONES: Now we are getting around to the situation. It amounts to this: We have a situation where the member for Pilbara went around—

Mr Tonkin: Do you know how popular she is in the Pilbara?

Mr PETER JONES: In relation to the normalisation of Wickham, the process had to be aborted and then slowed down because of the disruption, partly aided and abetted by the member for Pilbara.

Mrs Buchanan: That is absolute nonsense.

Mr PETER JONES: No, it is not. Let me also say how the Minister who sits in front of her went up to speak about it. The point is that the member made a case that the situation in the Pilbara is different. Perhaps it is. Should assistance by way of housing, transport, water, power, and whatever else is given up there not to be touched, or even partly touched, or what?

Mrs Buchanan: Ought not to be touched.

Mr PETER JONES: But of course elsewhere in the State it is different. That is the case the member is making.

Mrs Buchanan: It is different.

Mr Wilson: Do you think it is different?

Mr PETER JONES: The principle, so that I can advise the Minister—

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: No, I do not. The principle is not different, because up there the level of allowance and assistance is higher, and so it ought to be. What would be the point of giving the form of assistance which is given in the Pilbara in the metropolitan area?

Mr Bertram: Have you a tax on your perks?

Mr PETER JONES: I do not get subsidised housing or anything of that nature. The principle that that should apply in the Pilbara ought to be supported by everybody. It has no relevance in the metropolitan area, so what is the point of the Minister saying that? He asked if I agreed it should apply.

Mr Wilson: I said, "Don't you agree it is different in the Pilbara?"

Mr PETER JONES: Of course it is.

Mr Wilson: You are advancing the argument it is not.

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: The Minister for Agriculture has not in any way supported the industry that he is responsible for in the way that he should. What we saw last night shows

how distinctly unsuccessful he has been. Absolutely nothing was produced. As the member for Mt Marshall has said, it was part of what the Hawke Government took away which has been given back, and it is considerably less than what was promised by the Prime Minister and very much less than the primary producers would be prepared to accept as the basic minimum from this Government and the Federal Government.

That is why today we have the situation where not only do those in the primary industry say how they have been betrayed, but the Minister for Agriculture is not prepared to stand up against one of the men who is part of the empire here that is helping to bring about increased costs.

If the Government were dinkum about trying to help rural communities as far as taxes, charges, and so on, are concerned, it has been given a shopping list of what is wanted, and it is not extensive. All that the Government was asked to do was, firstly, completely to deregulate transport to assist in the cost structure.

What the Government has done is a pathetic apology for that. After several weeks of pressure, all the Government has done is exactly what it had agreed to do. It has extended fuel arrangements—which can be done without the regulations governing transport and fuel—from 80 to 120 kilometres, and wool is being deregulated in two steps. The last is to take effect from 1 January, at which time most of the wool will be shorn and in store.

That is a pathetic apology for what was asked: There is no complete deregulation of fuel, which would have been a very significant matter in the rural community.

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: Any shortcomings in the past should not be excused now. They were asked to deregulate fertiliser transport and they did not do that either.

We have a situation where the Premier writes to all the electors in Avon on behalf of the Minister for Lands and Surveys. Firstly, amongst other things, the member has proved himself to be competent and intelligent!

Mr Burkett: Should they not have written that about you!

Mr PETER JONES: No-one has written a letter to my electors trying to introduce me. The Premier said in the letter that the Minister had made a major contribution to the policies

of his Government with deregulation of road transport. It is a pathetic effort; and if that is all the Minister for Lands and Surveys has been able to do, the Government has demonstrated how pathetic it is by the way it has approached its responsibilities in the non-metropolitan area of the State. The Minister for Lands and Surveys has an overriding responsibility for that area; but we have seen nothing at all in relation to what the Government was specifically asked to do. The Government has done nothing at all except with that pathetic little effort with fuel. Nothing has been done with regard to fertiliser; little has been done in areas where it really counts; and yet the Minister last night was not prepared to stand up in relation to the man who is claiming to do so much to disrupt rural exports, and who has contributed so much to extra rural costs. He claims to have done so much to unseat the Government but has more or less contributed to rural costs.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 14

Mr Cash	Mr McNece
Mr Court	Mr Mensaros
Mr Coyne	Mr Old
Mr Grayden	Mr Rushton
Mr Peter Jones	Mr Tubby
Mr Laurance	Mr Watt
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams

(Teller)

Noes 24

Mr Barnett	Mr McIver
Mr Bateman	Mr Parker
Mrs Beggs	Mr Pearce
Mr Bertram	Mr Read
Mr Bridge	Mr D. L. Smith
Mrs Buchanan	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Terry Burke	Mr Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr Tonkin
Mr Davies	Mr Troy
Mr Evans	Mrs Watkins
Mr Hughes	Mr Wilson
Mr Jamieson	Mr Burkett

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Spriggs	Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Thompson	Mrs Henderson
Mr Blaikie	Mr Bryce
Mr Crane	Mr Hodge
Mr Hassell	Mr Brian Burke
Mr Trethowan	Mr Tom Jones
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Grill

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR CASH (Mt Lawley) [9.26 p.m.]: In my contribution to the Address-in-Reply I would

like to raise the matter of severely intellectually handicapped children within the electorate of Mt Lawley and within the State of Western Australia.

A number of people from my electorate have approached me and suggested that the accommodation available at the moment for severely intellectually handicapped children is absolutely insufficient to meet the demands of our particular problem and because of that lack of accommodation we have a number of parents who are in particularly difficult circumstances. I wish to describe the circumstances in three ways. Firstly, these parents are financially embarrassed with respect to keeping their severely intellectually handicapped children. They are physically debilitated by the effort it takes to keep their children at home, and emotionally they are totally drained; but their children are obviously a part of their families and are very much loved by all members of their families.

I am calling on the Government to recognise the problem associated with this lack of accommodation and to do something about it in the forthcoming Budget. I understand at the moment that funding for the handicapped comes basically from three sources. One third comes from the Slow Learning Children's Group of Western Australia, one third from the Commonwealth, and one third from the State.

It seems that there is a considerable waiting list for young children who wish to live in suitable places of accommodation and also for children who reach the age of 12 years and are faced with the problem of having to give up their accommodation and move into a different strata within this particular category.

It seems that if these children want long-term accommodation at present they are faced with one alternative, and that is to go into an institutional situation. Obviously, the parents of the children and their families who are concerned for them are not prepared to accept that situation. They believe, as I do, that there has to be a better way of dealing with handicapped children. I am hoping the Government will recognise this and provide adequate funding in the current Budget.

I said earlier that the problem does not relate to the electorate of Mt Lawley alone; but I would like to highlight a particular case that has been brought to my attention in recent weeks. I have had discussions with other parents and interested community groups both in the northern suburbs and south of the river.

The particular case that I would like to draw to the attention of the House involves a middle-aged couple who have three children, one of whom, regrettably, is severely intellectually handicapped. For 10 years now the family has cared as best it can, and very lovingly, for their child. The child has lived at home and has on occasions had the opportunity of staying in a particular care centre. As the child approaches the age of 12 years the parents are faced with a very difficult situation, because at age 12 the young daughter will have to leave the care of the centre that attends to her now and will be placed, as it were, on the open market. In fact this young 12-year-old, as she will be in two years' time, will have nowhere to go, unless, of course, her parents are prepared to accept long-term institutional accommodation. They are obviously not impressed by that situation developing and they have approached me, and members opposite, to put their case in the hope that the Government will recognise that in recent years insufficient funding has been made available for this special area. The parents hope that the Government will see the light and respect their wishes, and the wishes of other parents, and increase funding to allow additional accommodation to be made.

The case history I have before me indicates that the mother recently had to go to hospital. She was so physically debilitated, so emotionally strained and stressed, that the whole matter nearly overcame her. She was ordered to go to hospital but she had to tell her doctor that as there was no Government institution available to take care of her 10-year-old daughter, she, the mother, would have to refuse to go to hospital and keep going as best as she could. The doctor put it to her that if she did not attend the hospital, there was a possibility that she would become severely ill; and obviously in the longer term if she was not prepared to accept medical help and advice she may in fact die. To that the mother replied that if she died then she knew someone would take over the care of her daughter. It had been made patently clear to her that, because of the lack of suitable accommodation, that was the only way in which the various organisations that are able to assist would assist her, due to the numbers on their waiting lists at present.

I think the House would agree that is a frightening experience for any parents to face, to be told that they are in need of medical help and to have to say to their medical practitioner that they are unable to go to hospital because there

would be no-one left to care for their intellectually handicapped children. That may sound extreme, but I assure members that I have documented evidence to show that this is the case. This lady is not alone in her problem—I know of other families in the northern suburbs who face the same situation.

I understand that in recent weeks a number of people have written to the Minister for Health impressing on him the very important need to look into this matter. I have a folio of letters which have been sent to the Minister for Health and other members of Parliament. If I may, I will quote from some of them.

One is from a very concerned lady from the Dianella area. In part it reads—

I have been informed that no new accommodation is being built for at least three years. There is a desperate need for more hostels in the metropolitan area.

The lady goes on to urge the Government to look into this matter.

Another letter comes from a lady who, while not being the mother of a severely intellectually handicapped child, obviously knows the parents of such a child. She expresses in a one-page letter to the Minister that she believes the situation in Perth is becoming critical, as she also understands there are no plans currently on hand for additional hostel accommodation.

Mr Davies: Do you have any evidence as to whether the incidence of intellectually handicapped children is increasing?

Mr CASH: I cannot answer the Minister's question. I do not know if the incidence is rising, but the need for parents to have some sort of respite care appears to be increasing. There is also trauma involved when parents are advised there is not going to be any new accommodation. That seems to cause a fairly dramatic reaction from the community.

Mr Davies: It is a very grave problem. I have the greatest sympathy for those families. I had it when I was Minister for Health 15 years ago, but it is a question of priorities.

Mr CASH: I appreciate that it is a matter of priorities, and I also accept that being severely intellectually handicapped is not a glamour situation—it is not like having a heart-lung operation or a kidney transplant. But I hope members will agree that it is a real problem.

Mr Davies: The member for Mt Lawley might recall that I took over Tresillian for those people, and he might remember what happened about that.

Mr CASH: I remember very clearly, and I would hope that attitudes have changed and that it is now more acceptable for these severely intellectually handicapped people to be housed in a residential environment rather than an institutional environment, as has been the case in the past.

Mr Wilson: Does the member realise that the Government has greatly increased payments to the Slow Learning Children's Group since it came to office?

Mr CASH: I am not here to criticise the Government. The people who have approached me about this matter have made it clear that they are most grateful for the co-operation and help they have received from the Division of Intellectually Handicapped in West Perth. They are grateful to the Slow Learning Children's Group for the help that body has been able to offer, and they are grateful to the Government and the Opposition for the help that has so far been offered to combat this problem. Whether or not funds have been increased in recent years is a matter of record. What is also a matter of record is that insufficient funds are being made available. The Minister for the Arts has made the proper observation that it is a matter of priorities. My job tonight is to try to impress on the House that when it comes to determine its priorities, it should see the intellectually handicapped child as a high priority and therefore be prepared to allocate sufficient funding to cope with the problem.

Mr Bertram: You can rest assured that this cause already has the active support of the backbenchers in the Government.

Mr CASH: I am grateful to the member for Balcatta if he is making representations to other Government members about this matter. I will make a point of writing to the relevant Minister to express my hope that increased funds are made available. I made the point before that I am not here to criticise what is going on. I am aware that Government backbenchers are also making certain representations. Those people from the northern corridor have my support in their efforts to encourage the Minister to provide additional funds. The point I wish to make is that it is a very big problem.

It is a problem which will not go away and which we must address now. We are talking about a problem situation where, as I suggested before, we have a lady who went to a medical practitioner and was told she should go to hos-

pital because, physically and mentally, she had had it. She was forced to say to that medical practitioner that she could not go to hospital because no-one was going to keep her 10-year-old daughter. It is tragic that this could occur today.

I have also suggested that it is not a glamour situation to be intellectually impaired. But these people are still human and we are obliged to show them the compassion that we would show to other members of our society.

Before those other comments were made I was drawing from a folio of letters I have. This is another letter from concerned grandparents writing in very convincing terms about the need for more permanent accommodation to be made available for short stays and emergencies. The children of these grandparents are very concerned because both their son and their daughter-in-law are going through a very trying experience and obviously it is brushing off on the whole family. The grandparents are seeking assistance from the Government.

In another letter—and again I quote from it only briefly—can be found a call for more hostel accommodation in the northern suburbs. These people talk about the need for more hostel beds both for adults and for children throughout the whole metropolitan area.

The reason I seek to take just brief comments from each letter is to show the concern presently existing in the community because of this problem. Another letter from grandparents reads, in part, as follows—

Our little granddaughter is a handicapped person and we understand the enormous strain on her parents.

That is another call for help.

Although the Minister for Health is not with us tonight, I am in fact asking him to make a public statement as to whether additional accommodation for handicapped people is to be built in the next three years. It is very obvious that the parents of severely intellectually handicapped children are currently of the opinion—perhaps because of advice from an officer of a particular Government department—that additional accommodation is not to be built. If that is true, the Minister must come out publicly and say so in order that the whole matter is cleared up. If it is not true, it is important that these parents and other people in the community who are close to this problem are able to recognise that perhaps some help is around the corner. I call on the Minister to make a public statement in this regard.

I have already said that the parents of severely handicapped children are most grateful for the assistance offered to them to date; however, what I am saying now is that I do not believe we are doing enough for this group within the community.

I call on the Government to act positively in providing additional funds to build more hostel accommodation for these handicapped children and adults. It is an urgent priority, one we ought to be recognising. I assure members it is a problem which will not go away. I will leave the problem of the severely handicapped children on the clear understanding that Government members are at present lobbying the Government on this matter. In a few weeks' time I will look forward to seeing in the Budget to be brought down just how the severely intellectually handicapped children have fared with additional funds for this all-important accommodation.

As this is the Address-in-Reply debate I am given the opportunity to move to another subject which has been concerning me for some time. I had not intended to bring the issue of the ALP's Chinese restaurant to light again, but I am very concerned at the comments the Minister for Planning has made if he has been correctly reported in the latest edition of the *Guardian Express*. The Minister seems to think it is either smart, good value or good business to continue to impugn the City of Stirling for its actions in respect of the rezoning of the land on Wanneroo Road owned by the Labor Party.

This is the first time I have had the opportunity to speak in this House on the subject of the Chinese restaurant. I have made a point of not raising the issue prior to tonight because I wanted the Minister to have committed himself to agree that the City of Stirling's district planning scheme No. 2 would proceed without the amendment involved. That has now happened, and although the Minister has not as yet signed that planning scheme my understanding is that he has agreed to sign it in a few days.

Mr Pearce: Because it has not been forwarded to me.

Mr CASH: Perhaps the House should know that the reason the plan has not been forwarded to him is that some time ago when I asked a question in this place along the lines of, "When did the Minister expect to sign the district planning scheme No. 2?" he replied, "As soon as

the City of Stirling incorporates the amendment", that amendment being the ALP's Chinese restaurant on Wanneroo Road.

As a result of that answer the City of Stirling realised that a huge number of people in the City of Stirling were being disadvantaged by the Minister's action, so in order to try to assist some of those people it was agreed by the council that it would submit to the Minister amendments under the current district planning scheme No. 1.

Now that the Minister for Planning has agreed not to proceed with his Chinese restaurant amendment, the City of Stirling will obviously not need to continue with its amendments under its district planning scheme No. 1. So the answer to the question of why the documents are not yet with the Minister is that some slight alterations have to be made to the district planning scheme No. 2 before it can be ready for his signature. The Minister for Planning is well aware of that, and if he claims any other thing, he deceives the House.

Mr Pearce: I do not claim any other thing.

Mr CASH: Perhaps the Minister is confused on this issue, because he will recall that the reason the City of Stirling was not prepared to incorporate the Chinese restaurant amendment as he had demanded was that the council had a Queen's Counsel's opinion which was supported by another Queen's Counsel's opinion, a copy of which the Minister refused to give to the council but the contents of which certain members of council have since been notified. Both opinions ran along the same lines. The point I make is that the City of Stirling was never prepared to agree to a Chinese restaurant, because it was acting on legal opinion.

That legal opinion in fact suggested that the Minister had abused his statutory power in demanding that the City of Stirling incorporate something which was totally illegal and regrettable, as has been said. The Minister probably is not aware of certain documentation which has been given to me, interestingly, by Labor supporters because as Labor supporters, these people were totally dismayed at the way the current Minister for Planning had acted in this debacle over the last nine months.

As I checked through the papers I came across an interesting statement that, "The State Housing Commission has agreed to sell two adjoining residential blocks at the corner of Wanneroo Road and Ravenswood Drive to the Australian Labor Party for less than \$25 000."

The papers that have been given to me are in fact a sales blurb to members of the party and other interested people to contribute to the funding of the building that now stands on that site. One of the incentives that was given for people to contribute money was a statement which tends to belie everything that has been said on this issue by certain people on the Government side of the House who claim that they thought they always intended the place to be a commercial property. Back as far as 1981 a statement was made that the Labor Party believed that as commercial land the property would be worth between \$90 000 and \$140 000. In other words, "You pay \$25 000 and if you give us all our contributions it in fact will be worth, when we get it zoned commercial, between \$90 000 and \$125 000." That statement tends to cut right across the original conditions that were imposed on the sale of that land because, as members will remember, one of the conditions was that the successful tenderer would not apply for a rezoning of the land and, secondly, that the land not be disposed of within a reasonable time.

So members can go right back to 15 May 1981 when the current Premier wrote to the City of Stirling saying that he wanted to establish a non-residential club and at the same time, certain people within the party structure wrote to others saying, "When we get this land zoned commercial it won't be worth only the \$25 000 we are paying, it will be worth somewhere between \$90 000 and \$140 000." I suggest to members that that represents absolute deception and that that particular deal in respect to the Chinese restaurant was deception from day one.

At that time I was a member of the City of Stirling—I still am—and I was a member of it at all times when this matter came before the council and I assure you, Mr Speaker, that the City of Stirling acted with absolute propriety in every step it took in respect of this planning application. It has been suggested that the City of Stirling took its advice from others. That suggestion is totally untrue and there is no question that the majority of the members of the City of Stirling will agree that that is the case. As you would know, Mr Speaker, a number of Labor supporters from outside the City of Stirling are financial contributors to this building and I doubt very much whether the Minister for Planning would want to suggest that they were taking instructions from anyone but him.

I would like to raise another point about the Chinese restaurant, and it refers to a copy of the Australian Labor Party Balcatta branch minutes.

The member for Balcatta may in fact be interested in this matter. In fact, a desperate plea was made to party members to get out, to write to the town clerk, and to make sure that party members in fact supported the Chinese restaurant because, as it is stated here, "Your help in this matter is essential as the failure to operate the restaurant will seriously affect the operation of the building which is owned by you, the members of the Australian Labor Party in the Stirling area." Again we have a situation where the Minister's own party members lobbied within their particular groups to try to put pressure on the local authority of the City of Stirling to not recognise the wishes of the ratepayers in the general community which totally disapproved of this restaurant.

My time is nearly up, but I assure members that the City of Stirling-Australian Labor Party restaurant saga is not over. It is not over in my mind, and it is certainly not over in the minds of the people who live very close to this restaurant. They will remember it for a very long time and, I believe, with very good reason.

The Australian Labor Party restaurant could never be supported because it was illegal. The actions of the Minister for Planning were an abuse of his statutory power. I want it placed on record that that is the situation.

MR PEARCE (Armadale—Minister for Planning) [9.57 p.m.]: It is not normally the practice for Ministers to participate in the Address-in-Reply debate but I cannot let the comments of the member for Mt Lawley on the question of the Chinese restaurant go unchallenged.

Mr Rushton: If you can justify this sham you will be a lot better than you are.

Mr PEARCE: Obviously I am going to be a lot better than I am. There is a very simple explanation and I want to set the record straight on this issue. The truth of the matter in some way lies in the last few words spoken by the member for Mt Lawley. That is what needs to be clearly explained by him or one of his Liberal colleagues on the Stirling City Council.

If it is the case that the order that I made to the City of Stirling in regard to this district planning scheme No. 2 was illegal and invalid why was the first action of the Stirling City Council once the ALP withdrew its application for the rezoning to write to me to ask for a withdrawal of that order so that it could then

send the documentation forward? If the order was legal there would be no need for me to withdraw it.

Mr Cash: The reason the City of Stirling wrote to you was because it did not trust you—

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: That is the matter I particularly wish to raise with the House because I saw that the Liberal Party Mayor of Stirling (Mr Tyzack) was quoted as saying the council was fearful that if it forwarded the information to me I would simply gazette it with that amendment in it. As Minister I have no power to gazette town planning schemes with amendments I have incorporated myself. So there was never any possibility of the Stirling City Council forwarding its documentation to me, and my changing it in any way, and then gazetting it, without the signature of the City of Stirling on it.

Mr Cash: It is really a technical hitch because if you could have done it—

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: The reason that Mayor Tyzack would have known perfectly well that I did not have that power was that I had a discussion in this House with the member for Mt Lawley over my power in that area. I will explain to the House the details of that discussion because at an early point in this whole fiasco I had a meeting in the corridors of this House with the member for Mt Lawley because I wanted to make clear to him that what seemed to me to be the situation, that is to say, that the City of Stirling was setting up its own party political position in an attempt to embarrass the Government, but it seemed at the same time to believe that the way through it was that I was to gazette the scheme. Many of the comments that came from the City of Stirling led one to that conclusion; that is to say, the City of Stirling thought it could make its stand but that I would gazette the scheme with amendments anyway. I drew the member for Mt Lawley aside in this House to tell him that I did not have that power and I therefore would not be able to exercise it and I explained to him in great detail the opinions of the Crown Law Department which led me to that conclusion.

I was trying to say to him that if the City of Stirling believed the way out of the dilemma was for me to gazette the scheme and get us both off the hook it did not understand that I did not have the power. I asked him to transfer that message to Mayor Tyzack and the Liberal members of the council. We met a day after

that conversation in this House and the member for Mt Lawley told me that if I would gazette the scheme, illegal though it was, the City of Stirling would bring no legal challenge to my acting in that way. Let the member deny that.

Point of Order

Mr CASH: I have been totally misrepresented. What the Minister said is not accurate at all.

The SPEAKER: I appreciate the member's position. There is no point of order in what the member is saying, but if he feels that he has been misrepresented Standing Orders provide an opportunity for him to raise the matter at another time.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr PEARCE: That is the truth. I say to members opposite there is considerable substantiation in this Parliament for that discussion because I reported the substance of the discussion to Cabinet on the following Monday. I reported on this issue that that was the position taken by the member for Mt Lawley, but I felt there were two aspects: Firstly, that I could not act in an illegal way even if the illegality were not to be challenged in a way that meant the whole business would go ahead. There were two reasons. The first and most obvious is that as a Minister of the Crown I am sworn not to act illegally. That means a great deal to me. Secondly, if I attempted to override that principle someone could challenge the whole scheme at any stage in the next five, 10, 15 or 20 years on the basis of the illegality of that action. Irrespective of the assurance given to me by the member for Mt Lawley acting, he told me, on behalf of the Liberal majority on the council, I was not prepared to act in that illegal way. If any member were to go back over the utterances made by the City of Stirling he would see quite clearly that that was the way the council sought to see the matter resolved. I was not prepared to be involved in that.

Mr Laurance: You tried to stand over it. You tried to get this dirty deal up and you failed. You had to back off.

Mr PEARCE: In fact the reverse is true because the particular set of discussions I had with the member for Mt Lawley was one way—

Mr Burkett interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Scarborough will remain silent.

Mr PEARCE: That was one set of discussions I had in an effort to resolve a confrontation in which I was very sorry to be involved, and I would have liked the matter to be resolved without confrontation. I made a second effort behind the scenes to resolve the matter which I reported to the House six or eight weeks ago.

Mr Burkett interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second time I ask the member for Scarborough to remain silent.

Mr PEARCE: I made a second effort to resolve this business when six or eight weeks ago I launched a review of the corridor plan for the metropolitan region scheme to which were invited the heads of all local government authorities in the Perth metropolitan area. They included Mr Tyzack the Liberal Mayor of the City of Stirling. I took him aside at the morning tea which accompanied the launch and told him this whole matter had reached a ridiculous stage.

Mr Laurance: You made it ridiculous.

Mr Court: We don't want to know about the morning tea meetings; we want to know about the closet meetings.

Mr PEARCE: Are not members opposite reluctant to hear about all this!

I said to Mr Tyzack that obviously the Government could take the City of Stirling to court, and all our advice was that we would win. I thought that was an unfortunate situation for both sides, and I made him an offer. I said that instead of going through the business of a Supreme Court action which would be costly to the Government and the ratepayers of the City of Stirling I would be prepared to abide by the decision of a single, mutually agreed arbitrator on the issue. I was prepared to see the whole business go to arbitration.

Mr Tyzack was not particularly interested in that at the time I put it to him, but rather than ask him to say "yes" or "no" on the spot, I said if he was interested in that solution to the problem I would give an undertaking that the Government would abide by the decision of a mutually agreed arbitrator on the issue. If he thought the City of Stirling might prefer that course to a court action I would be only too pleased to hear from him. I never heard from him again, and I have not spoken to him to this day.

I made two efforts to resolve the matter behind the scenes. I had no response from the Mayor of the City of Stirling and the member for Mt Lawley, who is also a Stirling City councillor suggested to me that I should follow an illegal course of action to resolve the issue in favour of the ALP. He guaranteed the City of Stirling would not take any legal action to upset that.

Mr Court: I hope your second small business venture is more successful than the first.

Mr PEARCE: I thought the member for Nedlands was a supporter of small business.

I am pointing out the kind of duplicity in which the member for Mt Lawley has involved himself. I cannot say I am very surprised because the only reason an order was issued on the scheme in the first place was that when it came to boiling point before I was appointed Minister for Planning my predecessor (Hon. Peter Dowding) met members of the City of Stirling to resolve the issue. No doubt in the same tempting tones as the member for Mt Lawley they said that the way through was to require an amendment of the scheme by the council. I never first required an amendment of the scheme. It was first required by my predecessor, Mr Dowding, after discussions with the Mayor and members of the City of Stirling who suggested to him that that was the way they would go, and that the City of Stirling would not oppose such a requirement being made on their scheme. In those circumstances Hon. Peter Dowding issued that requirement.

In fact the town planning committee of the City of Stirling acting in accordance with the agreement made with Hon. Peter Dowding then voted to recommend to the full council meeting that that should be done. The member for Mt Lawley was involved in the discussions about that agreement and initially voted in support of it.

Mr Cash: I was not a member of the planning committee. Get your facts right!

Mr PEARCE: The member for Mt Lawley was involved in the discussions.

Mr Court: What about the neighbours who went to their local councillors to get them to do something about the matter and they found they were ALP councillors, and the residents were told to go home?

Mr PEARCE: A significant number of the people who signed the petition did not live within 10 miles of the restaurant.

The point I am making is that there was an agreement—admittedly an informal agreement—between my predecessor and the City of Stirling about the way the issue was to be resolved. The City of Stirling reneged on the agreement because of pressure brought by the parliamentary Liberal Party.

I was only new in the job. The truth of the matter is that I had no idea that the restaurant proposal was to be considered by the City of Stirling on a particular evening, and the first I knew of that was when I read in the paper 12 hours before the meeting a comment by the Leader of the Opposition that the proposal was to be rejected by the City of Stirling.

That happened 12 hours before they even met. In *The West Australian* on the morning of the meeting the Leader of the Opposition was able to say that the Stirling City Council would reject this proposal.

Mr MacKinnon: He said that he expected it to be rejected.

Mr PEARCE: He said that it would be rejected. He said that in the context of a recommendation from the City of Stirling's town planning committee that the rezoning should take place. Despite the fact that there would be anything other than an endorsement of the town planning committee's recommendations, 12 hours earlier the Leader of the Opposition was able to say that this matter would be rejected by the City of Stirling; and indeed it was. That occurred at the beginning of the affair. At the end of it a letter was forwarded to me instead of the scheme documents. The member for Mt. Lawley has now conceded that the City of Stirling's scheme documents were not in any state of preparedness even to have them forwarded to me. Instead, the council sent me a letter. I read the letter twice. The first time I read the letter was in the political notes of the Leader of the Opposition in *The West Australian*. I received the letter from the City of Stirling after that, and it was in almost identical words. It may be that there is mental telepathy between Mayor Tyzack and the Leader of the Opposition. Maybe great minds think alike.

Mr MacKinnon: Maybe the Mayor sent the Leader of the Opposition a copy of the letter.

Mr PEARCE: Maybe he did before he sent it to me.

Mr Court: This is a character assassination of the Mayor of the City of Stirling. He is entitled to more respect than you are giving him at the moment. It is all right for you to assassinate his character.

Mr PEARCE: Perhaps the member for Nedlands, who knows something about Press deadlines, can explain to me how the substance of the letter that the City of Stirling sent to me found its way to the Leader of the Opposition in time for him to get his political notes written for *The West Australian* before I had received the letter from the City of Stirling.

Mr Court: This issue was running for many months. You people wanted to completely ignore it. We had to bring the matter to the attention of the public. The Premier did not answer questions relating to the issue the first time it was raised in this House because he was ill.

Mr PEARCE: That is not the question. The question I am asking is how the Leader of the Opposition received a copy of the letter before I received it. The letter was not posted to me; it was sent to me by courier delivery and was received in my office on the same day it was sent. However, it still managed to get to the Leader of the Opposition in time for his Press secretary to get it into the political notes before the deadline. Did Labor councillors send the copy to the Leader of the Opposition? How is it that the Leader of the Opposition was able to announce, 12 hours in advance, the vote of members of the City of Stirling rejecting the proposal? It is a matter of public record that the Leader of the Opposition made the announcement in advance of the City of Stirling vote. If members do not recall that, it is not difficult for me to table the Press releases.

I have risen to speak in the Address-in-Reply this evening to put the record straight.

Mr Court interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Tonight I attempted to give the member for Nedlands some protection from the House. I invite him to extend the same courtesy to the member who is now speaking.

Mr PEARCE: I think the whole matter has been a very sorry episode for all of the parties involved. In looking back over the whole matter there is no doubt in my mind that, when my predecessor, Hon. Peter Dowding, first made the requirement on the City of Stirling to change the scheme, with the agreement of the City of Stirling he was being set up to try to manoeuvre the ALP into the position in which it finished up. He was misled by the City of

Stirling in relation to what it saw as a resolution of the issue. There is no doubt in my mind that he was being set up.

There is no doubt in my mind also that, when the member for Mt Lawley told me that I should have the scheme gazetted illegally, against the advice of the Crown Law Department on the understanding that it would not be challenged by the City of Stirling, he was making an effort to set me up in precisely the same way. It was a devious way to try to use the Liberal majority of the City of Stirling for the political advantage of the Liberal Party in this State. In doing that they were prepared to hold up every development of the City of Stirling for nine months, 12 months, or however long it took in order to keep this matter going.

The member for Mt Lawley's saying tonight that this matter is not over is because he and his Liberal colleagues on the City of Stirling want to keep it going for as long as they possibly can, in quite the same way as they are prepared to hold up small business and big business. Every time they seek to provoke an industrial confrontation at a cost to employers, they do so for their own political advantage and to hell with people who will have to pay the price. That is precisely the attitude the member for Mt Lawley has taken with regard to this issue.

I was very reluctant to withdraw the order that I gave, not because the ALP had withdrawn its application and hence sought to resolve the whole situation, but because the City of Stirling sought to abuse the whole of the planning processes and politicise them. I was very reluctant indeed to get into a position where anybody may have thought that they had got away with it, or that they may be tempted to try it on again, or that any other Liberal Party-controlled council might try a similar thing whenever it took a set against a particular developer. Any developer who found himself in the same position *vis-a-vis* the City of Stirling could have sought the same protection from me as was sought by the ALP on this occasion. Any Liberal Party person who was interested in developments around the place, would receive the same protection from me if they were treated so unfairly by the Council of the City of Stirling. I acted honestly, legally, and honourably in this whole matter. I have stuck by the oath that I swore when I became a Minister in this Government. In my relatively short time in politics I have never had any more dishonourable proposition put to me than that put to me by the member for Mt Lawley that I

act illegally against my oath to resolve a position on the basis that it would not be legally challenged by the people seeking some benefit from my illegal ruling.

I have kept quiet about that until today. I would not have raised it now except that the member for Mt Lawley has sought to make further political capital from this matter. I tell him that people in glass houses should not throw stones. He has now finished up with mud all over his face tonight. In what I saw as a way of solving this matter, I was prepared to keep that information confidential. However, I am not prepared to put up with the very misleading and deceptive statements put forward in the House by the member for Mt Lawley. He will have to live with his illegal proposition to me. He will carry that reputation relating to this issue forward from this day.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Williams.

Personal Explanation

MR CASH (Mt Lawley) [10.19 p.m.]—by leave: Mr Speaker—

The **SPEAKER**: I remind the member that there are a number of constraints placed on the making of personal explanations. It is not possible to debate matters. The member should put forward the matter on which he feels he has been misrepresented.

Mr CASH: I thank you for that advice Mr Speaker.

The reason I rise is that the Minister for Planning has suggested tonight that I told him that he should sign the district planning scheme irrespective of the legal consequences that might flow from that action.

I advise the House that at all times in this distasteful episode I have acted in the knowledge of advice from a Queen's Counsel on this matter. If I may, I would like to read to the House two clauses from the advice I received from a Queen's Counsel concerning the actions of the Minister for Planning. They read as follows—

It is my opinion that the Minister's order by his letter of 25 February 1985 is ineffective in law and is not—

The **SPEAKER**: Perhaps the member for Mt Lawley's colleagues should have advised him that it would have been better to have made his personal explanation tomorrow because one of

the problems with which he is confronted is that he is not permitted to introduce any new matter into his personal explanation.

Mr CASH: When I spoke earlier this evening I did mention the opinion I received from a Queen's Counsel.

I make it clear to the House that the claim and accusation by the Minister for Planning is totally untrue and unfounded and that at all times I have acted properly and within the advice tendered by a Queen's Counsel.

House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

Mr Keith Gale: Title

9. Mr OLD, to the Premier:

What is Mr Gale's official title in Exim?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Mr Gale has no official position within Exim. He is a consultant to the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

21. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTRE

Abolition

25. Mr MENSAROS, to the Premier:

Has the Government Information Centre at the basement of 32 St George's Terrace been abolished or have only some of its functions—such as accepting the State Energy Commission and Water Authority accounts—been curtailed?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Government Information Centre is still located on the ground floor of 32 St George's Terrace and continues to carry out all its functions. The Information Centre has never performed the duties of accepting payments for SEC and Water Authority accounts. The Treasury cashiers, when located adjacent to the Government Information Centre accepted payments of Water Authority accounts and State Housing Commission rents. This function continues to be carried out by the Treasury at its new location at 197 St George's Terrace, Perth. All SEC charges are paid direct by consumers to the Commission or through various banks.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Headworks Charges: Review

33. Mr LAURANCE, to the Premier:

Does the State Government have any plans to review the scale of headworks charges being levied by various

Government agencies in order to reduce their impact, so that major tourist and other commercial developments in the north of the State can proceed?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

All State taxes and charges are constantly under review.

EDUCATION: STUDENT TRAVEL SUBSIDY SCHEME

Increase

37. Mr MacKINNON, 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:

Yes.

- 48 to 50, 65 and 66. *Postponed.*

HOUSING: HOME PURCHASE SCHEME

Advances

67. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Of the \$69 335 000 made available in 1984-85 for the Home Purchase Scheme and the advances to home builders account to be administered through the State Housing Commission, what amount was actually provided in the form of loans or advances to assist in home purchases?
- (2) How many loans or advances were made in 1984-85 from this budgetary allocation?
- (3) Of the \$104 084 000 General Loan Fund allocation for housing in 1984-85, how much was expended—
 - (a) as at 31 March 1985;
 - (b) as at 30 June 1985?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) As the question relates to matters concerning the administration of the State Housing Commission, the member's question would be more appropriately directed if asked of the Minister for Housing.

STATE FINANCE

Balances

68. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What was the total amount of public moneys, excluding superannuation, pensions and other assurance funds as at 30 June 1985?
- (2) What was the unexpended balance of the General Loan Fund as at 30 June 1985?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) \$653 185 444.
- (2) \$3 301 495.

69, 70 and 77. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT TRIBUNALS

Appointments

78. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) What system, if any, does he use to reappoint or replace personnel to the various tribunals and statutory bodies for which he is responsible?
- (2) Has the system been reappraised since the recent incident involving the Rajneeshees' school at Pemberton?
- (3) What faults were revealed that accounted for his failure to reappoint Mr David Malcolm and another member of the Town Planning Appeal Tribunal?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The appointment or reappointment of members of statutory bodies under my control is, like other statutory bodies, mainly governed by the legislation under which they are established.
- (2) Yes—see (3)
- (3) Without seeking to allocate blame to anyone, it appears that since the Tribunal commenced operating in 1979 there has been no formal procedure to monitor the appointment of members. Naturally more appropriate arrangements are now being investigated.

PLANNING

Stirling City Council: District Planning Scheme No. 2

79. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Planning:

- (a) With the withdrawal of the application by the Australian Labor Party seeking approval for a Chinese restaurant in its Nollamara office, are there any remaining obstacles to his authorising the City of Stirling's district planning scheme no. 2, forthwith;
- (b) if "Yes", would he state them;
- (c) if "No", would he agree to sign the document as a matter of urgency, since the delay may be causing serious hardship?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (a) to (c) Yes, a number of modifications need to be made to the scheme as a result of public submissions. I am advised that council has also requested additional modifications to reflect recent amendments to the existing district scheme and the metropolitan region scheme.

PORTS AND HARBOURS

Dredging: Kalbarri

80. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has he been approached by the Kalbarri Professional Fishermen's Association for assistance to overcome the problem of the silting of the Murchison River mouth?
- (2) Is he aware that the dredging carried out last year was of limited success?
- (3) Has any research been carried out on tidal action and flow pattern at the mouth of the river; if so, what were the results?
- (4) Is he also aware that fishing boats are being forced to anchor in the open sea which has resulted in the loss of three licensed boats recently?
- (5) Because of the value of the fishing industry in Kalbarri of approximately \$7 million plus tourism, what action does the Government propose to take to assist to overcome this problem?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Yes.
- (3) No.
- (4) I am aware that fishing boats anchor in an exposed anchorage when they cannot enter river mouth owing to sea and weather conditions or size of the vessel.

Casualty reports received by the Department of Marine and Harbours show three vessels went aground off Kalbarri in the last three years.

Two vessels dragged moorings while unattended, one vessel grounded before anchoring while still manned. Investigations have indicated that poor seamanship contributed to two of these accidents.

- (5) I appreciate the predicament facing the Kalbarri fishermen—there are no short term solutions to the problem. I have instructed the Department of Marine and Harbours to investigate the matter and to determine what can be done to alleviate the problem prior to the opening of the fishing season.

WATER RESOURCES

Northampton: Improvement

- 81. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is it a fact that there is an urgent need to improve water quality in the town supply at Northampton?
- (2) Has the Water Authority completed exploratory drilling to the west of the town?
- (3) If "Yes", what is the water quality analysis?
- (4) What was the evaluation of the potential yield?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) No, but because of occasional complaints it is considered desirable to improve the water quality.
- (2) The Water Authority has carried out preliminary exploratory drilling at seven sites designed to indicate possible locations for pumping bores, but evaluation of these sites is not yet complete.
- (3) The salinity varied between 500 and 1140 milligrams per litre total dissolved salts with dissolved iron be-

tween 0.03 and 0.84 milligrams per litre and manganese between 0.02 and 0.26 milligrams per litre.

- (4) The potential yield has not been determined.

WILDLIFE: FLORA

"Acacia guinetii": Protection Notices

- 82. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Referring to the colony of rare flora called *Acacia guinetii* on the Hemsley property at "Glenfield" Geraldton, how many notices have been served for *Acacia guinetii* since the legislation of protection came into existence?
- (2) Exactly where are the locations for which these notices were served?
- (3) How many notices have been served for *Acacia guinetii* colonies since 1981?
- (4) Exactly where are these locations for which notices have been served?
- (5) How many compensation cases have been settled for *Acacia guinetii* since the legislation for protection came into existence?
- (6) As compensation agreement was reached with the Hemsleys in 1983, why is it still not settled two years later?
- (7) Is he aware that the terms of agreement reached in 1983 are no longer acceptable in 1985?
- (8) Has the Minister been requested to remove *Acacia guinetii* from the rare flora list?
- (9) (a) Is he prepared to remove *Acacia guinetii* from the rare flora list;
(b) if not, why not?
- (10) Is he prepared to re-negotiate with the Hemsleys, and settle compensation within a set period of time?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Five.
- (2) As a matter of policy, precise locations of rare flora are only disclosed to the owner of the property on which it occurs. This policy exists to protect the rare flora involved.
- (3) Five.

- (4) Refer to (2).
- (5) None. The only dispute which has arisen has been the Hemsley case.
- (6) While the terms of settlement were agreed to in September 1983, those terms necessitated further negotiations with the relevant Shire Council and involved complicated land transactions. I understand that a series of unfortunate events has contributed to the delay in finalising the land transfers.
- (7) Not in those terms.
- (8) Mrs Hemsley has written to the Premier and me, raising this possibility.
- (9) I have not made a final decision on this question.
- (10) No. Processing of the agreed land transfers is at an advanced stage and will be finalised in the very near future.

POLICE STATIONS

Metropolitan

83. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:
 - (1) How many new metropolitan police stations have been established within the last 10 years?
 - (2) Where are these police stations located?
 - (3) On what dates were each of these police stations established?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) One.
- (2) Warwick.
- (3) 4 July 1979.

POLICE STATION

Hilton

84. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:
 - (1) When was the Hilton police station established?

- (2) How many officers are currently located at this police station?
- (3) What suburban areas does it service?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) 25 September 1961.
- (2) Eight.
- (3) Coolbellup, Hilton Park, Kardinya, O'Connor, Sampson, Willagee.

POLICE STATION

Cannington

85. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:
 - (1) When was the Cannington police station established?
 - (2) How many officers are currently located at this police station?
 - (3) What suburban areas does it service?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) 18 December 1961.
- (2) Eighteen.
- (3) Beckenham, Cannington, Canning Vale, East Cannington, Ferndale, Kenwick, Langford, Lynwood, Queens Park, Thornlie, Wattle Grove, Wilson.

POLICE STATION

Brentwood

86. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:
 - (1) When was the Brentwood police station established?
 - (2) How many officers are currently located at this police station?
 - (3) What suburban areas does it service?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) 18 November 1965.
- (2) Sixteen.
- (3) Applecross, Ardross, Bateman, Booragoon, Brentwood, Bull Creek, Leeming, Mount Pleasant, Myaree, Riverton, Rossmoyne, Shelley, Willetton, Winthrop.

ROTTNEST ISLAND: MOORINGS

Fremantle Boat Lifters

87. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Have Fremantle Boat Lifters been given approval to provide moorings at Rottne Island for boats which are visiting for the America's Cup?
- (2) If so, when was the approval given?
- (3) How many moorings were approved?
- (4) On what basis was the approval given?
- (5) Were any other groups invited to provide a similar service?
- (6) If so, which group?
- (7) What will be the location of the moorings?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) to (7) Not applicable.

COCKBURN SOUND: MOORINGS

Fremantle Boat Lifters

88. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Who gave approval to Fremantle Boat Lifters for their project to provide moorings for more than 120 yachts in sheltered water in Cockburn Sound?
- (2) When was this approval given?
- (3) Were any other groups considered when making this decision?
- (4) If so, who were they?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) A study was conducted by Marine and Harbours and the Fremantle Port Authority to examine the best location for moorings in Cockburn Sound. The problem arose because of the lack of facilities for large pleasure boats expected during the America's Cup.
- (2) Approval in principal was given on 30 April 1985.
- (3) To my knowledge no other groups expressed any interest in the project.
- (4) Not applicable.

TRANSPORT: METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORT TRUST*Perth Terminal Committee: Meeting*

89. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When did the Metropolitan Transport Trust Perth Terminal Committee last meet?
- (2) Who are the current members of that committee?
- (3) When is it expected that the committee will complete its report and recommendations to Government?
- (4) When was the committee initially appointed?
- (5) When did the committee first meet?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) As I pointed out in my replies to similar questions 201 and 1000, which were asked by the member in previous sessions the committee has no connection with the MTT. The committee, known as the City Bus Terminal Committee is charged with examining the feasibility of establishing a city bus terminal to cater for tour coaches and long distance express coaches.

The committee last met on 17 July 1985, and the next meeting is scheduled for 17 September.

- (2) Members of the committee are—

Mr R. J. Ellis—Commissioner of Transport (Chairman)

Mr T. McVeigh—WA Tourism Commission

Mr M. Papadoulis—Licensed Coach Operators Division of the WA Road Transport Association

Mrs M. Readhead—representing small tour coach operators

Mr D. Meadowcroft—representing small tour coach operators

Mr A. Chisholm—representing long distance express coach operators

Mr G. Ettridge—representing long distance express coach operators.

- (3) An interim report of the committee's activities and deliberations was presented to Government in April 1985. No date has been set for a final report to be presented.

- (4) The committee was established by Cabinet in June 1983, and membership appointments were finalised in late August 1983.
- (5) 18 October 1983.

PLANNING: CANAL DEVELOPMENT

Dawesville: Property Purchase

90. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Has the Government yet purchased any properties which are in the area proposed for the Dawesville Cut?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Yes. Four two hectare properties have been purchased.

COMMUNICATIONS: ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Members

91. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Communication:

- (1) Who are the current members of the Government's Communications Advisory Committee?
- (2) When was the committee appointed?
- (3) On what dates has the committee met since its inception?
- (4) What is the role of the committee?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) List of current members of Communications Advisory Committee as shown below.
- (2) Committee was established in July 1984.
- (3) The committee has met on—
 - 5 October 1984
 - 5 December 1984
 - 20 August 1985.
- (4) The role of the committee is to—
 - Advise the Western Australian Government on Community requirements for communication services.
 - Advise State Government on significant developments in the provision of communication services for Western Australia.

Identify opportunities for Western Australian manufacturers to supply equipment and services to the communication industry.

COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr B. Harper
Executive Director
Department of Computing and Information Technology

Mr W. Harding
Senior Policy Officer
Office of Communications
Department of Computing and Information Technology

Dr W. J. Cox
Department of Regional Development and the North West

Dr B. O'Brien
12 Caithness Road
FLOREAT PARK W.A. 6014

Mr L. Aris
Chief Manager (marketing)
Telecom Australia
80 Stirling Street
PERTH W.A. 6000

Mr R. Willcox
Manager
ABC Television
187-193 Adelaide Terrace
PERTH W.A. 6000

Mr R. J. McMillan
Training and Development Executive
Chamber Secretariat
Chamber of Mines of W.A. (Inc.)
231 Adelaide Terrace
PERTH W.A. 6000

Ms S. Paton
55 Reynolds Road
MT PLEASANT W.A. 6153

Mr D. Aspinall
Managing Director
Swan Television and Radio Broadcasters Limited
P.O. Box 99
TUART HILL W.A. 6060

Mrs J. Foulkes-Taylor
Yuin Station
YALGOO W.A. 6635

Cr R. Maslen
President
Country Shire Councils' Association of W.A.
134 Adelaide Terrace
PERTH W.A. 6000

Mr N. B. Fisher
Royal Flying Doctor Service of
Australia
Jandakot Airport
JANDAKOT W.A. 6164

Mr K. Pownall
Managing Director
Associated Surveys
18 Prowse Street
WEST PERTH W.A. 6005

Mr P. Collins
Branch Secretary
Australian Telecommunications
Employees' Association (W.A.
Branch)
P.O. Box 8241
Stirling Street
PERTH W.A. 6000

Mr C. R. Rodgers
Superintendent of Education
(Audio Visual)
Education Department

Mr A. J. Dean
Senior Education Officer
(Audio Visual)
Education Department

Mr E. G. Taylor
74 Smyth Road
NEDLANDS W.A. 6009

Mr B. Treasure
C/- 96FM
111 Wellington Street
PERTH W.A. 6000

Dr W. J. Howse
Secretary
Western Australian Post Secondary
Education Commission
P.O. Box 135
NEDLANDS W.A. 6009

Mr G. Troy
Member for Mundaring
Parliament House
PERTH W.A. 6000

Dr D. Hull
Technology Directorate
12th Floor
32 St. George's Terrace
PERTH W.A. 6000

Mr N. Harris
Aboriginal Advisory Council
17 Emerald Terrace
WEST PERTH W.A. 6005.

HOUSING: STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

America's Cup Defence Teams

92. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for
Housing:

- (1) Has the State Housing Commission yet made any final decision regarding its involvement in developing premises for America's Cup Defence challenge teams on land it owns in the Fremantle area?
- (2) If so, will he detail for me the intent of those decisions?
- (3) If not, when does he consider that this decision will be made?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) There are no plans for the commission to develop premises specifically for America's Cup defence teams.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) If there is any alteration to the current stance it will be as a reaction to the commercial realities of project development and the commission's responsibilities to manage its finances in a manner which will ensure maximum benefit to the community.

HOUSING: BUILDING BLOCKS

Rockingham Shire

93. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for
Housing:

- (1) How many completed homes and vacant blocks of land are currently owned within the Rockingham Shire by the State Housing Commission and what number of the homes are being rented?
- (2) How many lots of land is it estimated that the State Housing Commission will acquire in calendar years 1985 and 1986?
- (3) What Government departments delegate to the State Housing Commission the authority to purchase homes and land on their behalf?
- (4) What is the State Housing Commission's street by street distribution policy for rental and property purchased throughout the Rockingham community?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) to (4) As parts of this question require clarification and in any event the information may take some time to compile, the member will be advised in writing as soon as possible.

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

No, not during the current session of Parliament.

96. *Postponed.*

UNIONS: TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL

Migrant Workers' Information Strategies Project

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

What support, financial or otherwise, has the Government provided to the Trades and Labor Council's Migrant Workers' Information Strategies Project?

Mr PARKER replied:

The Government has joined with the Confederation of Western Australian Industry in endorsing this project. The Minister for Industrial Relations has asked Ministers concerned to request the management of their departments and instrumentalities to provide assistance to the Council's researchers and to participate in the project.

The scheme is funded through a Commonwealth Community Employment Programme grant.

Government support was detailed in the Minister for Industrial Relations' 25 July 1985 media statement which was reported in *The West Australian* on Saturday, 27 July 1985.

A copy of the media statement can be supplied to the member for Murdoch if he requires.

TOURISM COMMISSION ACT

Amendment

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

Is the Tourism Commission Act to be amended to enable the establishment of a special tourism fund to attract foreign investment to Western Australia?

GOVERNMENT ADVISER: SIR LENOX HEWITT

Conflict of Interest

97. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Is there a conflict of interest with Sir Lenox Hewitt being employed as a consultant/adviser to the Government, when he is also the Chairman of Austmark which has received substantial support from the present Government?
- (2) Does Sir Lenox Hewitt's recent appointment by the New South Wales Government to become Chairman of the New South Wales Rail Authority give cause for any further concern regarding his association with the Western Australian Government?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

SIR LENOX HEWITT

Appointments

98. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) What positions, appointments or responsibilities does Sir Lennox Hewitt currently hold with the Government?
- (2) What remuneration is still being paid to Sir Lennox Hewitt for any responsibilities he currently has with the Government?
- (3) When is the Government intending to review its association with Sir Lennox Hewitt?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) See answer to question 2738.
- (2) An annual fee of \$10 000.
- (3) The consultancy is for no specified term but the engagement may be terminated by either party by one month's notice.

TRANSPORT: AIR

Charter Flight: Sir Lenox Hewitt

99. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) For what reason did the Government provide an aircraft charter flight to the north-west on 25 May 1985, for Sir Lenox Hewitt, and the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet?
- (2) What was the cost of the aircraft charter?
- (3) Did other persons travel on the same charter flight?
- (4) If so, who were the other persons involved, and for what reason were they invited to travel on the Government flight?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) To promote investment opportunities in Western Australia in a number of areas.
- (2) \$12 750.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Sir Lenox Hewitt, O.B.E.

Mr Terry Burke, M.L.A.

Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet

Mr Robert V. Glaser,
Executive Director,

Arabian Investment Banking Corporation

Mr Chris McSweeney,

Consultant,

Resources 2 Division

Department of Resources Development

Mr John Edwards,

Kimberley Regional Co-ordinator,
Department of the North-West
and Regional Development

Mr Harold Jones,

Protocol Office,

Department of Premier and Cabinet.

100. *Postponed.*

ENERGY: DISTILLATE

Quality

101. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is he aware of difficulties being experienced by truck and machinery operators with the quality of automotive distillate?
- (2) Is it fact that some difficulty is experienced in vehicle starting during winter months where distillate refined from imported crude oil is concerned?
- (3) Can he state what assistance or consideration is being given to resolving any difficulties being experienced with fuel quality under conditions of low temperature?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (3) I understand some problems were experienced by users of automotive distillate earlier this year due to quality control problems with one batch of fuel.

The problem of wax formation during winter months is not uncommon in many parts of the world and it has been usual practice to supply a blend of fuel suitable for the season. The Kwinana Oil Refinery produces different grades of automotive distillate on a seasonal basis for distribution in Western Australia by the fuel marketing companies.

MINERALS: IRON ORE

Marandoo: Negotiations

102. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) When will the Government finalise negotiations for the development of the Marandoo deposits as part of Mr. Hancock's Rumanian deal?
- (2) Does the Trades and Labor Council now support barter arrangements required to make the project proceed?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Western Australian Government involvement in this project is directed towards facilitating the commercial negotiations which are necessary to make it a reality. There is no specific timetable for final resolution of out-

standing issues. I understand Mr Hancock is anxious to proceed as soon as possible.

- (2) A final proposal has not yet been put forward by the project proponents concerning the specific materials and equipment which might be supplied from Romania. Although I am not aware of a formal TLC position, discussions involving a number of the Unions which would be directly involved have suggested that they would adopt a responsible and flexible approach.

LIQUOR

Wine: Standards

103. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What controls or standards are set for wine sold in Western Australia?
- (2) Can casks or bottles labelled "wine" contain other fruit juices without being indicated in the labelling?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Wine sold in Western Australia is required to comply with the Western Australian food and drug regulations.
- (2) No. A number of new products of this nature are being introduced to the market and action is being taken to ensure compliance with the regulations.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES: TRANSFERS

Bunbury

104. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Government striking a deal with the Civil Service Association with regard to the movement of public servants to Bunbury?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) has agreement been reached as to payment in one form or another;
 - (b) what agreement has been reached?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) No.

As part of the Government's commitment to regionalisation of the Public Service, a Regionalisation Steering Committee has been established to identify problems and facilitate the introduction of regionalisation throughout Western Australia.

The Civil Service Association is represented on this committee.

- (2) Not applicable.

ABATTOIRS

Meat Marketing Authorities: Changes

105. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What are the proposed changes to the meat marketing authorities?
- (2) Where did the recommendation to restructure the meat marketing authorities come from?
- (3) Was there any consultation with the bodies associated with the meat industry?
- (4) If so, with which bodies?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board and the Marketing Division of the Western Australian Meat Commission are to be amalgamated to form the Western Australian Meat Marketing Board. The functions and powers of the Meat Marketing Board will be essentially the same as those of the existing bodies.
- (2) The report of the Independent Committee of Inquiry into Government Involvement in the Meat Industry (Treloar Report) recommended the amalgamation of the Lamb Marketing Board and the Marketing Division.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) The Primary Industry Association.
The Pastoralists and Graziers Association.
The Lamb Marketing Board.
The Meat Commission.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Waroona: Land Resumption

106. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) At what stage is the resumption order on the land owned by Mr and Mrs E. Brooks at Waroona where the proposed new primary school is to be built?
- (2) How long does he expect the resumption to take before the land is resumed?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) Survey action is proceeding for resumption purposes.
- (2) Several formalities to be attended to include Survey Diagram preparation, examination, Town Planning Board and Land Titles Office approval and examination and ultimately resumption action. It is anticipated that the formalities would be finalised within six months.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Waroona: Construction

107. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does he intend to have a primary school built in Waroona?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (3) The replacement of Waroona Primary School is currently being considered in the context of the Budget.

DAIRYING

Milk Price: Increase

108. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What has been the percentage increase in the price of milk, i.e., market milk, special milk product quota and excess milk to dairy farmers since 1 January 1983?
- (2) At what percentage rate have wages increased since 1 January 1983?
- (3) (a) When does he intend to increase the price of milk to dairy farmers in Western Australia;
(b) by how much?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) The following table shows farm gate prices paid to dairy farmers in cents per litre.

	Jan 1983	24.8.85	% change
Market Milk (a)	27.80	30.53	+ 9.8%
Special Products Milk (a)			
Flavoured	27.80	30.53	+ 9.8%
Ships stores	17.25	30.53	+ 7.0%
North West	17.25	18.96	+ 9.9%
Other (yoghurt & cream)	17.25	17.25	Nil
Manufacturing Milk (b)	11.12	9.24	-16.9%

- (a) Prices paid to dairy farmers by the Dairy Industry Authority.
- (b) Based on prices announced by the Dairy Produce Companies.
- (2) The ABS index of weekly award rates of pay for an adult male wage earner in WA increased by 12.2% between January 1983 and June 1985, the latest month for which figures are available.
- (3) (a) and (b) I understand the Dairy Industry Authority will announce an increase to dairy farmers of 0.85 cents/litre as of 24/8/85 for market milk, flavoured milk and milk for ships stores.

109 to 112. *Postponed.*

CHEMICALS: FUMES

Health Hazard: Government Chemical Laboratories

113. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Have tests been conducted to determine whether fumes emitted from the Government Chemical Laboratories constitute a health hazard having regard to changes in the wind pattern caused by the construction of Mineral House?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) who conducted the tests;
 - (b) were the test findings conclusive?
- (3) Does the Government intend to relocate the Government Chemical Laboratories?
- (4) Has the Government received a consultant's report recommending the future direction for the Government Chemical Laboratories?

- (5) Does the consultant's report recommending the Government Chemical Laboratories transfer certain functions to client departments?
- (6) Does the Government Chemical Laboratories charge client departments for the provision of analytical services?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Wind tunnel tests are being conducted in parallel with engineering studies of measures to mechanically "scrub" the gaseous effluents prior to release.
- (2) (a) Wind tunnel tests are being conducted at the Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Western Australia;
- (b) see (1).
- (3) No decision has been made.
- (4) A consultant's report has been received by the Public Service Board Functional Review Committee.
- (5) The report has not yet been released or considered by Government.
- (6) Government departments funded from Consolidated Revenue are not charged, in accordance with Treasury Regulations.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Candidates: Non-ratepayers

14. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Can an elector who is not a ratepayer be elected to the position of local government Councillor or Mayor?
- (2) If "Yes", can an elected Councillor or Mayor be disqualified from holding office for the non-payment of rates?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), does this disqualification apply to an elected Councillor or Mayor who is not a ratepayer?
- (4) If "No" to (3), what action is proposed to ensure there is no discrimination between an elected ratepayer and an elected non-ratepayer?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No.

- (4) Cabinet has approved the drafting of an amendment to the Local Government Act to remove the anomaly.

WATER RESOURCES: PIPELINE

Kimberley-Kalgoorlie: Feasibility Study

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

- (1) When was the feasibility study into the piping of water from the Ord River/Fitzroy Basin to the Kalgoorlie goldfields and the metropolitan area carried out?
- (2) Will he please table a copy of the report?
- (3) Is there a known technology which will enable the Pilbara gas pipeline to be jointly used to pipe water to the metropolitan area to augment the present supplies should Kimberley water be reticulated to Pilbara?
- (4) Has a feasibility study been initiated to bring Ord and Fitzroy Rivers water to the Pilbara?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), will he please table a copy?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Simple studies to check the feasibility of piping water from the Ord or Fitzroy Rivers to the Goldfields and the metropolitan area were carried out in the 1970s.
- (2) The results of these studies were only included in internal Departmental minutes such as the one I now table. No formal report is available.
- (3) Technically, it should be possible to transmit water and gas through a pipeline from the Pilbara to the Perth metropolitan area. However, the existing gas pipeline has not been designed for this and its conversion for this purpose is not economically feasible.
- (4) The feasibility of bringing Ord and Fitzroy River waters to the Pilbara was included in section 4.8 of a Public Works Department report "The Pilbara Study 1973-4—Feasibility Report on Water Supply" which was included as appendix 6.4 of a report published by the Department of Industrial Development in 1974 titled "The Pilbara Study".

- (5) A copy of section 4.8 referred to above is tabled.

(See paper No. 97.)

116. *Postponed.*

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING: YOUTH TRAINEESHIPS

Federal Government Scheme

117. Mr COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

Does the State Government support the Federal Government's new scheme of youth traineeships in private industry and the public sector for 16 and 17 year olds, including the payment of a minimum wage of \$90 per week?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The State Government has already announced that it will introduce traineeships in 1985-86 in the terms recommended in the Kirby Report.

At this stage it is proposed to establish 500 traineeships in the remaining part of this year, and a further 2 000 in 1986.

The State Government has not been party to any detailed discussions with the Commonwealth on the wage rates for trainees.

The State's position at the moment is that it will endeavour to negotiate appropriate trainee award rates of pay in accordance with the principles of cost sharing proposed in the Kirby report.

The Government is, however, mindful of the need to provide a reasonable level of income support for young people.

118. *Postponed.*

ABATTOIR: ALBANY

Reopening: Contract System

119. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Would the introduction of the contract system of payment used at the Mudginberri abattoir enable the Borthwicks Albany abattoir to be reopened?
- (2) If "Yes", would the Government discuss this proposition with both the owners and its former employees at Albany?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) This is a matter for the company concerned.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING: UNEMPLOYMENT

Statistics: Economic Planning and Advisory Council

120. Mr COURT, to the Treasurer:

Does the State Treasury support the Economic Planning Advisory Council figures of eight per cent-nine per cent levels of unemployment remaining over the next 10 years?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The relevant Economic Planning Advisory Council paper, "Medium to Longer-Term Trends Affecting Australia's Economic Growth", does not forecast the figures quoted by the member but refers to a range of scenarios with differing GDP growth rates and unemployment rates.

121. *Postponed.*

TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

Sand Tolerant Pump

122. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

Through what company has Exim developed a sand tolerant pump?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

E & L Metcalf Pty Ltd approached Exim with a proposal to assist in the marketing of its sand tolerant pump, a product which was fully developed in Western Australia.

TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

Tractors: Marketing

123. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) What agreements does Exim have to market "Acremaster" tractors overseas and interstate and with what company are these agreements?
- (2) How many Exim personnel are involved in marketing these tractors?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Exim is charged with the responsibility of marketing Acremaster tractors on behalf of the manufacturer, Zanetic Manufacturing Co Pty Ltd.
- (2) Exim devotes the level of resources required to effectively market its clients' products or services.

124. *Postponed.*

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Short-term Cash Surpluses: Investment

125. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

What percentage of the Treasury's short-term cash surpluses does the Western Australian Development Corporation invest in Eastern States' money markets?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Western Australian Development Corporation invests Treasury's short-term cash surpluses into the open market and the decisions it makes in carrying out this operation are the commercial prerogative of the Board of the Western Australian Development Corporation.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Money Market Operations: Closure

126. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

How many financial institutions have closed or reduced their money market operations in Western Australia over the past year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

This information is not readily accessible to the Government.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION

Builders Labourers Federation: Tactics

127. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Are the existing State and Federal arbitration systems capable of controlling the tactics of the Builders Labourers' Federation in this State?
- (2) If "Yes", why have not these tactics been controlled?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The questions seek an opinion which is out of order.

TRADE: IMPORTS

Motor Vehicle Engines: Second-hand

128. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Transport:

Do the imported second-hand automobile engines from Japan meet Western Australian exhaust emission control regulations?

Mr GRILL replied:

Imported second-hand Japanese automobile engines may coincidentally meet Australian exhaust emission control regulations. However, there is no reason to think that the majority do.

It is difficult to be precise on this matter because an engine's compliance with exhaust regulations can only be tested once it is fitted into a vehicle, and inspectors of the Police Traffic Branch do not have cause to examine all vehicles.

Suffice it to say that if a vehicle is examined and its engine is found to be in contravention of Australian exhaust regulations, the owner is liable to prosecution.

TRADE: IMPORTS

Motor Vehicle Engines: Second-hand

129. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is the importing of second-hand automobile engines from Japan affecting the Western Australian engine reconditioning industry?
- (2) Do all these engines fully comply with Australian standards?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) There is no real comparison between second-hand automobile engines from Japan and locally re-conditioned engines.

The former, it is understood are "used" engines, whereas the latter are fully re-conditioned and sold "as new", with usually a warranty.

- (2) I have been informed that it is up to the supplier and fitter to ensure that Australian emission standards are met.

TRADE

Export Market Development Grants Scheme

130. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Small Business:

What effect will the Federal Government's changes to the Export Market Development Grants Scheme have on small business in Western Australia?

Mr BRYCE replied:

Estimates based on past claimants—from EDG Board annual report—indicate that 48.3 per cent of 1982-83 claimants will no longer be eligible.

Strong personal representations were made over the proposed amendments to the Minister for Trade but the Federal Government will not reverse its earlier decision to proceed with the cutbacks which are part of its overall policy to limit Government spending and reduce the deficit.

I have requested the Department of Industrial Development to examine what other alternatives may be feasible to provide support to targeted export industry sectors.

131. *Postponed.*

ABATTOIR: ALBANY

Purchasers

132. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Does the Government have any firm proposals from any prospective purchasers of the Albany meat works?
- (2) If "Yes", does the Government anticipate the new owners taking over prior to Christmas?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) No. The Government will not receive proposals. Negotiations will be conducted solely between Borthwicks and interested parties.
- (2) Not applicable.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

Negative Gearing: Effect

133. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What effect will the Federal Government's move against negative gearing in the housing industry have on the housing industry in Western Australia?

- (2) Does he support these moves?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) I am liaising with the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia to determine any likely impact.
- (2) I am concerned about any move which would adversely affect the supply and cost of private rental housing.

In the area of taxation reform, I have made strong representations to the Federal Minister for Housing concerning the need to stimulate the supply of affordable rental housing.

TAXES AND CHARGES

State Autonomy: Changes

134. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

What different taxes should the State be collecting to provide it with more tax autonomy as proposed by him prior to the tax summit?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Taxes which are currently available to the State are generally narrowly-based, regressive and, in a number of cases, the taxes impact adversely on economic activity—for example, payroll tax. The types of taxes which would give the States more tax autonomy would be broadly-based taxes which satisfy the basic criteria of efficiency, equity and simplicity.

ENERGY: PETROL

Service Stations: Viability

135. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Small Business:

What effect has the high fuel prices in 1985 had on the viability of service station operators in Western Australia?

Mr BRYCE replied:

As with any business, an increase in the cost of inputs will affect the trading operations of service station operations.

SHOPPING: TRADING HOURS

Kelly Inquiry: Report

136. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Small Business:

Will the Kelly Inquiry into Trading Hours be completed before the America's Cup races commence?

Mr BRYCE replied:

The inquiry into trading hours has been extensive, with major public involvement. Earlier this year, Commissioner Kelly released some initial recommendations in the interim report. In that, Commissioner Kelly also requested the Government to allow him to study the issue of trading hours at an international level.

He is currently overseas doing so, and on his return will be in a better position to estimate the completion date of his final report.

137. *Postponed.*

BUSINESSES

Small Business Development Corporation: Capital Gains Tax

138. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Small Business:

(1) Has he been advised by the Small Business Development Corporation as to the effect a capital gains tax will have on small business in this State?

(2) If "No", will he have them carry out such a study?

Mr BRYCE replied:

(1) No.

(2) The Small Business Development Corporation has, amongst a priority list of items for investigation and research, the issue of the effects of taxes in all forms on the Small Business sector.

139 to 141. *Postponed.*

MINERAL: GYPSUM

Tenement: Application

142. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

(1) Has the Mines Department received any application for a tenement to be granted for the development of gypsum in the region of Israelite Bay?

(2) If so, has the application been heard by the Warden's Court and subsequently considered by him?

(3) If the application has not been approved, for what reason has it been denied?

Mr PARKER replied:

(1) Yes. Exploration licence 69/57 by Gregory Malcolm Steinbeck at Pine Hill, 70 kilometres north west of Israelite Bay

(2) Yes.

(3) Approved on 27 November 1984.

HOUSING: STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Koolyanobbing

143. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many homes are currently owned by the State Housing Commission in Koolyanobbing?

(2) How many are occupied by State Housing Commission tenants?

(3) Have any units been offered for sale and removal from Koolyanobbing?

(4) If so, how many?

(5) Is it proposed to offer for sale and removal any State Housing Commission houses in Koolyanobbing?

Mr WILSON replied:

(1) 73.

(2) Nil.

- (3) No units have been offered for sale and removal by the State Housing Commission.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) There is no intention to offer any properties for sale and removal at this time.

HEALTH

Amyl Nitrate

144. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is amyl nitrate still required as an antidote for cyanide poisoning?
- (2) If so, under what requirements or regulations is this indicated?
- (3) From what source and by what procedure may amyl nitrate be obtained?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The National Health and Medical Research Council has approved a new Occupational Health Guide for cyanide poisoning and no longer recommends the use of amyl nitrite as an antidote for cyanide poisoning. There is still some controversy about this decision and amyl nitrite is still included in the Uniform Poisons Standards which is also published by the National Health and Medical Research Council.
- (2) The Poisons Act requires all cyanides to be labelled with the Uniform Poisons Standards first aid statement. It is understood that Dangerous Goods (Road Transport) Regulations require the carriage of the Standards Association of Australia Emergency Transport Guide for cyanide when cyanide is being transported and this too still specifies amyl nitrite as an antidote.

The recommendations are under active review and action is being taken to produce a consistent recommendation.

- (3) Amyl nitrite is available in small quantities from most pharmacies.

EXPLOSIVES MAGAZINE

Southern Cross

145. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is an explosives magazine established at Southern Cross?
- (2) If so, who is licensed to operate the above magazine?
- (3) If no explosives magazine is currently operating, what action is the Department of Mines pursuing in order to provide this facility?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The department has an explosives reserve at Southern Cross and it is available for any person who wishes to site a magazine in the region. No further action is currently contemplated by the Department.

ROAD: GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY

Southern Cross By-Pass

146. Mr McNEE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When is it proposed that preliminary works for the construction of the Southern Cross by-pass on the Great Eastern Highway will be commenced?
- (2) Has the Main Roads Department already acquired land for the purposes of the by-pass road?
- (3) Does the proposed by-pass road involve the use of any land presently designated as part of the Southern Cross airstrip?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) There are no plans to proceed with the construction of the bypass in the near future.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No.

ABATTOIRS

Stock Weighing Scales

147. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture;

- (1) What tests are carried out to ensure accuracy of stock weighing scales at abattoirs?

- (2) If tests are carried out, how often and by whom?
- (3) Upon evidence of under-weighing being established, what steps can be taken to reimburse the producers who sell their stock on a weight and grade basis?
- (4) (a) Has the body responsible for testing abattoir scales found any discrepancies either under- or over-weighing;
(b) on how many occasions; and
(c) what is the number of times any particular abattoir has been involved since 1983?
- (5) Further to (4), what action is taken when abattoir scales are found to be deficient?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Stock weighing scales at abattoirs are tested for accuracy by the application of standard weights.
- (2) Verification tests are carried out at 2 yearly intervals as required by the Act by Inspectors of Weights and Measures. Inspection tests may, and infrequently are, made between verification tests.
- (3) Evidence of underweighing of a deliberate nature would result in Court action against the company concerned. The Act provides that, on conviction of an offence, the Court may order the defendant to make restitution of such amount as it thinks fit.
- (4) (a) Yes.
(b) No record is kept of the rejection of scales in any particular type of establishment such as abattoirs. Records which are kept for weighing instruments in general indicate a rejection figure varying between 5 and 10 per cent of the total number of all appliances tested.
(c) As for (b) above.
- (5) The owner is required to have any rejected scale repaired by a scale repairer licensed for that purpose under the Act.

WOMEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL

Membership

148. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Women's Interests:

- (1) When did the State Women's Advisory Council become operative?
- (2) Who are the members of the committee?
- (3) What areas do they represent?
- (4) What are the criteria for their appointment?
- (5) What is the current term of the existing members?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) 17 September, 1983.

(2) J. Pine, (President)

S. Bradley
E. Brademeyer
G. Brennan
S. Brown
D. Caspersz
B. Cockman
B. Connell
H. Errington
K. French
J. Guhl
R. Hannon
P. Hatt
G. Kaub
T. Mendelsohn
N. Sassi
R. Shea
J. Siddins
R. Stanton
L. Stone

(3) Women are appointed to council as representatives of all women in the State. However, individual members have expertise in the following areas—

J. Pine—President Women's Advisory Council, Co-ordinator, New Opportunities for Women, TAFE;

S. Bradley—wife and mother, President of the Shire of Wyndham/East Kimberley, community worker;

E. Brademeyer—trade lecturer at Albany TAFE;

G. Brennan—social worker, particularly with Aboriginal people;

S. Brown—Equal Opportunity Superintendent, Department of Education;

D. Caspersz—social worker, working with migrant communities;

B. Cockman—recently seconded for three years to the WA College of Advanced Education as Equal Opportunity Officer, prior to this she was Deputy Principal at Wanneroo Senior High School;

B. Connell—President of the Shire of Roebourne and community worker;

H. Errington—social worker, particularly with disabled people;

K. French—community worker;

J. Guhl—foundation member of Watchdog Organisation, and has worked extensively with people with disabilities and their families;

R. Hannon—Teacher in Charge St Mary's Bunbury;

P. Hatt—tennis professional, businesswoman and concerned with women in sport;

G. Kaub—Industrial Inspector, Department of Industrial Affairs;

T. Mendelsohn—Adviser on Women and Welfare, Department for Community Services;

M. Sassi—Librarian, actively concerned with numerous women's issues;

Ros Shea—teacher at the Whitegum Valley Special School;

Judy Siddins—qualified mechanical fitter, SEC;

Raya Stanton—Barrister and solicitor;

Libby Stone—Consultant—youth, Department of Sport and Recreation.

(4) Not specifically set down, but rather to represent women in all parts of the community.

(5) Until January 1986—J. Pine, B. Connell, H. Errington, K. French, R. Hannon, G. Kaub, R. Shea, J. Siddins, S. Brown, T. Mendelsohn;

until January 1987—S. Bradley, E. Bredemeyer, G. Brennan, B. Cockman, D. Caspersz, J. Guhl, P. Hatt, R. Stanton, L. Stone, M. Sassi.

LAND: SQUATTERS

Barrel Wells

149. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Despite requests from landowners and farmer organisations, why has he not taken action to evict Aboriginal people who have taken illegal possession of the Crown Reserve known as Barrel Wells in the Ajana area, including running livestock and established buildings?

Mr McIVER replied:

On 4/7/85 the member was advised by the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs that the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority would liaise with the Department of Lands and Surveys which was considering approaches from both the Aboriginal Boomerang Council and the Northampton Shire in relation to Reserve 1475 known as Barrel Well.

This liaison is continuing in an endeavour to resolve the issues involved and I believe any action towards eviction while negotiations are proceeding in this manner would be precipitant.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Kimberley: Changes

150. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

(1) Since 1980 how many Kimberley pastoral leases have changed hands?

(2) Further to (1), how many leases, and would he indicate them by name, are now—

(a) owned or run by Aboriginal communities;

(b) held for pastoral management purposes?

(3) Can he state the number of leases through sale or otherwise, which are currently pending?

(4) Further to (3), how many of the transfers currently under review are to—

- (a) the Aboriginal community;
- (b) overseas interests?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) to (4) As the information sought will take some time to compile, I will reply to the member in writing as soon as it has been collated.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Forfeiture

151. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Would he detail those pastoral leases where action has been taken to ensure their forfeiture since 1980?
- (2) What were the reasons for forfeiture notices on each occasion?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) and (2) As the information sought will take some time to compile, I will reply to the member in writing as soon as it has been collated.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Emanuel Family: Cost

152. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) What has been the cost to the Western Australian Government in the purchase of the Emanuel pastoral leases?
- (2) What financial assistance was received by the State from the Commonwealth Government for the purchase, and under what conditions?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Government was not the purchaser of the Emanuel companies. This transaction took place between the Emanuel family and WA Livestock Holdings Ltd.
- (2) None. The assistance received from the Commonwealth Government was to assist with the restructuring of the Kimberley pastoral industry generally.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: RECONSTRUCTION

Kimberley

153. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) Would he state the agreed policy for the reconstruction of the Kimberley pastoral industry?
- (2) Does he support the breakdown of existing viable stations into units of smaller areas on the premise of their future viability?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) The Government is determined to arrest the deterioration in the condition of the Kimberley pastoral industry and to foster its reconstruction by all available means at its disposal. The Government has recently received the report of the Kimberley pastoral industry inquiry and is awaiting the report of the pastoral tenure study group. After due consideration has been given to these valuable reports from knowledgeable people concerned with the industry, a comprehensive policy statement will be made.
- (2) Yes, it is desirable that there should be stations of varying size in order to accommodate pastoralists of different means and to take account of variations in the carrying capacity of pastoral lands. However, no subdivisions will be allowed which would imperil the viability of individual leases.

MR KEITH GALE

Pastoral Industry Experience

154. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Further to question 3569 of 1985, concerning Kimberley pastoral industry leases, would he give details of "the broad commercial experience and a familiarity with rural industry in Australia" that Mr Keith Gale possesses?

Mr McIVER replied:

Mr Keith Gale served in the Australian Trade Commissioner's service in a number of Asian countries, managed a large trading operation in Japan for a number of years; he has also had extensive experience in

Australia in commercial organisations concerned with the ownership of rural properties and involved in the export of rural produce, particularly meat. His experience in these fields extends over a period of approximately 20 years.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY

Kimberley Pastoral Properties Consultative Investigative Committee: Meetings

155. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) On how many occasions has the Kimberley Pastoral Properties Consultative Investigative Committee met and on what dates?
- (2) Who is the representative of his department on the Consultative Committee?
- (3) Does the committee report to him as Minister responsible for the administration of the Land Act?
- (4) (a) If "Yes" to (3), would he table reports received to date; and
(b) If "No", would he give an explanation why not?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) to (4) The Kimberley Pastoral Consultative Committee is a committee of advice to the Western Australian Exim Corporation Ltd. Its membership is drawn from Kimberley pastoralists nominated by the Pastoralists & Graziers Association, the Primary Industry Association and other Kimberley residents.

It acts in a consultative way and is one of the sources of advice being drawn upon by the company and its subsidiary WA Livestock Holdings Ltd in formulating plans for the ultimate subdivision and sale of viable pastoral units from the lands in the company's control in the Kimberleys. The consultative committee is the vehicle for private sector advice.

A Government inter-departmental committee also advises the company. The Department of Lands and the Pastoral Board are both represented at a senior level on this committee.

It should be emphasised that the leases formerly owned by the Emanuel family companies are now owned by WA Livestock Holdings Ltd which is a subsidiary of the Western Australian Exim Corporation Ltd and as such operates under the Companies Code. Responsibility for its operations is therefore vested in its management and Board of Directors.

I maintain the same overview of the leases held by this company through the Department of Lands and the Pastoral Board as I would of any lease held by any other company incorporated under the Companies Code.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY:

Kimberley Pastoral Properties Consultative Investigative Committee:

Mr Stephen Hawke

156. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) As Minister responsible for the administration of the Land Act, does he support the appointment of Mr Stephen Hawke to the consultative committee investigating the restructuring of the Kimberley pastoral industry?
- (2) Can he state any special qualifications that Mr Hawke has in relation to the pastoral industry that sees him appointed to this important and highly influential Government position?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) and (2) Mr Stephen Hawke has had a number of years experience working as an adviser to an Aboriginal community in the Kimberley. Accordingly, I can well understand the decision of the Western Australian Exim Corporation Ltd to invite Mr Hawke to participate as one of the eleven members on the Consultative Committee since the interests of the Aboriginal residents of the Kimberley are of course affected by the reconstruction of the Kimberley Pastoral Industry.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Pastoral Leases: Interest

157. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) What Aboriginal groups have indicated an interest in land with the Emanuel and Australian Land and Cattle Company leases?
- (2) Would he table maps showing the areas sought and the dates requests were received?
- (3) Would he state the means by which the Government is considering Aboriginal groups may be granted excisions and may purchase pastoral leases in the area?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) The Marra Worra Worra Aboriginal Corporation has made it known that various Aboriginal groups living in the Fitzroy Valley have links to land within the former Emanuel leases and also those currently held by the Australian Land and Cattle Company.
- (2) Plans showing the excisions already approved and those for which no decisions have been reached will be prepared and made available to the member as soon as possible together with details of application dates.
- (3) Applications by Aboriginal groups for excisions from pastoral leases are considered on a needs basis with regard also to association with the land by residents or use by those community members. Where Aboriginal communities desire to establish village or group residential areas, endeavours are made to accommodate these requirements with the least possible inconvenience to pastoral lease holders. Excisions to date have been accomplished with the co-operation of pastoral lessees who have voluntarily surrendered the land sought.

The purchase of pastoral leases by Aboriginal groups would be on the same basis as for any others interested.

STOCK: WA LIVESTOCK AND FOOD PTY LTD

Emanuel Family Leases: Purchase

158. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

- (1) When did he receive advice that Western Australian Livestock and Food Pty Ltd was seeking his approval for the purchase of the Emanuel pastoral leases?
- (2) On what date did he give his approval for the transfer of the leases and with what conditions?
- (3) Was he or officers of his department aware that private purchasers were interested in purchasing the Emanuel leases?
- (4) Further to (3), did he or his officers receive any preliminary approach seeking advice on conditions that may be attached to transfer of leases?
- (5) If "No" to (3) and (4), can he categorically state that the only interested party in the purchase of the Emanuel leases was the State's taxpayers *via* Exim?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) The Under Secretary for Lands received a request dated 30 January 1985 for approval to negotiate the transfer of the Emanuel leases.
- (2) My approval to the transfer was conveyed on 7 March 1985. The standard conditions applicable to the transfer of pastoral leases were specified.
- (3) and (4) Yes.
- (5) Not applicable.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Emanuel Family: Purchase

159. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

On what date was agreement in principle reached between the Commonwealth Government and State Government relative to the purchase of the Emanuel pastoral leases?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

There was never any specific agreement reached between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government in relation to the transfer of the Emanuel leases from the

Emanuel family. In October 1984 discussions were held with the Prime Minister during the course of which it was agreed that the Commonwealth would provide assistance to the State for the reconstruction of the Kimberley pastoral industry. One of the subsequent initiatives taken towards this end was the purchase by the Western Australian Exim Corporation Ltd's subsidiary WA Livestock Holdings Ltd of the four Emanuel companies which held pastoral leases in the Kimberleys.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Emanuel Family: Sale

160. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) What were the terms and conditions pertaining to the sale of each of the four Emanuel properties?
- (2) What was the number of livestock accepted as part of the purchase on each property?
- (3) (a) Has any muster been made to verify stock numbers;
(b) when was this done; and
(c) by whom?
- (4) What Government officer or department has overviewed the purchase and transfer of assets from Emanuel to Western Australian Livestock Holdings Limited?
- (5) Further to (4), would he table all correspondence?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) The Emanuel family sold all of the shares in the companies which held pastoral leases in the Kimberley to WA Livestock Holdings Ltd which is a subsidiary of the Western Australian Exim Corporation Ltd. WA Livestock Holdings is answerable to its Board of Directors and operates under the Companies Code as does any other privately incorporated company. For these reasons the terms and conditions of purchase relating to the transaction which is the subject of the member's question are confidential to the parties to that transaction.
- (4) The transfer of the shares in the Emanuel companies to the ownership of WA Livestock Holdings Ltd was

subject to the same governmental overview as any transfer of shares in a company holding pastoral leases.

(5) Not applicable.

FORESTS: WOODCHIPPING

Forest Management Strategy

161. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Does the Government recognise woodchipping as an important and valuable component of an overall forest management strategy, and will he give details?

Mr DAVIES replied:

Yes. Details will be provided to the member if he would specify which details he requires.

162. *Postponed.*

FORESTS: PINE

Plantings

163. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) What decision has the Government made in regard to planting of pine in the Shires of—
 - (a) Manjimup;
 - (b) Boyup Brook;
 - (c) Bridgetown-Greenbushes;
 - (d) Donnybrook-Balingup;
 - (e) Nannup;
 - (f) Busselton;
 - (g) Augusta-Margaret River;
 - (h) Collie;
 - (i) other areas?
- (2) What planting will be carried out in the current year in the above shires on—
 - (a) Crown land;
 - (b) forest land;
 - (c) private property;
 - (d) leased private property;
 - (e) other?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) (a) A planting programme of 500 hectares per annum will continue;

- (b) to (i) land will be purchased for pine planting at a rate determined by available land and funds up to a maximum of 2 750 hectares per annum.

- (2) This information is not available as planting is still in progress and will not be completed until the end of this month. It could be sometime later before information is to hand regarding private property plantings.

164 to 168. *Postponed.*

FORESTS

Shannon River Basin: Reserves

169. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) What has been the extent of cutting of—
 (a) road;
 (b) stream;
 (c) river,
 reserves to find additional supplies of timber necessitated by the reservation of the Shannon River Basin?
- (2) (a) Has this programme of cutting been monitored;
 (b) by whom; and
 (c) with what results to date?
- (3) How much timber is available for milling purposes in the areas indicated in (1)?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) The planned area of cutting trials is—
 (a) 255 ha in road reserves;
 (b) 100 ha in stream reserves;
 (c) 42 ha in river reserves.
 Cutting is not yet complete.
- (2) (a) Yes;
 (b) a joint working party of officers of the Department of Conservation and Land Management and the Western Australian Water Authority;
 (c) no results are yet available.
- (3) This information is not available as cutting has not yet been completed. Data will be forwarded to the member when available. Depending on

weather conditions, cutting is expected to be completed about the end of September.

170. *Postponed.*

FORESTS: SHANNON RIVER BASIN

Log Production: Cessation

171. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) As a result of the Government ceasing log production in—
 (a) Lane-Poole Reserve; and
 (b) Shannon River Basin,
 what will be the consequences for the State's timber milling and wood chipping industry in the years 1986-91?
- (2) (a) Will there be a further reduction in available hardwood logs;
 (b) what mills will be affected; and
 (c) where?
- (3) What alternatives to supply hardwood logs does the Government propose to ensure that towns including Yarloop, Manjimup, Nannup are not commercially and socially disadvantaged by its decision to "lock up" timber from these areas?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) to (3) All these matters are being considered in the review of the current general work plan which will regulate timber harvesting from State forest over the period 1986 to 1991.

172. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Nine-day Fortnight

173. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Would he detail those—
 (a) salaried officers;
 (b) wages staff,
 in departments and agencies under his portfolios who work a nine-day fortnight?
- (2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?

- (3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?
- (4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—
 - (a) services provided and expected;
 - (b) increased costs; and
 - (c) to what extent?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing by the Minister for Industrial Relations.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Nine-day Fortnight

174. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Would he detail those—
 - (a) salaried officers;
 - (b) wages staff,
 in departments and agencies under his portfolios who work a nine-day fortnight?
- (2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?
- (3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?
- (4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—
 - (a) services provided and expected;
 - (b) increased costs; and
 - (c) to what extent?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing by the Minister for Industrial Relations.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Nine-day Fortnight

175. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Would he detail those—
 - (a) salaried officers;
 - (b) wages staff,
 in departments and agencies under his portfolios who work a nine-day fortnight?

- (2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?

- (3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?

- (4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—
 - (a) services provided and expected;
 - (b) increased costs; and
 - (c) to what extent?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing by the Minister for Industrial Relations.

176. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Nine-day Fortnight

177. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) Would he detail those—
 - (a) salaried officers;
 - (b) wages staff,
 in departments and agencies under his portfolios who work a nine-day fortnight?
- (2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?
- (3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?
- (4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—
 - (a) services provided and expected;
 - (b) increased costs; and
 - (c) to what extent?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) to (4) The Minister for Industrial Relations will advise the member, in due course in writing, the information he seeks.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Nine-day Fortnight

178. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Would he detail those—

(a) salaried officers;

(b) wages staff,

in departments and agencies under his portfolios who work a nine-day fortnight?

(2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?

(3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?

(4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—

(a) services provided and expected;

(b) increased costs; and

(c) to what extent?

Mr DAVIES replied:

(1) There are no staff in the Department of Conservation and Land Management who work a nine-day fortnight.

(2) to (4) Not applicable.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Nine-day Fortnight

179. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Would he detail those—

(a) salaried officers;

(b) wages staff,

in departments and agencies under his portfolios who work a nine-day fortnight?

(2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?

(3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?

(4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—

(a) services provided and expected;

(b) increased costs; and

(c) to what extent?

Mr EVANS replied:

(1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing by the Minister for Industrial Relations.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Nine-day Fortnight

180. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Would he detail those—

(a) salaried officers;

(b) wages staff,

in departments and agencies under his portfolio who work a nine-day fortnight?

(2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?

(3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?

(4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—

(a) services provided and expected;

(b) increased costs; and

(c) to what extent?

Mr HODGE replied:

(1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing by the Minister for Industrial Relations.

181. *Postponed.*

EXPLOSIVES AND DANGEROUS GOODS ACT

"Bulk Container": Definition

182. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

What is the precise definition of a "bulk container", as referred to in Regulation 801, under the Explosives and Dangerous Goods Act 1961?

Mr PARKER replied:

"Bulk container" means a container, not being a freight container or an outer package, in which dangerous goods are packed for transport, which container—

(a) if it contains dangerous goods of class 2, has a water capacity exceeding 500 litres;

(b) if it contains dangerous goods, not being of class 2, that, at 55° Celsius, are in the form of a liquid or a paste, has a water capacity exceeding 250 litres; or

- (c) contains more than 400 kilograms of dangerous goods that, at 55° Celsius, are in solid form.

ROAD: CARNARVON-GASCOYNE JUNCTION

Condition

183. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that the Carnarvon-Gascoyne Junction Road is currently in very poor condition due to lack of adequate funding?
- (2) Will he endeavour to provide more funding for this road in the 1985-86 and subsequent budgets?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The road within the Shire of Carnarvon is currently in poor condition. The Main Roads Department and shire engineers have studied the road deficiencies and identified where available funds can be spent to best advantage. Current work by the council work force should achieve substantial improvements.
- (2) Over the past five years \$450 000 of Government funds has been allocated to the Carnarvon Shire Council for improvement and maintenance of this road including \$88 000 in 1985-86. The allocations for the current year have already been approved, however the needs of this road will be considered when determining priorities and allocations in future programmes.

ROAD: CARNARVON-GASCOYNE JUNCTION

Traffic Counts

184. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Are regular road counts carried out on the Carnarvon-Gascoyne Junction Road?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) how often have the counts been done;
 - (b) what times of the year have they been done;
 - (c) have the results shown a trend of increasing traffic on this road?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) (a) Approximately once every 2 years;
- (b) counts are taken in different months of the year and adjusted to an annual daily average in keeping with nearby permanent traffic counters;
- (c) counts on the Carnarvon-Gascoyne Junction Road at the turn-off from North West Coastal Highway have been 50, 54 and 56 vehicles per day in the years 1978, 1981 and 1983 respectively. Some 38 km inland at the Rocky Pool turn-off the counts were 43, 21 and 26 vehicles per day for the same years. No significant trends are apparent.

ROAD: CARNARVON-GASCOYNE JUNCTION

Tourist Traffic

185. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that the major tourist attraction of Mt Augustus in the upper Gascoyne and the associated tourist developments at Mt Augustus station and Cobra Station are causing a considerable build-up of traffic on the Carnarvon-Gascoyne Junction Road and other roads in this general area?
- (2) Is additional funding required for these roads to cope with this additional traffic?
- (3) Is he also aware of substantial roadtrain movement in this general area that is also causing additional difficulties with these roads?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) I am aware of the tourist development at Cobra and Mt Augustus Stations but have no details of the traffic build-up. I understand the Carnarvon and Upper Gascoyne Councils are evaluating the traffic movements in the area.
- (2) The councils concerned are responsible for determining priorities for roadworks in their shires and allocation of road funds.
- (3) Yes.

**ROAD: CARNARVON-GASCOYNE
JUNCTION**

Classification

186. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

Will he give consideration to upgrading the classification of the Carnarvon-Gascoyne Junction Road from a secondary road to a main road?

Mr GRILL replied:

The classification of this road has recently been reviewed and it was found to be appropriately classified as a secondary road since it did not meet the principal warrants for a main road classification.

COURT: LICENSING COURT

Revenue Collections

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

- (1) Further to question 22 of Tuesday, 20 August 1985, concerning revenue collected by the Licensing Court, will the Minister provide examples of how much the premiums are with regard to projects such as the Merlin Hotel, Orchard Hotel and Burswood Island casino?
- (2) How does the Licensing Court justify charging a premium?
- (3) Is the Minister's department in agreement with the premiums charged by the Licensing Court?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The liquor licence for the Burswood Casino Hotel is exempt from the payment of a premium pursuant to recent amendments to the Liquor Act.

The Merlin Hotel premium was \$160 000, plus \$21 000 for a cabaret licence.

The Orchard Hotel premium was \$39 500, plus \$21 000 for a cabaret licence.

- (2) The fixing of a premium is mandatory in respect of new hotel and tavern licences. A discretionary power for the Licensing Court to impose a premium in respect of variations to hotel and tavern premises was introduced in 1981. This was done to discourage the

practice of building small premises initially, for which a lesser premium would be payable, and subsequently effecting major variations which could not attract a premium.

- (3) The Licensing Court is an independent judicial body responsible for any matter within its jurisdiction.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**INSURANCE: STATE GOVERNMENT
INSURANCE OFFICE**

Price Waterhouse Report

27. Mr BRIAN BURKE (Premier):

As a point of clarification, I indicate that yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked me, during his speech on the Address-in-Reply debate, whether I would send him a copy of the Price Waterhouse report on the operations of the SGIO. I advised him that I was under the impression I had sent him a copy but that I might not have, and I undertook to check the matter. I did so this morning and I am able to advise that in a letter dated 21 January 1985 and addressed to the Acting Leader of the Opposition, I forwarded information outlining the Government's intentions for the State Government Insurance Office, but indicated that I was unable to supply a copy of the Price Waterhouse-Rothwells report because it contained a great deal of commercially confidential information which could be used to the disadvantage of the organisations concerned; that is, the SGIO and the MVIT.

The Leader of the Opposition will be aware that the Price Waterhouse report on the Tourism Commission was released and a copy forwarded to him.

There may have been some confusion in my mind about the two reports. The only thing I can do is to indicate that if the Leader of the Opposition wants a briefing on the Price Waterhouse-Rothwells report, if he contacts the director general of my department I will arrange for that briefing to be given to the Leader of the Opposition.

INSURANCE: STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Price Waterhouse-Rothwells Report

28. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

The Premier will be aware that I am about to ask a question on the same matter on which he has just commented because I telephoned his office at 11 o'clock this morning. In view of the fact that yesterday he mentioned not only that he had sent a copy of the Price Waterhouse-Rothwells report to me—which he now acknowledges as not having been sent to me—but also that he believed the report had been released to the public, and in view of the remarks he has just made, is it the Government's intention to keep secret the report and not release it to the public at all?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Just so that there is no misunderstanding, let me quote from my comment in *Hansard* yesterday. I said—

I thought you asked a question about when it was to be released and whether you could have a copy. I was under the impression that I have sent you a copy, but I may not have.

I tried to elaborate by saying—

Mr Hassell: There were earlier remarks.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There may have been but I am trying to put into context the whole thing, and that appears to me to be the last comment I made. As I said previously when trying to clarify the situation, if the Leader of the Opposition wants a briefing on the report I am prepared to arrange for that, but the release of the report is constrained by the commercially confidential information about the SGIO and the MVIT contained in the report. For that reason it is not proposed to make the report public. I am perfectly happy to have the matter reviewed with a view to releasing the report, less the commercially confidential information, but then the Leader of the Opposition will accuse us of releasing just half the report. It is a very difficult situation to meet unless we seriously disadvantage those two statutory authorities, according to them. On

that basis it is not envisaged that the report will be made public. The Leader of the Opposition may have a briefing and I am happy to consider whether we can exclude the commercially confidential information about the operations of the SGIO and the MVIT—information that may damage those two organisations in the competitive or commercial sense—if the Leader of the Opposition thinks that is appropriate after the briefing.

HEALTH: VENEREAL DISEASES

Penalties

29. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Health:

My question follows on from an answer that the Minister gave to the member for Balcatta's question yesterday about existing penalties under the Health Act. Could the Minister please inform the House—

- (1) When were the existing penalties in relation to venereal disease last increased?
- (2) Has the incidence of venereal disease dropped since those penalties were increased?
- (3) Would the Minister please advise what is the incubation period for AIDS?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) to (3) I advise the member for Kalgoorlie that the penalties to which he refers were last raised in 1965, and that, since that time, the number of notifications of venereal disease has increased five-fold.

I can further advise that the incubation period for AIDS is at least two years, and may be a lot longer; so a sufferer could contract the disease without showing symptoms for years. It is, therefore, distinctly possible that the carrier could unknowingly transmit the disease to another person at any time during the incubation period.

I await with some considerable interest the legislation the member for Kalamunda has promised to introduce into this House on this matter. I really cannot believe

that he proposes a six-month gaol sentence for people who are found to be suffering from AIDS. It really seems quite incredible that he proposes that a person dying from AIDS would firstly be put into a prison rather than a hospital, and, secondly, of course, there is much more inclination for prison communities to indulge in homosexuality than would perhaps the normal population. Thirdly, of course, I do not imagine that the prison officers would be very thrilled about handling AIDS victims in the State prison system.

So all in all, it seems to me a very odd procedure which the member for Kalamunda has outlined, and which he intends introducing into this House, and I think all members on the Government side will wait with some interest to see how he actually tackles this problem.

EDUCATION

Student-free Days

30. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

What arrangements have been made by the Education Department to accommodate children of working parents for the two pupil-free days granted to teachers to prepare for the introduction of changes resulting from the Beazley report?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The short answer is: None. In having pupil-free days this year—two for high schools and two for primary schools—we are trying to achieve a balance between the legitimate needs of schools and to make dramatically increased provision for the professional development of teachers because of the very heavy loads that they are bearing in that regard. Next year, of course, and thereafter, there will not be any difficulty because of the new four-term-year arrangements; we have set aside four professional development days on which teachers will be at schools and the children will not be expected to attend. Those four days actually represent a cut into the hol-

iday time of teachers under the old arrangements, so we are in fact giving teachers fewer holidays and more time for professional development.

Mr Hassell: Having children at school must be a terrible annoyance to teachers. It must really upset their metabolisms.

Mr Old: Pupil-free days!

Mr PEARCE: I do want to hear the Opposition's comments on this question because the Government is doing what it always tries to do—to arrive at a correct balance in these matters. We are on the one hand opposing one-fifth time to primary teachers because we feel that the State cannot currently afford it, and on the other hand, we are also of the view that the professional development that is necessary to implement the Beazley report recommendations does require some days for professional development. I made a similar decision last year when we took the reading programme through primary schools, and rather than try to spend approximately \$5 million or \$6 million for teacher replacements so that professional development can be undertaken, we have taken the cheaper option of closing the schools for a day. I am interested to know the Opposition's attitude to this matter. Perhaps members of the Opposition would state clearly if they are in support of this matter or not.

Mr Hassell: We will make our statements when we are ready. We are listening in amazement to yours at the moment.

Mr PEARCE: My position on the matter is perfectly clear.

Mr MacKinnon: You have made no arrangements for parents whatsoever for those pupil-free days. That is all I asked you.

Mr PEARCE: That is right, in the same way that no arrangement was made, for example, when under the previous Government staff meetings were called for an afternoon and students were sent home early. In those circumstances, in general terms the children become the responsibility of the parents.

Mr Taylor: They were given at least a week's notice.

Mr PEARCE: That is right. They were given at least a week's notice, and the schools are not obliged to use the same day. In fact, the schools have been asked to cause the least possible inconvenience to parents. If members of the Opposition are opposed to that arrangement, let them say so.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: The Government's position is quite clear. I inform the Opposition that if it has hopes, come election time, it will have to realise that when the silences come, after we have announced our policy on these matters. The time will come, gentlemen, when the Opposition will have to answer.

FISHERIES: RESEARCH

Northern Regions

31. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Fisheries:

What assistance is being given to aid research projects in northern fisheries?

Mr EVANS replied:

The Government has allocated \$89 000 from the fisheries research and development fund for research projects in two northern fisheries.

After negotiations between the Marine and Harbours Department and the Fisheries Department up to \$70 000 will be spent on providing a research facility on Broome Jetty.

Part of the jetty transit shed will be used as a field station for the Fisheries Department's pearl oyster cultivation studies.

A further \$19 000 has been allocated for the final stage of the tiger prawn breeding monitoring programme in the Exmouth Gulf prawn fishery.

The funds for the Broome project will be used to install a seawater pumping station, an algal laboratory and to carry out modifications to the transit shed.

Since 1980 the Fisheries Department has been looking at unusual mortalities of pearl oysters, and this

mortality has caused a deal of consternation to the pearl farmers in the Broome region.

In the next two years about \$300 000 will be spent on the project and it is hoped to enhance the availability of pearl oysters for pearl cultivation in Western Australia.

The research is being carried out in a small hatchery at Waterman and while this has been successful and breeding has been improved, a major problem involves getting supplies of mature oysters from Broome. Duplicating the facilities at Broome is seen as a way of overcoming the problem.

Part of the transit shed will be used as a field station for the next two to three years while plans for a shore-based facility can be determined.

The Exmouth Gulf monitoring programme aims to look at the relationship between spawning tiger prawn stocks and the numbers which will reach harvestable size.

The monitoring programme is of paramount importance for the management of the Exmouth Gulf prawn fishery and the final stage will result in a greater understanding of the fishing pressures the fishery can sustain.

The policy developed by the Fisheries Department which is supported by this Government has improved the recruitment stock dramatically. The levels in the past three years have increased immensely because of the restrictions on the fishing pressure imposed by the Government. Now the industry is starting to show the justification for and the fruit of that policy.

EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOLS

Teachers

32. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Minister employ teachers in pre-schools?
- (2) Is the Minister supporting the State School Teachers Union in its moves in the Industrial Relations Commission to gain coverage of pre-school teachers who are already members of the pre-school teachers and associates union?

- (3) If so, why is he intervening in this case?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (3) I have had lengthy discussions with the Miscellaneous Workers Union which covers the pre-primary school teachers and with the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia with regard to the circumstances of employment of pre-school teachers. The situation in this area is rather messy because of the convoluted statements made by the member for Narrogin when he was Minister for Education.

When the Pre-school Board was abolished in 1977, the former Minister made a distinction which was not valid in law. He argued that pre-primary teachers would be employed by the Education Department and pre-school teachers would be employed in a different way through the Education Department. He saw a distinction in that kind of employment. In fact, in my discussions with both unions, we moved to get both pre-school and pre-primary teachers on the same set of conditions. In the end we ran up against the strange statements made by the former Minister which have proved to be legally inaccurate.

The legal fact is that all pre-school teachers are employed by me as the responsible Minister. There is no difference in the employment between a pre-primary and a pre-school teacher. I have taken no position with regard to the coverage of pre-school teachers by the Miscellaneous Workers Union or to the coverage of pre-primary school teachers by the State School Teachers Union. I have said that the problem would be more easily solved if both unions continued to cover the different sets of teachers. I understand that there is a dispute between the unions which has gone before the Industrial Relations Commission. I take no position on this matter. I do not feel it is any of my business and I am sure the Industrial Relations Commission will make a decision on the matter without my assistance.

ELECTORAL: ENROLMENTS

Imbalance

33. Mr P. J. SMITH, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) What is the degree of imbalance in enrolments in the Western Australian electoral system?
(2) Do these imbalances create a contravention of accepted United Nations standards?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) The ratio between the enrolment numbers of the highest and of the lowest electorates for this Parliament are 7:1 in the Legislative Assembly and 11:1 in the Legislative Council. Imbalances in enrolments are a source of embarrassment within Australia because the extent of malapportionment in our electoral system is the worst in Australia. Internationally, our major trading partner has condemned imbalances in its own electoral enrolments. The Japanese Supreme Court has been reported to have ruled that the previous election there was unconstitutional because some electorates have four times the number of electors in them than other electorates.

Uncomfortable comparisons like this reinforce the resolution of this Government to strive for a fair electoral system of which every Western Australian can be proud in a national as well as an international sense.

Before members opposite think it is funny to endorse United Nations' resolutions, they should remember that it was the conservative Government in Canberra which ratified that agreement.

TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

Cattle Marketing: Mr Keith Gale

34. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Is Mr Gale, in his capacity as an adviser to the Department of Premier and Cabinet, required to oversee the marketing of cattle from the previous Emanuel leases on behalf of Exim?

Mr EVANS replied:

Mr Gale is employed within the Department of—

Mr Old: Answer the question.

Mr EVANS: I am not sure of the precise mechanics whereby the cattle have been marketed. However, I will undertake to find out the precise details of those mechanics for the member for Katanning-Roe.

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Antismoking Campaigns: Young People

35. Mrs WATKINS, to the Minister for Health:

Is it the Government's intention to direct a significantly greater proportion of Government grants to groups working on antismoking programmes aimed at the young?

Mr HODGE replied:

Yes. Out of a total of \$85 000 which will be made available to voluntary groups, more than \$27 000 will go towards work with the young.

For the first time four Western Australian high schools will receive grants totalling \$7 350 for work on antismoking campaigns.

The International Youth Year co-ordinating committee will receive \$20 000 for an educational programme based on a theatre group. The grants reaffirm this Government's commitment to its antismoking campaign. However while the campaign has been successful, there is still a long way to go.

In particular, we have a lot of work to do with young people and there is no better place to start than in our schools. We must aim to encourage people not to take up smoking, not just work on them after they have the habit.

The four schools to receive assistance are—

Wanneroo Senior High School—a grant of \$5 500 to mount a programme involving all pupils, aimed at encouraging personal development of self-esteem in a smoke-free community.

Woodvale High School—\$750 to run an intensive course for the Year 8 intake to provide smoke-free models for following students.

Melville Senior High School—\$400 to train peer group leaders in smoking education.

Belmont Senior High School—\$700 for an extensive programme including a smoking clinic.

Significant components of other grants encompass youth activities.

There are many exciting and innovative projects being undertaken by a variety of groups in the community.

For example, the International Youth Year co-ordinating committee will use its grant to involve young people with experienced performers and directors to produce a show focusing on the issues of cigarette smoking.

We will continue to help community organisations, educational institutions, health agencies, and any other groups which support our bid to reduce the incidence of smoke-related diseases in Western Australia.

TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

Cattle Marketing: Mr Keith Gale

36. Mr OLD, to the Premier:

In view of the fact that the Minister for Agriculture is not responsible for Exim, I ask the Premier—

Is Mr Gale, in his capacity as an adviser to the Department of Premier and Cabinet, required to oversee the marketing of cattle from the previous Emanuel leases on behalf of Exim?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Firstly, in answer to a question which I think was asked and answered tonight, I pointed out that Mr Gale was a consultant to the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Secondly, in respect of the Emanuel leases, I am not sure about the role that Mr Gale has been playing in either the marketing of cattle or in talking to those people in the industry

who have an interest in the Emanuel leases and the way in which the Government, with the help of the industry, hopes to restructure the industry. I am perfectly happy to ask Exim to define for me the role that Mr Gale is playing. I am sure it will be a worthwhile one.

In conclusion, I should say that the Opposition, in its criticism, appears to be out of step with how the industry feels about the whole exercise because, consistently, we are being told that, for the first time in this State's recent history, a Government is facing up to some of the problems associated with the pastoral industry in our north. Those problems include problems of insecurity of tenure, problems of stations that are run from outside the control of the State, problems of overgrazing, problems of conflicting demands for land, problems of dog control, and many other matters. Those matters are being seriously addressed within the commercial context of the Emanuel properties. The latest advice I have received from Exim is that the Emanuel properties are shaping up to be an excellent purchase by the State Government.

Mr Old: What is so secret about the marketing of the cattle?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There is no secret.

Mr Old: Why was I told those matters are confidential to the company?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am perfectly happy to ask whether Mr Gale is involved in the marketing arrangements. I will ask Exim whether it will reveal that information, apparently in answer to a question asked by the member for Katanning-Roe.

Members of the Opposition might recall that they made the Western Australian Development Corporation, specifically by legislation, outside the control and direction of the Government.

Mr Hassell: Exim is not within the control of the Government. You were the one who got Western Australian Government Holdings through on the basis of buying diamonds.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not saying that Exim was established on the same principle. I am pointing to the inconsistencies in the attitudes of the Opposition.

Mr Hassell: There was no parliamentary approval for Exim's operations. The matter was never brought before Parliament for approval.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: All I can say is that the inconsistencies in the Opposition's attitude are highlighted by the fact that, on the one hand, it would seek to ensure that the WADC remains outside the direction of the Government and outside its knowledge, if that is the Opposition's insistence.

Mr Hassell: You don't know what the Opposition's attitude towards Exim is because you have never brought it before Parliament.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition's attitude to Exim has been reflected in some of its interjections tonight. In any case, I guess the fundamental issue is that, if the WADC is to be expected to operate commercially and Western Australian Government Holdings is expected to operate commercially and not to gain advantage from the Government, the least the Opposition can expect is the refuge that the Opposition provided to the WADC. That is an indication of the Opposition's attitude. It has obligations under the Companies Code and also it has obligations to purchasers and other people with whom it enters into commercial operations and agreements. I suspect those people will not want their commercial secrets, if one wants to put them that way, displayed publicly. That may apply to Exim. I do not know whether it has put a caveat on the disclosure of information. I am perfectly happy to ask Mr Gale to advise me of his role in the marketing of cattle and to advise me also of the role he is playing in assisting Exim in splitting up the Emanuel properties satisfactorily.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Kalgoorlie

37. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

Can the Minister for Transport outline what further funds the Burke Government, as part of its catch-up plan after nine years of Liberal Government neglect, is putting into the Kalgoorlie region in the area of road construction and maintenance during this financial year?

Mr GRILL replied:

A total of \$13.47 million has been allocated for road construction and maintenance in the Kalgoorlie region during this financial year. This includes Commonwealth funds provided by the Australian land transport programme and the Australian bicentennial road development programme.

The allocation includes \$3.9 million for roads under the control of local authorities. This comprises \$2.32 million in statutory and ABRD grants and other allocations of \$1.58 million for the improvement and maintenance of council roads.

In a programme to upgrade Eyre Highway, \$1 530 000 has been allocated for widening and reconstructing 63 kilometres of the highway between Cocklebiddy and Madura. This is the first stage of a proposed programme for widening the entire length of the highway within Western Australia, which will be funded over a number of years. Another \$2 108 000 will be spent on maintaining the highway, including resealing 102 kilometres.

Another major item is continuing the reconstruction work on Great Eastern Highway between Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. For this \$1 755 000 has been allocated as part of the cost of reconstructing the remaining 13.1 km on this section of the highway. It is expected this project will be completed early in the 1986-87 financial year.

Funds have also been provided to widen and seal the shoulders over 8.1 kilometres between the railway

underpass and Throssel Street. This work, with reconstruction between Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie, will greatly improve the entrance to the town of Kalgoorlie.

An amount of \$1 635 000 will be spent on improvement and maintenance of the Coolgardie-Esperance Road. The improvements include reconstruction of a 1.1 km section at the junction with Great Eastern Highway and reconstruction of a 2.38 km section over Lake Cowan, north of Norseman.

An allocation of \$555 000 has been made for sealing and resealing 6.5 km south of Leonora on the Kalgoorlie-Meekatharra Road. This work will complete the widening of the road between Kalgoorlie and the railhead at Leonora, a distance of 237 km.

An extra \$100 000 has been provided for construction to start on a new 30.4 road between Leinster and Miranda. This new road, which will be constructed as a gravel road, will provide a through route between Leonora and Wiluna via Leinster.

Allocations for works on local authority roads include—

\$206 000 for construction of the Kalgoorlie eastern bypass, between Hainault Road and Boorara Road.

\$170 000 for formation improvements and gravelling of the Laverton-Warburton Road in the Shires of Laverton and Wiluna.

\$107 000 for maintenance including resealing and shoulder reconditioning on the Esperance-Israelite Bay Road in the Shire of Esperance.

\$91 500 for improvements to the Cascades Road in the Shire of Esperance.

\$60 000 for gravel sheeting 15 km of the Agnew-Leinster Road in the Shire of Leonora.

\$50 000 for formation improvements on the Warburton-Giles Road in the Shire of Wiluna.

I think all members would agree that that is a very fine programme.

POLICE: BLUE LIGHT DISCOS

Albany

38. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Minister seen my letter of 9 August 1985 marked "Urgent" in connection with the blue light discos conducted in Albany by local off-duty policemen?
- (2) Is the Minister prepared to take urgent action to ensure that this worthwhile community service is not strangled to death by Government red tape?
- (3) Does he interpret the present health regulations as giving him discretionary powers to approve the conduct of functions of this type?
- (4) As the blue light discos have been highly successful, attracting hundreds of young people, can he say what changes to the regulations he proposes to allow the discos to continue?
- (5) When will the proposed changes, if any, be made?

Mr HODGE replied:

I thank the member for Albany for some previous notice of the questions, the answers to which are as follows—

- (1) Yes, I have seen his letter.
- (2) Yes, I have already taken action. I received, in addition to his letter, representations from the Minister for Police and Hon. Tom Knight. I have discussed the matter at some length with senior officers in the Health Department to see what action, if any, can be taken.
- (3) With respect to discretionary power, I advise that we are talking about public safety regulations that were enacted under the Health Act. They do not provide for the Minister to have any discretionary power, nor for the Commissioner of Health or any other person. Thus, the regulations have been approved by this Parliament and are the law of the land. Therefore, they must be obeyed. The honourable member referred to the regulations as strangling red tape. That is his opinion. His Government, not

ours, enacted those regulations some years ago. However, I understand why they were enacted. They were enacted to provide public safety for people using public buildings.

- (4) With respect to the action I will take, I have discussed the matter with senior officers, including Dr McNulty (the Executive Director of Public Health) and Dr Richard Lugg (the officer in charge of health inspection services). I have asked them urgently to convene a meeting with the police and the fire brigades to discuss the matter, and to see whether there is indeed some room for altering the existing regulations in view of the very special circumstances of the blue light discos.

- (5) If any changes are to be made, obviously they will be made as soon as possible. I am as keen as the member for Albany, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, and Mr Knight to ensure that the blue light discos continue to be the great success that they are. However, the regulations were enacted by the previous Government to ensure that public safety in public buildings is at all times, and under all circumstances, protected. There have been some terrible tragedies overseas caused in discotheques, nightclubs, and hotels by overcrowding; and it is my responsibility, as the Minister for Health, to try to ensure that these sorts of tragedies are not allowed to happen in Western Australia.

However, taking that into account, if the public health officials in consultation with the police and the Fire Brigades Board recommend to me that the regulations should be amended, I will be only too happy to take the quickest possible action to implement that recommendation.

HOSPITAL LAUNDRY AND LINEN SERVICE

Sale

39. Mrs BEGGS, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Does the Government support the disposal of the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service to the private sector?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr HODGE replied:

(1) No, the Government has no plan to sell the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service.

(2) A report commissioned by the O'Connor Government recommended against the disposal of the laundry and linen service to the private sector.

The report was commissioned in 1982 from consultants P.A. Australia by my predecessor, the then Minister for Health, Mr Ray Young, and was received before the previous Government left office.

The consultants were asked to consider outright sale, leasing, and joint private and Government equity.

P.A. Australia warned of two major risks associated with any transfer of the service to private management. These were—

the successful private operator monopolising the metropolitan laundry business, not just hospital business, because of benefits conferred by ownership of Hospital Laundry and Linen Service;

industrial action because of the need a private operator would have to achieve operating economies in a short time.

This amounted to objective independent evidence that the privatisation policy being pursued by the Opposition would lead to the loss of jobs and the establishment of a private monopoly.

The report showed the sale of the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service would be viable only if the private purchaser could—

lease the building for an amount that represented a return to the Government of less than 10 per cent on its investment;

reduce staff by about 28;

cut linen stocks by 30 per cent while still giving hospitals the service they currently receive;

successfully incorporating the existing laundry business into the hospital service, despite the problems associated with trying to keep the two types of laundry separate; and

charge a higher rate of depreciation.

The previous Government made the only sensible decision it could. It abandoned the attempts to privatise the laundry service.

COMMUNICATIONS: SATELLITES

Receivers: Sales Tax

40. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Regional Development and the North West:

(1) Is the Minister aware that equipment for the earth stations required for outback homesteads to receive communications signals from Australia's domestic satellites when they are launched in a few weeks' time will attract a sales tax at the rate of 32.5 per cent?

(2) Will the Minister approach his Federal colleagues as a matter of urgency and add to my own representations to the Federal Minister to have these products treated as essential rather than luxury items?

Mr GRILL replied:

Unfortunately this particular area of responsibility no longer comes within my charge and although I would be very happy to take up this matter with the Federal Government, I simply do not have that responsibility any longer. There has been a change in portfolio responsibility and this matter is now the responsibility of the Deputy Premier. However, I reply as follows—

(1) and (2) Western Australia in fact has been extraordinarily successful in representations to the Federal Government in respect of the whole outback satellite scheme. I do not want to take all the glory in this regard because the initiatives

were commenced by the previous Government, but they were brought to fruition by the present Government. Initially the spectre presented by the Federal Government was that programmes for the satellite would actually emanate and be presented from the Eastern States. The Western Australian Government was able to convince the Federal Minister that in fact these types of programmes—especially those being received by isolated communities in the outback—should emanate from the State in which they were to be beamed. There was a whole host of technical problems to be overcome in that regard, but everyone of those problems has been overcome. I must admit that the Federal Government did change its policies some months ago. It was a sweeping win to Western Australia, and a vindication of the very detailed work that was carried out by the Department of Regional Development. However, having succeeded in that, the responsibility was then taken over by the Deputy Premier.

ENVIRONMENT: PEEL-HARVEY ESTUARY

Problems

41. Mr READ, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Will the Minister advise what the Government intends doing to combat the algae and navigation problems in the Peel-Harvey Estuary?

Mr DAVIES replied:

I am delighted to be able to give a comprehensive report to the member. The State Government has committed itself to spend \$2.5 million over the next year to combat the algae and navigation problems in the Peel-Harvey Estuary. This expenditure is the next phase in the implementation of measures to restore the long-term health of the estuary.

Stage 1 of the environmental review and management programme, and a public environment report, have

demonstrated that the Government is on the right course with its plans for the area and the reports will be open for public comment for two months. The total cost, if all the recommended options were adopted, would be about \$40 million over four years.

The fact that the Government is giving active consideration to significant expenditure in the future underlines the importance of the estuary to Mandurah as a healthy, robust estuary is of critical importance to the long-term future of Mandurah as a tourist and recreational centre.

The condition of the estuary had deteriorated progressively over the past 20 to 30 years as increasing amounts of phosphorus had run off into what has been a poorly flushed system. This resulted in a massive weed problem. A six-point action plan has been developed for the estuary and includes three major initiatives, namely—

- (a) A detailed engineering and environmental study for the Dawesville Channel at a cost of \$509 000. It is planned to release stage 2 of the environmental review and management programme for the channel in mid-1986.
- (b) A dredging programme, subject to completion of a public environment report assessment, to begin in December downstream of the traffic bridge, at an initial cost of \$460 000.
- (c) Provision of a two-metre deep all-year navigation channel, subject to agreement on cost-sharing arrangements for annual maintenance, at a cost of \$1.4 million in 1985-86.

The Government has also reaffirmed its commitment to the fertiliser modification plan on the coastal plain and to the weed clearing programme in the estuary. Fertiliser controls, weed management, dredging and the proposed Dawesville cut are all elements which will restore the health of the estuary.

The Government has, however, decided to delay a final decision on the Dawesville cut until stage 2 of the environmental review and management programme assessment is completed in about 12 months.

The aim of the proposed dredging work is to improve the navigability of the Mandurah channel and to assist water exchange in the Peel Inlet. This will lead to a reduction in weed growth in the inlet in the long term. The development of a permanent two-metre deep all-year ocean entrance to Mandurah is a separate issue and will thereby enhancing Mandurah's ability to develop as a major centre for recreational boating and fishing. The State Government will seek to enter into an agreement with potential beneficiaries on cost-sharing arrangements for annual maintenance works.

A steering committee, convened by the Department of Conservation and Land Management, will be set up to provide on-going advice to the Government; and the Minister for Transport will take over co-ordination of planning and implementation of all maritime engineering and land development works associated with the estuary strategy.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Emanuel Family: Purchasers

42. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Further to question 158 regarding the Exim purchase of Emanuel leases I ask the Minister—

Will he give an assurance to the House as to whether the consideration he gave those private purchasers who, as he has said, were interested in purchasing the Emanuel properties was any different—

The SPEAKER: Order! The last part of the question is out of order.

Mr McIVER replied:

All this happened a long time ago and I cannot recall each person who made requests of the pastoral board.

Mr Blaikie: March this year; and it was \$8.5 million.

Mr McIVER: Is the member going to answer the question or am I? I will obtain the information for him and advise him of it by correspondence.