

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 15 July 1986

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

EDUCATION: STUDENTS

Censorship: Petition

MR CASH (Mt Lawley) [2.17 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

To: The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, request that the Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled should examine the English and Health Education programs used in Western Australian schools with a view to:

1. Prohibiting the use of any part of films or videos classified "R" or "AO" in any Western Australian school.
2. Prohibiting in Western Australian schools the use of books, films or videos which promote illegal activities such as violence, incest, homosexuality, euthanasia, drugs, suicide, abortion, blasphemy and obscenity.
3. Restricting the use in Western Australian schools of material which usurps parental responsibility in the area of sex education i.e. contraception and pre-marital sex.

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

The petition bears 154 signatures. I certify that it 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. 14.)

PUBLIC TRUST OFFICE

Royal Commission: Petition

MR LEWIS (East Melville) [2.20 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

Enclosed are eight pages of a Petition for a Royal Commission into the operations and system of the Public Trust Office and its agents and servants and their associates, bearing one hundred and sixteen (116) signatures.

Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 116 signatures. I certify that it 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. 15.)

MIDLAND ABATTOIR SALE: SELECT COMMITTEE

Membership: Notice of Motion

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.25 p.m.]: I give notice that at the next sitting of the House I shall move that the member for Cottesloe, Hon. Bill Hassell, be discharged from the services of the Select Committee into the sale of the Midland Abattoir land, and that Richard Lewis, the member for East Melville, be appointed in his place.

Standing Orders Suspension

MR PEARCE (Armadale—Leader of the House) [2.26 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to permit the following motion to be moved forthwith:

That Mr W. R. B. Hassell be discharged from the services of the Select Committee into the sale of the Midland Abattoir land and Mr K. R. Lewis be appointed in his place.

The **SPEAKER**: To be passed, this motion requires the concurrence of an absolute majority. If I hear a dissentient voice I shall have to divide the House.

Question put.

The **SPEAKER**: I have counted the House; and, there being no dissentient voice, I declare the question carried.

Question thus passed.

Motion

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.27 p.m.]: I move—

That Mr R. W. B. Hassell be discharged from the services of the Select Committee into the sale of the Midland Abattoir land and Mr K. R. Lewis be appointed in his place.

MR PEARCE (Armada—Leader of the House) [2.28 p.m.]: I understand the Leader of the Opposition is under some threat because this is not the first part of the process. The Government indicates it is quite prepared to support the Opposition's placing on this committee whoever it wishes.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [2.29 p.m.]: I thank the Leader of the House and the Government for their cooperation in this matter. The reason for dealing with the matter today is so that the new member of the committee can take up his responsibilities from the outset of its deliberations tomorrow morning before the House sits.

It is with regret that I have sought the leave of the House to be discharged from the committee. It is a committee of considerable interest to me and one that, from the initial meetings, I believe will be a most useful and good committee. The demands of my position do not allow me the flexibility or time to give the attention required to that committee. That is why I have sought the leave of the House according to this motion. I am sure that my colleague, the member for East Melville, will very adequately perform the duties of membership of that committee and I thank him for accepting.

Question put and passed.

URGENCY MOTION*Point of Order*

Mr HASSELL: I understand that a request was made to you, Sir, today by my colleague the member for Kalamunda in accordance with Standing Orders Nos. 47 and 48 for an urgency motion. In light of your indication to him that the motion would not be accepted he did not seek leave to proceed with it but rather gave notice of motion for consideration by the House tomorrow.

I further understand that the basis upon which you indicated the likelihood of a ruling against the urgency motion was that the matter

at issue was sub judice because it is before the Industrial Relations Commission.

The **SPEAKER**: It is not my intention to stop the Leader of the Opposition from speaking, but it would seem to me that it is more appropriate that he make a statement to the House. It seems to me that there is not a real point of order. I think he should seek leave to make a personal statement on that basis.

Personal Explanation

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [2.33 p.m.] —by leave: I do not want to make a speech; I merely want to raise an issue because we are currently, as a House, giving consideration to whether the urgency motion procedure is appropriate or whether it should not be replaced by debate on matters of public importance.

Secondly, I make the point that the fact that a matter is before an industrial tribunal does not, on my understanding of the law, make it sub judice. I see very considerable disadvantage to the Parliament of that proposition becoming a general ruling of the House because industrial tribunals are not judicial bodies. Therefore, proceedings in front of industrial tribunals are not sub judice. That is borne out by the fact that debate and controversy concerning industrial disputes continue unabated in the public arena and in the media—television, radio, and newspapers—even when matters are being considered in detail and there are formal hearings before industrial commissions.

Therefore, I would like to submit to you, Sir, that the ruling that has been laid previously by other speakers is one which would unfairly and to the disadvantage of Parliament inhibit debate in this place of matters that the Parliament itself would wish to debate.

Two things should happen. Firstly, the issue of whether matters before industrial tribunals are sub judice should be further considered by yourself and secondly that consideration of matters now taking place between the Government, ourselves, the National Party and yourself, as Speaker, as to the appropriate procedures and Standing Orders relating to matters of public importance, should also be reviewed.

That is simply what I wanted to put on record. I thank the House for receiving it.

The **SPEAKER**: Before proceeding with Orders of the Day or any personal explanations, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the

comments made and advise that I will ensure that the very good and valid reasons he has put before the House will be brought before the next meeting of the Standing Orders Committee and hopefully appropriate changes will be made to the Standing Orders.

BUILDING INDUSTRY (CODE OF CONDUCT) BILL

Personal Explanation

MR PETER DOWDING (Maylands—Minister for Employment and Training) [2.36 p.m.] —by leave: In the edition of *The West Australian* of Friday, 11 July 1986 there was reference to debate in this House on a matter concerning the legislation in relation to the Building Industry (Code of Conduct) Bill.

The report included the following paragraph—

The code was a flexible document “full of motherhood statements” which could change from day to day.

That purported to be a report of a quotation I made in the debate. At the time, I took the opportunity of checking *Hansard* to see if that was an accurate report of what had been said in the House. The *Hansard* report clearly shows, in accordance with my recollection, that it was not an accurate report and that the correct words I used were “and it has in it some motherhood statements”.

I raise the issue because at the time the member for Mt Lawley was making his address he made reference to my having said that the code was full of motherhood statements, and by interjection I had sought to correct him. The reporter who reported this story acted on a quotation from the member for Mt Lawley of what I had said, which was clearly inaccurate. I would refer the member for Mt Lawley to *Hansard* if he has any doubt. I am not sure that that will put the matter to rest in his own mind but it would in everyone else's mind. I wish the record of the House to show the correct quotation I used at that time.

SITTING OF THE HOUSE

Extension: Personal Explanation

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.38 p.m.] —by leave: I refer to the answer provided to question without notice 162 of Thursday, 10 July. I was not here and could not respond at the time. I now take this opportunity to do so.

At the outset, the Minister for Industrial Relations replied and I quote—

I am sorry that so many members of the Liberal Party needed to go home at 6 o'clock. I thought they were the working class. They keep maintaining that they are.

I want to point out to the Parliament and to the Minister for Industrial Relations that the Leader of the House and I have had a very good working relationship through this session of Parliament. The agreement we had last week was to deal with a piece of legislation, to the best of our ability, at the end of the day.

There was no indication from our side to the Parliament that we were not happy to go on that evening if that was necessary. I indicate to the Minister for Industrial Relations that if he is going to make those sorts of inane remarks to the Parliament in a very ill-founded, ill-researched, and ill-judged way, the relationship built up by the Leader of the House and me, representing the Opposition, will certainly not be as healthy as it has been in the past.

I wanted to make sure the Minister was aware of that so that hopefully, in future, he will temper his remarks accordingly.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Presentation to Governor: Acknowledgment

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett): I have to announce that, accompanied by the members for East Melville, Narrogin, Subiaco, and Welshpool, I this day attended upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech in opening Parliament.

His Excellency has been pleased to reply in the following terms—

Mr Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty The Queen and for your Address-in-Reply to my Speech to Parliament on the occasion of the opening of the First Session of the Thirty-Second Parliament.

GORDON REID,
Governor.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

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

**MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC
AFFAIRS COMMISSION AMENDMENT
BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 24 June.

MR CRANE (Moore) [2.42 p.m.]: I indicate from the outset that the Opposition supports this Bill. However, I would like to ask the Minister one or two questions in respect of it. As indicated in the Minister's second reading speech, the Bill provides for the appointment of a deputy commissioner, which is important for the continuity of working arrangements in case the commissioner is absent on leave, or is otherwise away.

I ask the Minister whether this appointment will conflict in any way with the Premier's claim of wishing to streamline the Public Service. The Minister's second reading speech states that the amendment sought to be effected by this Bill will not result in any additional cost to the commission as it substantially reflects existing policy and administrative responsibilities. The Opposition would like to be assured that there will be no additional cost. Where would that deputy commissioner come from? Is another salary to be provided which is not already being provided? If it is to be provided, that would be an additional cost.

However, the Opposition is very happy to support the legislation and give it our fullest support, as we think it is very sensible.

While I am on my feet, I will say something which is of concern to some of us in the Opposition, and certainly to me. It has been suggested that as an Opposition we are not interested in ethnic groups or multicultural affairs. Nothing could be further from the truth. Many of us do fully appreciate the contribution that these people have made to the State for many years.

Only last Saturday evening I represented the Opposition in Millendon on the occasion of the Yugoslav club's new bocci club being opened by the member for Mundaring, the Minister for Transport.

I was happy to meet there one of the Yugoslavs who went to Bindi Bindi in 1926 when I went there myself to start up a farming career as a very small boy. He went there with an axe to help clear the estate of the New Zealand-Australian Land Company, or Tootra, as it is more commonly known. He worked there for one shilling a day for nine hours a day, as a 16-year-old. That is the sort of contribution those people made to this country.

We in the Opposition are very aware of this and are supportive of them, and would hope they are given every encouragement to carry on the traditions of their own countries. On the evening to which I referred, the children performed a dance which was typically Yugoslav and was much appreciated by us all. This must be encouraged.

Those of us who remember the difficult days just after World War II will recall that there was a tremendous influx of ethnic people into Australia, and we referred to them then as new Australians. Those people have made a tremendous contribution to Australia. They fitted in very well in our society and really are true Australians. The children have married and intermarried with Australians.

Therefore, while some people complain we are a multicultural race—perhaps to a small extent we are—we are certainly a very proud race, and very proud to have among our people the ethnic members of our community from other countries. It does not hurt to remind ourselves at times, when espousing how important we feel they are to our society, of the difficult time when those people came here, many from dispossessed countries—countries of Western Europe which exist no more. I refer to Latvia and Estonia, two countries of which many people possibly have not heard.

Those countries certainly did exist, and the people lost their countries and homelands which were taken over by the USSR as a result of probably the greatest victory that Stalin ever won—that horrible conflict at the Yalta Conference when Roosevelt, Stalin and Winston Churchill agreed to the division of Europe. At that conference, when Roosevelt was a very ill man, an agreement was made that those countries disappear. The people of those countries were left homeless, and it was Australia which opened its doors and gave them an opportunity for a new life where they could work, and live, and love, and be loved. It is to their credit that they have made such wonderful citizens of Australia.

Some years ago I read a book entitled *Sailing to Freedom* which told the story of 16 people who, on a 36-foot sloop, sailed from Sweden—where they were in exile from Estonia because the Nazis had pushed them out. In 1944 the Russians asked them to go back, but realising what they would face if they went back to a country taken over by the USSR, they elected to sail to America. Those 16 people, in a boat called the *Erma*, sailed from Sweden, through the Caledonian Canal in Scotland and across to Ireland, down to Madeira and across to Norfolk, Virginia in the USA.

That was a wonderful story of the kind of people who had the courage and initiative to make new lives for themselves. While they did not come here, we in Australia should be very proud that we have considered these ethnic groups. We have legislation which considers them and makes provision for them, so that they have the heart and courage to carry on the traditions of their earlier lives in their own countries.

I want it recorded that we in the Opposition are not only happy to support this legislation but also want to put aside once and for all the very unfair myth that we do not concern ourselves with ethnic groups.

We on this side concern ourselves very much with this matter. I employed many of these migrants in those days after they had fled from Poland, Latvia, and Estonia. These people had no homes; they had lost everything. Many of them had suffered at the hands of the Gestapo, and had been in concentration camps. I remember one such person working with me who told me that in Auschwitz he had eaten grass as it was the only way he could stay alive. These people came and made their homes here, and this legislation will enable us to care for them and to encourage them to carry on their traditions.

I conclude my remarks by saying that the Opposition is very proud to support this legislation and I would like it recorded for ever that the Opposition is very concerned for these people, who play such an important part in Australian society today.

MR GORDON HILL (Helena—Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs) [2.51 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its support. I particularly thank the member for Moore for his brief but rapid tour of the world.

The member for Moore asked whether this Bill in any way conflicts with the streamlining of the Public Service, to which the Premier referred recently in his economic statement. The answer is, "No, it does not". As I indicated in my second reading speech, the intention of the Bill is to create a position wherein the deputy commissioner assumes the role which was previously taken by a senior administrative officer, which position will become redundant. In effect this is an amalgamation of the two positions. The position of deputy commissioner is a ministerial appointment, but I do not see any conflict with the person who is currently holding that position remaining in that position as the deputy commissioner. This merely gives what is virtually just a different title to his position.

Once again, I thank the Opposition, particularly the member for Moore, for its support of this Bill. The question of the member's attendance at a recent function in the Swan Valley is acknowledged, and I regret that I was not able to join him on that occasion at the Yugoslav community club. I belong to that club; it is one of many ethnic clubs to which I belong in this State. I am very proud to belong to that club, which has a tremendous history. I have been associated with that club for some years and I will remain so in the future. I trust that clarifies the question asked by the member for Moore.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Gordon Hill (Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs), and transmitted to the Council.

RESERVES AND LAND REVESTMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 24 June.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [2.55 p.m.]: This Bill deals with a large number of clauses and it is quite typical that it should come up towards the end of the parliamentary session. It is a Bill which deals with a number of reserves.

The Opposition cannot find anything in the legislation which gives it cause for worry, although I would like to make some general comments in respect of this Bill. Firstly I indicate that the Bill contains a large number of clauses; this has been brought about because the parliamentary session, which is usually held in the first half of the year, was delayed because of the State election. Consequently it has been some time since the local authorities and other interested parties have been able to have amendments to reserves brought before Parliament. This Bill is important, although this matter seems to have been given less importance in recent years in the Parliament than it was when the rules were first made that any amendment to Class "A" reserves should come before the Parliament. It does not seem to be a matter of such importance today, so it does not get a lot of attention in this place.

The Minister for Lands when introducing this Bill, said in future that he would like to be able to table the papers associated with it, because they are usually very lengthy, technical and detailed, and he found that reading all of these papers to the Parliament was quite a task. I understand the Minister's problem. In fact, one of the things which made the papers so lengthy was the naming of each electorate and province in every clause that dealt with them. That was one of the instructions I issued when I was the Minister for Lands, because I found it even more confusing—as did members—not knowing to which electorates the proposed amendments referred. Thus I felt it was easier if the members could quickly look down a schedule and see whether a proposed amendment actually related to their electorates.

In some cases the names of divisions or subdivisions of land are the same as a number of Assembly electorates, which is very confusing. Members cannot necessarily tell by looking at the location number of a reserve whether it lies within their electorates. That was one of the changes which I requested as Minister, but it does indeed lengthen the amount of detail the Minister has to read. I indicate to the Minister that I would be quite happy, as the Opposition spokesman on lands, for him to deal with this in a different way when it comes before the Parliament in the future.

If the Minister made a second reading speech which condensed all of that material in a very brief form and then tabled all the necessary papers in association with the Bill, that would be quite acceptable to the Opposition. However, I make the further suggestion to the Min-

ister that, in bringing that brief second reading speech to the Parliament, he also attach to it a schedule of the clauses involved, along with a list of the Legislative Assembly electorates and Legislative Council provinces to which each clause refers. If such a schedule were distributed to all members, the Minister would not have to perform the arduous task in his second reading speech of relating all of those clauses to the Parliament. At the same time, the list would not just lie on the Table of the House and, because of its uncontroversial nature, be at risk of going unnoticed by the Parliament, something which would not be good for the Parliament.

I suggest that, if the Minister rearranges the presentation of this Bill at the conclusion of each session, incorporating a brief second reading speech and a schedule of the clauses which are proposed to be amended, or the reserves which it is intended to deal with, and if, associated with that second reading speech, the Minister presents a record of the Legislative Assembly electorates and Legislative Council provinces involved, it would be up to each member of the Parliament to check and see whether any of the amendments affected his or her electorate and he or she would be able to obtain the relevant papers, because they would have been tabled at the time the Minister introduced the Bill. That would be a better way to handle the matter and it would speed up the business of the Parliament. At the same time, it would protect the rights of members to know what is going on and whether their electorates are affected.

I make the general point about amendments to "A"-class reserves that people in this State have always treated "A"-class reserves as being virtually sacrosanct. The fact that any change to an "A"-class reserve must go through both Houses of Parliament indicates the concern people feel about land being set aside for that purpose.

During my time as Minister for Lands I found that for many years only excisions from "A"-class reserves were brought before Parliament and, if it were intended to make an addition to an "A"-class reserve, it was not included in legislation brought here. That position pertained for 20 or 30 years and no-one questioned it. However, a legal question was raised at one stage and it just happened to occur during the time I was Minister for Lands. It was suggested that that practice was ultra vires the Parliament and that any change to an "A"-class reserve should be brought to this

place for approval. As a result, it was decided that retrospective legislation would need to be passed.

As a person who abhors retrospective legislation, I did not like the fact that on that occasion I had to bring such legislation before the Parliament. Members of the then Opposition were quick to point out that that legislation was retrospective and we were seeking to obtain the Governor's approval for something which had occurred years earlier and which had not been brought before the Parliament at that time, as it should have been.

In order to ensure that at some future time it was not found that the Parliament had been misled or got around in some way, it was decided to introduce retrospective legislation to make legal all the additions which had been made to "A"-class reserves over many years. That was done and the Opposition of the day agreed to the measure, although it highlighted what appeared to be a slightly hypocritical stance on my part.

Because the State set aside "A"-class reserves which were approved by both Houses of Parliament, any move to remove those reserves from that category has always been viewed very seriously. That is why such changes must be approved by both Houses of Parliament. People feel that they do not want to give up any part of an "A"-class reserve without the matter being scrutinised properly and that scrutiny should be performed by both Houses of Parliament. That indicates the importance placed on these reserves by the people of Western Australia. That is appropriate and that position should remain unchanged.

A great many of these changes involve very minor areas not considered to be controversial. However, they are usually put before the Minister for Lands and his department by local authorities which require to carry out some improvements in the areas. If the public disagree, the matter is usually fought at the local authority level before it comes to the Parliament. Nevertheless, the fact that the matter must come to the Parliament gives the opportunity for representatives in both the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council to question the Minister and indicate their approval of or opposition to each of the measures. That is important and I hope it is a practice which continues.

I make brief reference also at this stage to the matter I referred to a moment ago; that is, additions to "A"-class reserves. Because people

were so careful about excisions from "A"-class reserves, it was assumed that if one wished to add to an "A"-class reserve, everybody would be happy about it. That is the reason that, for many years, such additions were not brought to the Parliament for approval. It was simply assumed that Parliament would give its approval to such additions, because everyone believed that "A"-class reserves were sacrosanct and, if one intended to add to such a reserve, the approval of the people of Western Australia would be automatic; therefore, it was not necessary to bring it before the Parliament.

In the last 10 to 15 years I do not think it has been appropriate to take that attitude, because a great deal of land has been set aside in "A"-class reserves, particularly since the conservation through reserves committee met in the 1970s and made an enormous number of recommendations to the Government of the day.

The conservation through reserves committee and the Department of Conservation and Environment made recommendations to the Government of the day, which happened to be a Liberal Government, although I do not believe that makes any difference. The Government of the day approved in principle all of these reserves. Approval was given in a *carte blanche* sense, in principle only. We have reason to be proud of that decision, because, as a proportion of total land, Western Australia has more land set aside for reserves than does any other mainland State of Australia. I emphasise the words "mainland State", because Tasmania has a greater proportion of its total area set aside for reserves. It can be seen that there are very positive aspects to that policy, although the negative aspects are these: Because the Government of the day accepted in a *carte blanche* way all of the recommendations of the conservation through reserves committee, the Department of Conservation and Environment proceeded to bring these matters to fruition. In other words, it went ahead and reserved all of those areas. The department took for gospel as the Government's will what in fact was an approval in principle, and there is a great difference between the two. When the Government in the mid-1970s gave approval for all these reserves to be set aside, it did so in principle only and yet the bureaucracy—on this occasion I do not use that term in a derogatory sense—said, "The Government has approved all of these. We must go ahead and implement its wishes and set them up as reserves."

They took too far the approval that the Government of the time had given. I will not go so far as to say that they abused their position, but they did take too much for granted in setting aside these reserves. In fact, by the end of the Court and O'Connor Governments' term of office the Government had changed its method of dealing with these reserves and had in fact directed the Department of Conservation and Environment to bring every proposal back to the Parliament. The State was divided into, I think, nine or 10 regions. As a former Minister for Conservation and the Environment, I should know this. Perhaps one or two members might be able to assist me.

Mr Stephens: The fact that you have not been corrected would indicate either that you are right or that they don't know.

Mr LAURANCE: Yes. I think the State was divided into nine regions. The most difficult region, of course, was System 6 because it dealt with the metropolitan area and the near south-west area and impinged on the bauxite mining areas. It was the last area report to be released and dealt with, and of course it was the most controversial.

Mr Court: That is where the new prison will go.

Mr LAURANCE: Yes, it is in fact true that the new prison will be in a System 6 area, and that means all systems or areas of the State, including that which deals with the Gascoyne area, my own electorate, were taken *carte blanche* by the department, and the recommendations of the conservation through reserves committee were proceeded with automatically as though the Government had approved each one. All recommendations were approved collectively but only in principle.

The Government of the day decided to change its method of approach in regard to System 7, which dealt with the Kimberley region of the State; in fact, it said to the Department of Conservation and Environment that it did not approve the recommendations in principle. The Government said it had noted the report of the conservation through reserves committee and asked the department or the appropriate Minister to bring each proposal before the Cabinet individually to give Cabinet the chance to examine each proposal individually. When examining the total proposal, one found that much of the area of the State would be locked up in reserves. On one hand, it could have been advantageous and a positive thing

but, on the other hand, it could lock up a land area that could be used for other pursuits and if an area of land has a protective purpose the State must think very carefully before locking up an area of land in a reserve.

I know the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services intends shortly to move an amendment to this Bill. He will agree with me that sometimes very worthwhile proposals impinge upon an area of land that has been set aside as a very special area of the State in an "A"-class reserve. He wants to remove a small area of an "A"-class reserve in order to make way for a proposal which is considered by the Government to be desirable.

Mr Gordon Hill: We are not touching an "A"-class reserve at all.

Mr LAURANCE: You have an amendment.

Mr Gordon Hill: Yes, but not to an "A"-class reserve.

Mr LAURANCE: I have not seen the amendment so perhaps I made an error there. The Opposition has been waiting for it to appear on the Notice Paper. That is a minor point. The Minister would understand the point I am making in regard to dealing with a special area for another purpose.

Mr Gordon Hill: I understand.

Mr LAURANCE: At the time the reserve was set up, that was the most appropriate course of action, but circumstances change, as do the requirements of the State and the public; and sometimes reserves have to be rearranged.

Mr Hodge: I have been listening with great interest to your comments. You really should have a heart-to-heart talk with the member for Mt Lawley because he has been making some very uninformed comments about the Government's decision to choose a reserve for the site of the new prison and you have just fairly clearly spelt out the Government's position in that case.

Mr LAURANCE: I am sure the Minister would love me to agree with him but unfortunately I cannot do so.

Mr Hodge: The member for Mt Lawley only needs to read *Hansard*.

Mr LAURANCE: Whether the Opposition agrees with the Government about the changed use is an entirely different matter.

Mr Hodge: The argument you have just put so clearly is the precise answer to the arguments the member for Mt Lawley has made.

Mr LAURANCE: I beg to differ from the Minister, although I understand the point he is making because the very fact that there will be a change in use means the matter must come before the Parliament, and that is appropriate. Whether the Parliament agrees with the changed use is an entirely separate matter and one which the Minister should take up with the member for Mt Lawley before commenting to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services who wants to change that use. I did not say whether we will argue about the reason for the changed use. In this instance I do not wish to argue with him anyway. The prison is a separate matter and the Opposition may decide to disagree with the Government on that matter.

I am talking about the principle of changing a reserve. It is important from the State's point of view. Those proposals were made in the late 1970s and I oppose some of them very strongly anyway. One of the recommendations of the conservation through reserves committee was to set aside the Shannon basin. As a former Minister for Forests, I disagreed very strongly with that recommendation. When I became Minister for Forests one of the first things I did was to visit the Shannon basin. I flew over it, I drove across it both ways—up and down and from side to side—and I walked through it. I wanted to know what it was all about. I must say that some areas of the basin are totally forgettable. They are very nondescript pieces of land, yet the whole Shannon basin is reserved because of its having magnificent stands of karri. That is nonsense. Yes, it is a river basin, so it is a contiguous area of land from that point of view. The member for Warren would know some of the other areas alongside the Shannon basin which I am referring to. It is some years now since I was Minister for Forests and I cannot recall those areas—he would know them well—where there are magnificent stands of karri. In fact, the Forests Department at that time, rather than saying, "We will reserve all the Shannon basin as a contiguous area, said, "We will take some areas and reserve parts of the karri forest, some parts in the Shannon basin and other parts in adjoining areas". They were mostly highly visible areas too, especially ones located along the highway so that people who drive along the highway can view these magnificent stands of karri preserved in a position where easy access can be gained to them and they do not have to go off the bitumen road, and so on. I agree with that policy because, particularly when one flies

over the area, one can pick from the air the magnificent stands of karri that are representative of karri forest and should be preserved.

Other areas of the Shannon basin are very poor. They have been burnt out many times because of regular fires. In fact, it is thought that the fires go back to the days of Aboriginal settlement when Aborigines regularly fired that area which resulted in the destruction of much of the karri forest. Lightning has been responsible for many other fires.

As I said earlier, large areas of the Shannon basin were not worthy of being set aside because of their very poor stands of karri. They were not good examples of karri forest at all. Those areas could have been used in the normal way under the forestry programme. That would have been preferable than to reserve them as "A"-class reserves or national parks, as was done by this Government. The Government threw out the plans to retain the stands of karri forest that the previous Government had made under the multiple use programme for the management of our forests, and decided for purely political reasons to adopt the recommendation of the conservation through reserves committee report and reserve the entire Shannon basin.

It put a lot of pressure on the Forests Department working plan. It was generally opposed by the people of the area within the Warren electorate. We said they would oppose it, and my goodness, they did; they very nearly removed their member of Parliament. What they failed to do last time we will ensure they do next time, although I do not know whether the same member will be standing next time.

Mr Evans: You have been saying that for a long time.

Mr LAURANCE: We went close last time. Although the member survived I think it is fair to say that the reservation of the Shannon basin was one of the public issues that went against him, as did a number of others perpetrated by this Government which did not suit his electorate.

To come back to the point about reservation of "A"-class reserves, it is important to advise the public of this State when we intend to add to such reserves, not only when we decide to take a part away from them, whether it is small or not, and for whatever reason. When it is proposed to add an "A"-class reserve the proposal should come before Parliament because not everybody may agree.

Members should remember what was proposed in relation to the granting of Aboriginal land rights; this was defeated in the public arena and the State Government backed right off the whole idea prior to the election and tried to bury it. It has resurfaced since the election and the Government is proceeding down another track to set aside and grant land rights in this State. Members do not have to take my word for it; it was referred to at the ALP national conference in Hobart last week when the Federal Minister for Defence, Mr Beazley, said the Burke Government should be congratulated for introducing land rights by another name since the election. He let the cat out of the bag that the Government has not backed off the whole idea of Aboriginal land rights, but intends to proceed, not by way of legislation, but by other methods.

Those other methods may include reference under the powers of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority; and we have recently seen an area of land given to Aboriginal interests for 99 years. I am not necessarily opposed to Aboriginal groups getting that land, but it is hypocritical of the Government to arrange a 99-year lease for an Aboriginal group when all the surrounding pastoral leases are 45-year leases. It is most inappropriate that people should be treated differently. If the Government indicated it was going to give 99-year leases to all pastoral lessees and decided it was going to give Aboriginal groups a similar lease, it would be consistent and it might get support from this side of the House. But it is cause for some criticism when the Government gives an Aboriginal group a lease that is twice as long as the surrounding pastoral leases, and that is why I raise it now.

There are other reasons for concern about increasing the size of "A"-class reserves. I can give a local example from Exmouth in my electorate where it has been proposed on a number of occasions to extend the national park. The local people opposed it very strongly because while national parks are a wonderful thing for the people of this State to preserve certain areas and make them available in a way that ensures they are preserved for future generations, there are also some restrictions on the use of those areas. When a national park surrounds a town those restrictions affect the everyday lives of the residents of the area.

I refer to Exmouth which is almost at the end of a peninsula—North West Cape—and the largest part of the cape is taken up by Cape Range National Park. It means the town of

Exmouth is virtually on the end of the peninsula and is surrounded by a small area of land which is outside the national park. If the park were extended it would mean there was virtually nowhere to go outside the town without facing the restrictions of a national park.

It is illegal to take a dog into a national park, and some people want to go outside the town and take their dog with them. They cannot take it into the national park, so if the boundaries are extended there is nowhere outside the town for those people to take their dogs. That does not affect many tourists, but the local people living alongside or adjoining the national park find their lives are affected. It is particularly important in Exmouth where 60 per cent of the people work at the same place—the United States naval base. If one lives side by side with one's neighbours and they all work at the same place one sees the same people at work as he does at home. One way of getting relief from that situation is to go bush at the weekends, camping or fishing, and many people in the town do that.

That is one example, and there are others; Kalbarri is an excellent case in point of a town surrounded by a national park. Every time the town wants to do something it bumps into the national park. The Minister has probably had similar requests made to him as I have received. If the town wants to extend the airstrip it cannot do so without getting an excision from the national park. The member for Greenough would be aware of that problem. The town wanted a new rubbish tip because the existing tip was full, but it could not get any land without cutting into the national park. Any time it wants to do something that is a normal occurrence in the expansion and growth of the town it bumps into the national park. It would be a good idea to have a substantial buffer zone for future development between the town of Kalbarri and the national park.

The National Parks and Wildlife Authority is very jealous of its areas and does not like to give away ground to a shire which is trying to expand and progress.

Mr Stephens: Some towns trying to expand need land and take it from the shires.

Mr LAURANCE: Right. That is a particular situation to which the member might like to refer. He knows more about it than I do, and I will not get onto that hallowed ground.

Mr Hodge: Surely you would not advocate that for environmentally sensitive areas around a town?

Mr LAURANCE: No. I am saying there must be a balance. A shire cannot say that a national park should get to hell out of a particular area and that it wants a huge piece of land for future development. On the other hand it is not right for the National Parks and Wildlife Authority to say that a shire cannot do anything because the boundaries of the town and the park abut.

The two examples I gave were appropriate. One was the airstrip, and that was a difficult problem because the National Parks and Wildlife Authority did not want to give way; the other problem was the rubbish tip. Health is an important matter—one of the Government's Ministers sacked a councillor in my area over trumped-up health matters.

To give another example, the town wanted a television antenna sited on a little hill just outside the town. It wanted only a small area of the hill, but I understand the National Parks and Wildlife Authority was very reluctant to grant any access for that small excision. That was a worthwhile service for the town. I am not saying either side is 100 per cent right in its stance; there must be a balance. Both sides must agree that the other has a right to be there. It is not right for the authority to say that a town cannot expand in any way if the town requires land for essential services.

Mr Hodge: I do not think the Department for Conservation and Land Management is saying that. As I understand it there are some important national park areas surrounding Kalbarri and it is difficult to find areas that can be used for services without impinging on those important areas.

Mr LAURANCE: I acknowledge what the Minister is saying. The previous National Parks Authority was more accommodating of various pressures. The Minister may recall that an executive officer from that department had a reputation for being intransigent when it came to local authorities. He did a lot of damage to the authority, but since he left that employ most of the problems have been overcome.

The interjections from members and the Minister highlight the need for proposals for the additions to and the excisions from various reserves having to come before this Parliament.

The Bill contains a large number of clauses for the simple reason that it has been many months since a Bill of this nature has come

before the Parliament. The Opposition has no objection to the measures contained in the Bill. I have circulated a copy of the Bill to interested members on the Opposition side of the House in order that they can ascertain the clauses which relate to their electorates. As a result, some members may wish to raise particular matters which are of interest to their electorates. I mention this to the House because, as I said earlier to the Minister, if the relevant papers and a schedule showing the areas affected by this legislation were made available to members, they could seek the necessary information, but because the Bill is not handled in this way I have made the provisions available to members on this side of the House.

The amendment to be moved by the Minister for Lands and which is included on the Notice Paper is accepted by the Opposition. I acknowledge that it is an addition to the original schedule. I understand from the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services that a further amendment will be moved to this Bill when it is dealt with in Committee.

On behalf of the Opposition I advise the House that I can see no reason that the Opposition should oppose any clauses contained in the Bill, the amendment on the Notice Paper and the further amendment which will be moved today.

The Opposition supports this Bill.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [3.34 p.m.]: I indicate the National Party's support of this measure and compliment the member for Gascoyne for the manner in which he has debated this subject. He has covered everything admirably and I congratulate him for suggesting the inclusion in *Hansard* of the various papers relevant to this legislation. It is an excellent idea and I hope the Government will take notice of it.

Mr Laurance: I added to the Minister's suggestion. He suggested that the papers be tabled and I suggested that he should issue a schedule.

Mr STEPHENS: I think it is an excellent idea. The member for Gascoyne suggested that in addition to the various reserves being defined by their electorates, all relevant details be included to avoid confusion. That is the reason I am on my feet: Instead of reducing confusion, it has added to it.

On page 742 of *Hansard* reference is made to Class "A" Reserve 4156 at Albany in the town of Albany, electoral district of Stirling. It can-

not be both and I would like it recorded that the reserve is in the electoral district of Albany.

Another example of this confusion is on page 744 of *Hansard* where reference is made to Albany Lot 1194, Reserve 2190, situated in the town of Albany, electoral district of Stirling. I bring those errors to the attention of the House to allow them to be corrected through *Hansard* in order that the people who read *Hansard* will know that members have done their homework on this subject.

MR EVANS (Warren) [3.35 p.m.]: I wish to speak on clause 14 of the Bill about which I have a particular interest. Clause 14 will increase the size of the D'Entrecasteaux National Park by some 5 685.4725 hectares including two areas of vacant Crown land. The first area is bounded by the Donnelly River and Woodarburp Road. The second extends from the Warren River along the south coast to just east of the Merup River.

The D'Entrecasteaux National Park spans approximately 130 kilometres and covers a strip varying from five kilometres to 20 kilometres in width along the south coast between Augusta and Walpole and comprises 118 000 hectares. The area of this national park is vested in the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority or the Department for Conservation and Land Management. Crown land under pastoral lease with three smaller areas in the Manjimup Shire Council is not vested.

The D'Entrecasteaux National Park comprises a significant area and the future management of the park is of vital consideration to the region and to the people who use it regularly—in fact, to the entire population of Western Australia. It is now over a decade since this park was recognised by the conservation through reserves committee which said it is a “last opportunity” to reserve and protect some outstanding natural environment and provide for appropriate public recreation.

If members view the draft management plan they will see that the D'Entrecasteaux National Park contains many outstanding natural features, from the granite hills of Mt Chadalup, the basalt columns at Black Point, and the huge mobile sand dunes at Yeagarup, to bullich, yate and karri forests, wetlands, and a vast variety of coastal scenery.

The concept of the south coast national park was originally put forward by five Forests Department officers in 1973 as a voluntary study. It was presented under the auspices of

the Foresters Institute to the conservation through reserves committee, which adopted the submission as a recommendation.

The Manjimup Shire Council has signified its approval of a south coast national park and the Select Committee of the Legislative Council in 1981 supported the concept of the park system. It would be fair to say that the majority of people in the region accepted the concept of a south coast national park. Most people recognise that the management of areas which are vacant Crown Land is inadequate. The mechanism and funding to manage vacant Crown land whether for recreational purposes, conservation values, scientific purposes, or any other purpose does not exist.

The vast majority of people in the area wish to see this magnificent section of our coast safeguarded from alienation and made available for usage by future generations. They also wish to see the park managed in the most proper and suitable manner which allows for recreational purposes.

I draw attention to the method of developing a management plan that has been adopted by this Government, and which can only be described as far-sighted and most imaginative in its approach. It has been entrusted to the Department of Conservation and Land Management, from which department a planning team has been set up. The planning team was instructed to prepare a proposed management plan for the D'Entrecasteaux and Shannon national parks, and this plan was to be released for public comment. A local advisory committee of the region has also been set up. Prior to the setting up of the planning team, a strategy document was proposed and presented but this was unacceptably restrictive. It drew forth considerable response, which was most impressive. The committee of one organisation, Keep Our Coasts Open (KOCO), presented an outstanding submission which involved months of written preparation and the production of a video film.

The management team has completed its draft management plan and it is now before the public for comment. It looks as though the response will be very considerable indeed. However, it has become apparent that some of the existing national park guidelines will conflict with traditional usage of the D'Entrecasteaux National Park area and many of these uses would not impact adversely upon the park. I will refer to several of them, including the use of Lake Jasper for hang-gliding. To highlight the concern of this perception of restriction, I

will quote from the submission made by one of the most perceptive and balanced members of the KOCO organisation, the chairman of the Windy Harbour Board of Control, Mr George Adams. The following paragraphs are most meaningful and reflect local feeling—

At a meeting with CALM and representatives of the Conservation Movement last year, we were told by the Conservation Movement that, after the declaration of the national park, these traditional activities would have to be carried out "elsewhere".

I made the point then, and restate it again, that for us (ie. locals) there is no "elsewhere". National Parks will occupy the southern coastline from Black Point to Nornalup, and we will need to travel excessive distances west and east to carry out traditional activities.

It is essential that some modification be made to existing national park policy guidelines to include, traditional activities, where the park area is of such magnitude as to exclude adjacent areas suitable for such activities.

SUBMISSIONS AND NATIONAL PARK POLICY

Since becoming a member of the Southern Forest Region Advisory Committee, I have learned of two aspects of the planning process that must be considered when preparing submissions.

These are:—

1. Submissions contrary to legislation and/or policy (at this time previous NPA policy) cannot, and will not be considered by the Planning Group.
2. Indications have been given that policy changes will be recommended by the Planning Group and considered by the NP and NCA if there is substantial community support for such changes.

Groups and individuals making submissions to the current Draft Management Plan need to be aware of these two aspects.

If the submission is contrary to policy, it will not be considered and the effort will be a waste of time, and if the submission recommends a policy change, the recommendation needs to have substantial community support.

By way of observation, the Minister for Conservation and Land Management has reiterated his assurance that every submission put for-

ward will be properly and thoroughly evaluated. I am happy to be in a position to give that undertaking as enunciated by the Minister.

In context and in keeping with that submission by Mr Adams to the shire council, I hope that where policy guidelines can be shown to be inappropriate for particular areas, they will be changed. Several examples can very readily be cited and I have already referred to the use of Lake Jasper for hang-gliding and water-skiing. As this body of water is not a bird breeding sanctuary, its use for recreational purposes is fully defensible. I also raise the question of the use of the Broke Inlet area which in itself is a fairly complex matter and which I will not detail at this stage.

I refer also to an issue touched upon by the member for Gascoyne, in connection with the restriction on dogs in national parks. An ironic situation arose in Pemberton: Dogs are not allowed in the national park in which a caravan park is located. Many retired people, as well as others who use the caravan park, have a deep attachment to their pets but they were told that they could not go into the park with their dogs. These caravanners were told they had to move elsewhere which meant out into the State forest. This meant they could camp in a location in which a dog could conceivably cause far more damage than it could in the national park at the edge of the town where there was no restriction on the dogs belonging to local residents. That situation has been rectified in the interests of commonsense.

I return to the concept of the draft management plan which is now open for public comment. It is a major departure in this State and it is a pattern for the future drafting of management plans for areas of national parks such as the south coast. It allows the people of an area in this State to make direct input into the management of that area, which after all is their land. The attitude of the present Minister for Conservation and Land Management and Minister for Lands is in startling contrast to the attitude of the previous Government.

The total area of the proposed D'Entrecasteaux National Park is 118 000 hectares. At this time 36 599 hectares have been declared and vested in the National Park and Wildlife Authority; this was gazetted in November 1980 by the previous Government. This declaration of one-third of the D'Entrecasteaux National Park was done without any consultation whatsoever with the community or those who have traditionally used

the area. I verified with the Nannup Shire Council yesterday that no consultation took place, yet the park runs along the entire area of what was vacant Crown land abutting the south coast of the shire boundary.

The constraints and guidelines of management policies were applied with the gazettal of the D'Entrecasteaux National Park in 1980, but I do not think it was realised when they were introduced that these constraints would apply.

They were never consulted and the Government proceeded with the proposal of gazetting that massive region. It was only through this Government requiring the Department of Conservation and Land Management to present a draft management plan that people became aware of the problems of management and the restrictions which could arise with traditional use and users of the area.

I refer to the temerity of a member in another place in being critical of the Government's approach to presenting a draft management plan. He has been critical, yet the Government which he supported showed no interest towards planning or funding for management purposes. When that area of 396 500 hectares was gazetted I was critical because no provision was made for management or funding to ensure that the region was treated in the manner which was necessary. This lack of management has occurred in the wilderness area of the north of the Walpole-Nornalup National Park where the fire hazard is now excessive and the whole region has deteriorated through lack of proper management procedures.

The key to the management of the D'Entrecasteaux National Park is to provide the essential recreation area's need in this era of increasing leisure and to protect the values of the region into the twenty-first century. This is contained clearly in the draft management document where it states on page 6—

"§56(1)(c). In the case of national parks and marine parks, to fulfil so much of the demand for recreation by members of the public as is consistent with the proper maintenance and restoration of the natural environment, the protection of indigenous flora and fauna and the preservation of any feature of archaeological, historic or scientific interest."

At this stage the Department of Conservation and Land Management is awaiting submissions from the community. As I have said, the Minis-

ter has given an assurance that every one of these submissions will be thoroughly and properly considered. I have been active in advising and imploring people who have an interest in this region to ensure that their submissions are lodged and the contribution they are able to bring to the ultimate draft management document is available so that the authorities are cognisant of the wishes of the community.

A great deal of knowledge and information of this outstanding region was gained from some of the submissions presented in the past. I am confident that a situation can be arrived at where the recreation needs of a community that is subject to increasing leisure time, and that is able to travel with greater ease and with the advent of off-road vehicles, are able to be met.

It will not be long into the twenty-first century that the population of this State will exceed two million people. For these reasons there will be a heavy requirement for adequate recreational facilities; and, when one looks at the pressure on the west coast—from Mandurah to Augusta—it is clear there will be a demand on the south coast. It requires a careful and appropriate management plan to ensure that the recreational needs of the community at that time are met. At the same time it is an area that we all want to see maintained for future generations.

MR TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Lands) [3.56 p.m.]: I thank the members for Gascoyne and Stirling and my friend the member for Warren for their contributions to the debate. I am pleased the member for Gascoyne has taken a little further the matter I raised at the beginning of my speech; that is, the time-consuming nature of this legislation. I think that a combination of my suggestion of tabling the second reading speech and his suggestion that the detail of reserves also be tabled, will serve the purpose; his was an excellent suggestion and one I will take up in future in relation to reserve Bills. That will, to some extent, be dependent on an amendment to Standing Orders to allow the tabling of second reading speeches. However, I may be able to read a short second reading speech and table the detailed information, which will overcome any problem with Standing Orders.

The member for Stirling raised a couple of matters that related to the boundaries of electorates, and where reserves are included in electorates other than those outlined in the second reading.

Mr Watt: A couple of bad mistakes.

Mr TAYLOR: Yes between Stirling and Albany. I could imagine they would be considered to be bad mistakes. There are a couple of those in the Bill which have been drawn to my attention. The member for Geraldton has also mentioned a difficulty between Greenough and Geraldton and the member for Avon has mentioned the situation with respect to his electorate. That is a problem with people who may not be completely aware of electoral boundaries. The only boundaries that I know by heart are those between my electorate and other electorates. Local members are not necessarily aware of the exact nature of their boundaries.

The member for Warren has shown his interest in matters associated with his electorate and the recreational needs of the community. I would hope that this Government—myself, the Minister for Conservation and Land Management and the member for Warren—can work together to meet some of the needs and difficulties outlined.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Burkett) in the Chair; Mr Taylor (Minister for Lands) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 9 put and passed.

Clause 10: Reserve No. 4156 at Albany—

Mr WATT: This clause deals with an area of land adjacent to the Old Gaol and Residency Museum in Albany. Everyone who has visited Albany and spent even a short time as a tourist there will be familiar with that locality. It is close to an area in which there is a full-sized replica of the brig *Amity*. It is a fairly prominent tourist precinct in the town, which contains a number of craft shops. A local winemaker has established a retail outlet there, and my interest in this matter is that it is the part of Albany which was referred to in the "Albany Tomorrow" recommendations by the strategy group as an area that should be established as a tourist precinct. It is already a tourist precinct but I believe the strategy group wanted to make it a museum precinct, and it fits nicely into that category.

My interest in this area of land was generated quite some time ago when, under the previous classification of "parklands and recreation", a local businessman wanted to establish tearooms there. A significant number of tourists

pass through this region every year and it seems to me that it would be quite appropriate to have tearooms there. However, there was a dispute about the suitability of the vesting order on the "parklands and recreation" classification in respect of whether tearooms could be established. A further dispute developed between the town council and the trustees of the local museum about whether it was a suitable place for tearooms to exist. The businessman had drawn up plans for the tearooms, which were to be in a colonial style that in my opinion would have blended nicely with the area. In any event his bid to build this facility, which I regarded as being beneficial to the tourism industry in Albany, failed.

I do not know whether the local museum administrators have plans to build something in place of the tearooms, but at the time they said they would like to be able to do something themselves. I believe, in view of the difficulties we seem to experience in finding funding for just about everything these days, we should have welcomed someone who was prepared to provide that tourist amenity. It was a proposal which I would have supported.

I will be very much happier when the Government—and I do not make this as a strong criticism because when the Opposition was in Government, it was a bit tardy about putting up money for this project—can find some money to house the Eclipse Island light. The Minister for Lands will be aware of the need to provide adequate housing for that light, because it is unique. Although my comments may have sounded negative, in fact I support the vesting of this area of land into a total tourist precinct, because it tidies up the whole block, and completes it.

I hope that in the fullness of time this area might be served by some sort of amenity which will allow tourists access to refreshments and so on, particularly those who arrive on tourist coaches and cannot go up the street to other amenities.

Mr TAYLOR: I am aware of the area to which the member for Albany refers and I am pleased to do my little bit, hopefully, to make it a better precinct than it is now.

I visited Albany on business about 18 months ago and my wife took the children down to the area referred to by the member. It is an excellent place for families and the concept has been very well done. I think that the particular amendments before the House can only add to what has been done there.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11: Reserve No. 9457 at Narrogin—

Mr LAURANCE: I ask the Minister how he intends to handle clause 11 and how he will handle the other clauses, including the amendment on the Notice Paper and the one which has been prepared by the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

Mr TAYLOR: By way of explanation, it is my intention to move ahead with an amendment to clause 29 on the Notice Paper. There will be an additional clause 30, which will be moved by the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. There will also be an amendment to the long title of the Bill moved by the Honorary Minister in relation to the closure of Harvest Road in North Fremantle. I hope we can deal with that amendment in this Committee stage.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 12 to 25 put and passed.

Clause 26: Albany Lot 1194—

Mr WATT: This clause relates to the buildings erected by the Slow Learning Children's Group of W.A. (Inc) that are used as a hostel for intellectually handicapped people. I use this opportunity to speak on this matter because the Minister for Lands is also the Minister for Health and I reinforce the appeals which have been made to him, not only by me but also by other groups in the community, in respect of the need for a hostel to be located in Albany to deal with the intellectually handicapped.

The existing hostel has served a very great need and it has housed a number of intellectually handicapped people from around the region. The regional committee has contributed to its funding over the years. It is adjacent to what was known as the "Special School", a school which catered specifically for intellectually handicapped people. I have been involved for the last few years with the committee of the Slow Learning Children's Group in Albany. I am probably one of the few people on the committee who does not have a handicapped child of my own. I have great admiration for these people and for the way in which they work as a self-help organisation.

Although I would not say that this building has outlived its usefulness, there has been a change in the direction of the management and care of intellectually handicapped people. The committee has been experimenting in Albany for some time with the placement of these

people—who cannot be called children because many of them are technically adults—out into the general community in groups of two to four. They may live in a house, and in some cases they may care for themselves, depending on their level of incapacity. There is a limit to how much one can expect of them, and those who are too incapacitated to look after themselves must do so with some oversight and supervision. A regional administrator of the Slow Learning Children's Group is located in Albany, and he takes an overview of these people in order to make sure they are properly looked after. However, in general, these people have coped very well and it has been a most interesting and useful experiment.

The objective now is that this hostel should be sold and the funds so obtained be used to purchase other properties so that these intellectually handicapped people can go into more of a home environment where, under supervision, they will be able to learn basic day-to-day survival needs such as cooking and money management. This will mean they will be in a much better position when the time comes, as it inevitably must, when they have to care for themselves.

That is our object. I really wanted to use this opportunity to place on record my appreciation for the work that community volunteers do for the intellectually handicapped people.

Mr TAYLOR: This is perhaps a health matter more than a lands matter, but I indicate to the member for Albany that I am aware of his involvement with the Slow Learning Children's Group in Albany. Certainly what the group is seeking to do here is an excellent idea. I suggest that perhaps the group should look towards Homeswest in regard to any part it could play in the provision of those houses.

Mr Watt: It has in fact done that.

Mr TAYLOR: It is possible that Homeswest could assist in the provision of that sort of housing. I have a very special interest in the Slow Learning Children's Group and its work in Kalgoorlie. In fact, my wife has been president of the group in Kalgoorlie for some years now. I agree entirely with the member for Albany when he says he has to admire these people for the work that they do.

He mentioned the possibility of having a team in Albany. Given the current circumstances that possibility is perhaps more remote than it was this time last year, but the member is not alone in his view. Kalgoorlie, of course, is a much larger centre than Albany and it does

not have a team. I think the only team is the one based in Bunbury. As Minister, I would love to have buckets of money to be able to spread those sorts of services throughout regional centres of Western Australia. Certainly those services are needed by communities throughout our State. Perhaps this is something we might be able to achieve at a later date; but there is no point in my kidding members that it will be possible in the forthcoming Budget. We will have to see what can be done.

Mr Watt: Keep trying.

Mr TAYLOR: Yes, we have to keep trying.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 and 28 put and passed.

Clause 29: Land revested in Her Majesty—

Mr TAYLOR: I move an amendment—

Page 10, after part 11 of the Table—To add the following part—

12. City of Cockburn

The pedestrian accessway containing 324 square metres bounded by Lots 28, 29, 59 and 60 on Office of Titles Plan 9319 and extending between Romeo Road and Friar John Way on that Plan.

I will briefly explain the relevance of the pedestrian accessway in that area. Members may be aware that in some of the more recent residential developments in the metropolitan area and elsewhere there has been a requirement for pedestrian access ways. More often than not they are more trouble than they are worth; in fact, the people who own homes beside those access ways often find themselves subject to rubbish being thrown over their fences or people abusing them as they walk down the access ways, and that sort of thing. This is exactly the case in Cockburn and I have been approached by people in that area, and, of course, the shire and the local member of Parliament have called for this amendment to be moved.

Mr LAURANCE: The Opposition cannot see any problem with this amendment and we are prepared to give it our support. It is not really desirable to have these things added; however, it is non-controversial and I did make the point earlier that because Parliament did not reconvene for a long time due to the previous election, this matter has probably been made more difficult and more delays could occur in amendments being approved by the Parliament than in normal circumstances. That is one of

the reasons that the Bill was dealt with in this way and the Opposition is prepared to give it its support.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

New clause 30:

Mr GORDON HILL: I move—

Page 10, after clause 29—To insert the following clause—

Road closure

30. (1) That portion of Harvest Road being 548 square metres comprising North Fremantle Lot 441 as surveyed and shown on Department of Land Administration Diagram 87559 is hereby closed.

(2) Section 294 of the *Local Government Act 1960* shall apply to the land referred to in subsection (1) as if the closure had been effected under that Act.

This will facilitate the establishment of a water police facility in North Fremantle. The purpose of the closure of the road is self-evident; it is in fact to shorten the road by approximately 45 metres, thereby creating North Fremantle Lot 441 as indicated. This is a riverfront lot which is intended to be consolidated with part of the adjoining riverfront leasehold lot to the south and part of an adjoining freehold lot in order to provide a site for the water police facility.

I have presented arguments in this Chamber and in the community generally for the need to establish this water police facility in North Fremantle on this site and I do not want to repeat those arguments. The matter before us is the question of the closure of this portion of Harvest Road. It will be noted that the creation of the site for the facility will not involve the excision of any of the adjoining "A"-class reserves to which public access by a three-metre wide landscaped access way or pathway is guaranteed, and that is a position we have consistently argued; we have consistently supported the need for access to the beach at the end of Harvest Road, North Fremantle.

We have only recently looked at the possibility of having to take some part of that "A"-class reserve in addition, but changes to the plans have avoided the necessity for such action. It is worth noting also that the Fremantle City councillors and spokespersons for the North Fremantle Community Association recognise that the Government, and myself in particular, have gone to great lengths to try to

accommodate the wishes of the local community in facilitating access to the beach and in not in any way intruding upon their swimming area at North Fremantle. The "A"-class reserve will remain intact and will not be intruded upon in any way.

Mr Rushton: They are still not satisfied, are they?

Mr GORDON HILL: It may be that members of the North Fremantle Community Association are not yet aware of our decision to not proceed with the closure of an "A"-class reserve. Arguments have consistently been presented to me by the North Fremantle Community Association, and members of the Fremantle City Council, representing that association have indicated that they want to maintain access to their beach, and that is a position the Government has consistently supported. We have never diverted from that view. We have continued to try to maintain access to the beach.

An area of land just south of the beach area adjacent to a land-banked wharf which the association claims is a swimming area frequented by residents of North Fremantle, is the "A"-class reserve area to which I referred; the Government does not intend to proceed with the closure of that reserve. Perhaps these people are not aware of that fact, but they will be made aware of it soon.

The point is that the water police facility is a relatively small, two-storey building which is described by its designer, the Building Management Authority, as being of domestic scale. It is not a huge construction in any way which could be detrimental to the area.

At this point I seek leave to table a plan which indicates the area of Harvest Road which is to be closed, Department of Land Administration diagram 87559 and an artist's impression of the water police buildings in North Fremantle which will be located on that site.

(See paper No. 283.)

Mr LAURANCE: We are not very happy with the way this amendment has been handled. At least the previous amendment was on the Notice Paper and we had a chance to consider it. However, it is very difficult for the Opposition to be able to consider a matter when it is introduced in this manner. We received some notification of it a week ago when I asked the Minister for Lands whether he was intending to move an amendment. I watched the Notice Paper each day to see what

the amendment would be. Just before I came into this Chamber today I was handed a letter to the Leader of the Opposition from the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. That letter included the amendment which was moved today and a copy of the map which was tabled. That letter was received in the office of the Leader of the Opposition today.

I have no doubt that there is good reason for the Government's dealing with this amendment in this way. However, if the Government wanted to deal with this Bill today it should have given some advance knowledge of the amendment to the Opposition. We have received representations on this matter and should have been given the opportunity to consider it.

This amendment allows for the establishment of a water police facility. I think that, apart from the America's Cup being held here, it is urgently required. Obviously that competition has already brought about an enormous increase in water activities in this State. A significant proportion of our population uses boats because Perth is spread out along the coast. We are also a fairly affluent society, although that may change shortly. It is therefore necessary that we expand our water police facilities in line with the expanding boating activities in this State.

I am a strong supporter of the Police Force, and particularly the water police, and am aware that they are in dire need of new facilities. Apparently there is some controversy about where those facilities are to be located. Every time somebody tries to build a new facility these days he runs into some opposition. Representations have been made to the Opposition about the new facility in an attempt to scuttle it. However, I do not think it is appropriate to deal with those objections in debate on this amendment to the Reserves and Land Revestment Bill. I suppose that the people opposed to the location have good reason for their opposition, but there are ways of raising that objection. That debate, though, is quite separate from any move to amend the Bill. If the Government has made a decision to build the facility on that site, it is up to the Government to negotiate that development. The Minister has indicated that that is so and it is now up to the Government to withstand the pressure from whatever sources.

Mr GORDON HILL: The member should realise that we have a certain time frame in which to deal with this facility. We have tried

to accommodate the interests of the local community and the concerns of the Fremantle City Council in establishing the water police facility on that site. That restricted our movements to some extent. We have repeatedly made it quite clear that we intend to close a portion of Harvest Road and it was well known that we intended to amend the Reserves and Land Revestment Act. Whether it was done by this Bill or by some other separate legislation is immaterial. For our purpose, it was worth introducing it early to fit in with our timetable.

We announced the proposal to introduce this legislation in the middle of June. I indicated that legislation would be introduced to close portion of Harvest Road. In addition, notice was given to the Leader of the Opposition at about midday that I would be moving an amendment. That, in conjunction with the fact that I indicated some time ago that we would be amending the Act, should indicate that plenty of notice was given.

I wonder what the Opposition's position is with respect to the water police. I acknowledge that the member for Gascoyne said that it is a separate issue. However, the Opposition has never come clean on where it stands in relation to the new facility for the water police.

Mr Taylor: Certainly the Leader of the Opposition has not.

Mr GORDON HILL: The Leader of the Opposition has been silent on the matter. In answer to the ministerial statement to which I referred earlier, the member for Mt Lawley tried to have two bob each way. He indicated that the Opposition believed that there was a need to establish a facility for the water police in Western Australia and at the same time he criticised the Government for its handling of the issue. Today, the member for Gascoyne has done the same. He indicated the need to establish a facility without reference to that particular site. I appreciate the position of the member for Gascoyne. There is a need for a water police facility. All the possible sites have been canvassed thoroughly and the Government has determined that that chosen is the most appropriate site. Certainly, it is the wish of the Police Department for the facility to be established at that site.

As I said a moment ago, I wonder about the position of the Opposition. At no time has it indicated whether in its view the site is appropriate. Reading between the lines, I believe that the member for Gascoyne today backed away

from the whole issue by saying that it is a separate issue that does not need to be canvassed.

Mr Laurance: If you want an argument about it, we could easily have one.

Mr GORDON HILL: Does the member for Gascoyne think that the site is not appropriate? Would he prefer another site? I accept that that is not germane to the issue; I am just making the point that at no time has the Opposition indicated where it believes the water police facility ought to be established.

I thank the Opposition for its support of this amendment.

Mr LAURANCE: No-one in this place loves a stoush more than I; I thought that I had tried to accommodate the Minister in as cooperative a manner as I could.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought that you were most accommodating.

Mr LAURANCE: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

It is fairly obvious that the Minister is newly elevated to the Ministry, because he could not stop even when he was in front. Those of his colleagues who have been in the Ministry longer than he has, will perhaps tell him that the time to stop is when he is in front. He should not continue to try to win the argument.

If the Minister wants an argument about this, he deserves to have one. I offered not to have an argument, but the Minister tried to keep the matter going.

Mr Gordon Hill: I just thanked you for your support of the amendment which, I accept, was a separate point from the general issue of the establishment of a water police facility. I just wonder where the Opposition thinks that facility ought to be established.

Mr LAURANCE: In relation to the amendment before the Chair, I thought I made our position perfectly clear. I do not really take much provoking; the Minister went a long way towards provoking me today.

I make another important point for the Minister, because I think he ought to understand it. The need for an amendment to this Bill was canvassed before the public; thus the intention was signalled. However, I point out to the Minister that Governments always signal what they intend to do well before taking action. For instance, it was reported in the Press yesterday that the Government considered in Cabinet a matter about which it intended to legislate. The matter referred to was an extension of the cooling-off period associated with door-to-door sales. That report in the Press did not consti-

tute official notification to the Opposition about the proposed legislation. It told the public that that was what was considered in Cabinet yesterday. The Minister for Consumer Affairs will bring that matter to the Parliament. He will give the Bill a first reading; the second day he will make a second reading speech; the debate will be adjourned; and, by practice of the House, the Opposition will be asked to deal with it about a week later. Even though advice about the matter may have been given and we may know to expect that legislation will be introduced, we need to have ample opportunity to refer the matter to interested parties once it hits the Parliament.

What I tried to explain to the Minister was that this time the matter was raised in the wrong way, but that we were prepared to go along with it because it was uncontroversial. The Minister then tried to defend his stance. I tell the Minister that his stance is indefensible and the fact that he gave public notice some time ago does not absolve him from the obligation of giving the Opposition appropriate opportunity to deal with the proposal. The Minister has not been here very long. Had members on his side, particularly some of those who have left the House in recent times, been treated in that way the Government would have been held up all day arguing the point. When Government members were in Opposition, if a new Minister had tried to do what the Minister did today we would have been here until midnight trying to get this new clause through.

I advise the Minister to back off, because he is in front. He is winning and we are prepared to let him go that way. However, if he wants a stoush he will get it. Many people on his side of the Chamber have held us up for many hours when one of our Ministers did what the Minister just tried to do.

Mr Taylor: You are just doing a bit of baiting.

Mr Evans interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This debate is progressing quite well and I do not think that any chitchat or interjections from the back bench will help.

Mr LAURANCE: The member who just interjected would know that his colleague from Collie and his former colleague from Avon, in particular, would have given us a bollocking over this sort of thing. The Leader of the Opposition was given notice of this proposal at midday, with the House due to sit at 2.15 p.m. The

Leader of the Opposition has several other things to do apart from advising those involved with this legislation. Thus it was only about 1.30 p.m. that he was able to pass it on to me, that is, only a few minutes before the House sat. We knew it was coming; we heard about it in the Press. A number of people approached us and warned us about it and asked us to take a particular stand.

Mr Taylor: Wasn't there a question on notice about this? I thought the shadow Minister for Police was asked a question on notice about this.

Mr LAURANCE: Yes. However, I think that that question indicated only that there was an intention to proceed in this way. I have acknowledged all of that. The appropriate thing to do is to give the Opposition several days' notice. The Opposition deserves to be given a week's notice. If we had been given notice last Thursday, we would not have complained. In fact, this debate would not have been proceeded with at all.

I make the point to the Government, in particular, to the Minister who has introduced the new clause—as I said earlier, he is a new Minister—because he made the point that it was difficult to get these things here in time to give the Opposition some prior official documentation of what the Government intended to do so that it could be studied and discussed among Opposition members and taken to our party room, for instance. I had to report to the party room this morning to say that I was aware that an amendment was to be brought forward but that it probably would not be debated this week because we had not at that stage sighted it. Those are some of the difficulties created when the matter is proceeded with in this manner.

However, the Minister said that the reason he had to proceed in that manner was that he had to accommodate other interests including those of the City of Fremantle. That is why I say that the Minister has probably done an excellent job of accommodating all those other interests; however, in meeting the requirements of others, he forgot the Opposition and the Parliament. Thus he has treated the Parliament with contempt by not affording to the Opposition all the sorts of prior discussion and negotiations and the like that he afforded to those other groups. He must remember that the City of Fremantle is not the only one that has to be accommodated in those matters. I do not want to sound overbearing about this matter, but if the City of Fremantle has a lawful interest in it, certainly the Parliament of Western Australia

has such an interest. The Minister is not a councillor of the City of Fremantle; he is a member of this Parliament and must treat it with all due respect. I do not think he has done that on this occasion. In seeing that all those other people were accommodated, the Minister forgot the most important body in the State, the Parliament. I suggest to him that in future he handle matters in a different way.

New clause put and passed.

Title—

Mr GORDON HILL: I move—

Page 1, after "Reserves Act 1984,"—To insert the following—

to close a portion of road,

That is simply a follow-on from the new clause I moved previously.

Amendment put and passed.

Title, as amended, put and passed.

Bill reported, with amendments, and with an amendment to the title.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 26 June.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.42 p.m.]: This piece of legislation symbolises in almost every way the style of Government which Western Australia has been led to expect over the last 3½ years. It stands for everything that this Government would aspire to having the community believe are its standards of performance. I would like to list those five major standards of performance of this Government.

First, I refer to the imposition of a standard that sees the Government in its first year of office savagely—and I use that word advisedly—increasing taxation in Western Australia. This is not six months or two years after the election but immediately after the election. At the first available opportunity—right at the outset of its term in office—the Government savagely increased taxes.

That was the hallmark of this Government in its last term of office. As you know, Mr Speaker, we had significant and savage increases in taxes back in 1983, and we see a repeat of that performance now.

The second standard of its performance—and this is really hard to fathom; I would be interested to hear the Minister trying to justify this in her response—is that taxation increases imposed by this Government fall hardest upon

the working men and women of this State. Taxes imposed by State Governments are regressive. They fall hardest upon those who are least able to afford the taxes. In this instance the liquor tax will obviously fall hardest upon the working men and women of this State.

That was one of the hallmarks of the previous term of office of the Burke Labor Government. This is now repeated.

Another point is that this Government, by increasing taxes in its first year, as is happening again, and in the following two years imposing lower taxes, that means that a greater amount of revenue is being collected by Government than if tax increases were graduated properly and increased it regularly over the three years.

The third hallmark or standard of this Government and its performance is that the Bill was introduced into the Parliament without one skerrick of consultation with the industry upon which it is to be imposed. The industry which is to feel the hardest blow, the hospitality industry, was not consulted. Since this Government came to power in 1983 it has talked long and hard about its special relationship with business. It has worked long—and here I give it credit—to cultivate the impression in the minds of some people that there is such a special relationship, yet here is a Bill which savagely increases taxation to the industry, and to the working men and women of Western Australia, without one jot of consultation with the industry.

The fourth standard of performance of this Government, a standard upon which it will be judged increasingly by the community, is that it continues to impose even more bureaucracy upon the community of Western Australia. Again, this Government came to office in 1983 with a great promise that it would be a deregulator; it would cut through the red tape. Yet we have seen in the first three years of office that it has created 35 statutory authorities or agencies, while getting rid of only 11. Those 11 authorities did virtually nothing, so it has really created 35 new agencies of Government. Here we have even more bureaucracy being imposed upon the community.

Finally the Minister must be taking the lead from the Premier in this regard. As I shall explain later, there has been an attempt through the economic statement of the Premier, and right into this Bill, to mislead the people of Western Australia as to the real purpose behind the legislation. A deliberate attempt has been made, as I shall indicate as I expand upon my

argument in this debate, to mislead the people of Western Australia.

At the outset let me indicate to the Government that we will not be opposing the Bill at the second reading stage. It is in all senses of the word—and the Minister indicated this in her second reading speech, and it was a part of that speech which was accurate—a Budget measure, and, of course, we are not in the habit of opposing Budget Bills.

However, I can assure members opposite that we will be voicing our concerns about the legislation throughout the second reading and Committee stages of the debate. I can also indicate, through you, Mr Speaker, to the Minister, that we will be opposing certain sections of the Bill, and probably more sections if we do not receive adequate explanations for the reason for their inclusion in the Bill in the first place.

I indicated that the first standard of this Government is that it has imposed savage taxation increases upon the community of Western Australia. I now want to expand upon that argument to justify that claim.

As I understand it, the research I have undertaken indicates that this piece of legislation, the liquor tax in Western Australia, was first imposed in 1911. At that time the level of tax was five per cent of liquor sales. It may have been a percentage point less or more, but my research indicates it was five per cent.

Now, in July 1986, 75 years later, that tax has increased three per cent at maximum; in fact only two per cent for many people in the industry, such as hotels. So over the life of the liquor tax itself the increase has been at a very modest rate.

As I will explain in a moment, the revenue of the State has not suffered because of inflation. That has been maintained, but I am talking about the rate of tax which has been imposed.

Now we see in this legislation, in one fell swoop, the tax goes from seven or eight per cent, depending on what type of outlet one has, to 11 per cent—the most significant increase in the history of this tax in Western Australia. I do not think one could call such an increase anything but savage. When one looks at it in percentage terms, one sees that licensees in Western Australia will now be facing an increase, on average, of 40 per cent. That means a 40 per cent increase in the commitment a licensee must make to the Government on liquor sales. In isolated cases, if one looks at the percentage of the greatest increase, it goes

up to a 57 per cent increase which must be faced by some people in the community.

That is not surprising when one considers the principle of government to which the Burke Labor Government aspires, of ensuring that one slugs the taxpayer quick, slugs him early, and slugs him big in the first year of office. One only needs to recall that these licence fee increases faced by publicans and licensees come on top of electricity charges, which have risen by 12 per cent, which were already the highest in Australia, and which are increasing at a faster rate than those in any other State in the Commonwealth. Of course, hotels are large electricity consumers because of the cool rooms and refrigeration equipment they are required to maintain.

Metropolitan Water Authority charges have increased substantially in the last couple of months, and again, hotels are large water consumers. Payroll tax has been increased significantly for large employers in the hospitality industry; and, importantly for all of the hoteliers and licence holders, there has been a savage increase in the fuel levy, which has been adequately exposed by my colleague, the member for Gascoyne, in recent times. I think 98 per cent was the increase in that regard. Perhaps the liquor industry should be "grateful" that its increase has been, on average, only 40 per cent, when, had it imitated the fuel levy, it could have been a 98 per cent increase.

The licensees are not a very happy group in the community at the moment, after facing those increases. I believe those hardest hit, and those who will feel the increases most, are probably those hard-working licensees who live in country areas. Country publicans and club licensees are hit hardest by the fuel levy, the increase in SEC charges, and, when it comes, the increase in the liquor tax. Those people are not facing the easiest time of any section of our community at the moment. In fact, times are difficult in the country and I predict this increased liquor tax will sound the death knell of several small publicans in country areas. I am sure that the country members on this side of the House, in both my party and the National Party, will allude in greater detail to that section of our community which is so adversely affected by this piece of legislation.

Let me list again the impositions faced by this section of our community: A liquor tax increase of 40 per cent, on average; electricity charges significantly up and the highest in Australia; increased Metropolitan Water Authority charges; increased payroll tax; and an in-

crease in the fuel levy. If that is not enough, the industry has to face other externally imposed imposts that are causing it to reel under the pressure. These include the national wage case decision for an increase of 2.3 per cent and entertainment expenses that have been disallowed as a tax deduction at a Federal level.

All the issues I now list have been supported actively and vocally by the Burke Labor Government: The national wage increase of 2.3 per cent; the disallowance of entertainment expenses, whether they are legitimate or otherwise.

Mr Brian Burke: We did not support that. We put forward the proposition that 50 per cent should be permitted.

Mr MacKINNON: So half of it is okay and the other half is not! I say to the Premier, that is a complete cop-out, and he knows it. A business expense is either a business expense or it is not; and if it is a legitimate business expense it should be 100 per cent deductible. To say, as the Premier has just said, that 50 per cent is okay and 50 per cent is not, is half good and half bad. That is just sitting on the fence, and I think the fence is starting to poke out. We can see that.

Mr Brian Burke: I was addressing your point that it was done with our full support. That is not right.

Mr MacKINNON: It was done with only 50 per cent support—is that right?

Mr Brian Burke: Whatever it is, you were not right.

Mr MacKINNON: Whatever the Government's position, it clearly was not one that supports our proposition, which is that legitimate business expenses should be fully tax deductible. We stand by that and will continue to do so both in Opposition and in Government. In Government we will be working actively to ensure that proper tax deduction is restored for people who legitimately incur such expenses.

I talked earlier about the State impositions, about which the Premier was strangely silent. I am now expanding upon the other imposts, the national wage case; the disallowance of entertainment expenses; the imposition of a fringe benefits tax, again supported by the Burke Labor Government and felt very much by the hospitality industry; and the capital gains tax that will impact upon all those people within the hospitality industry who might be working 80 to 100 hours a week to build up a capital asset which they would have hoped to enjoy previously, but from which the Commonwealth

Government will now take a large slice. Of course, there is also the proposed three per cent superannuation "productivity" agreement that business must face.

At a time when both the Premier and the Prime Minister have been publicly urging us to put our shoulders to the wheel, saying it is time that Governments got behind business and gave it every encouragement, a section of our community—the hospitality industry—is really being savaged by Government at both Federal and State levels, in a seemingly completely insensitive manner.

I use the word "insensitive" advisedly. I received a phone call last week from a metropolitan licensee who was outraged at the attitude of a Government employee to whom he spoke. He was talking to that Government employee about this liquor tax, and the Government employee—I will not name her publicly but am prepared to do so privately, because I do not wish to publicly malign public servants or other people, Mr Speaker, in line with your recent guidance—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr MacKINNON: That Government employee indicated to the licensee that—and I quote—

The Government realises there will be casualties . . .

The casualties will occur as a consequence of the liquor tax increase. To continue—

. . . but are prepared to accept that this will be so.

In other words, this Government employee indicated to the licensee that the Government is aware of the impact on the hospitality industry that this liquor tax will have on top of all the other impositions.

Mr Trenorden: Particularly in country areas.

Mr MacKINNON: Yes, particularly in country areas as I indicated previously. I thank the member for Avon for his interjection, and hope that he and his colleagues will expand on that impact in due course, as the debate proceeds.

Clearly, this increase is savage and that can be justified from the comments I have made.

The tax falls hardest on those who are least able to afford it; that is, the working men and women of this nation whose income is less than the average of most Australians. Those people enjoy an occasional drink and cigarette, perhaps at the hotel, and they have been the hardest hit by this Government since its elec-

tion to office. The Government has not only significantly increased the cigarette tax—I think the level of increase after its ascension to office was 25 per cent—but also we now see a tax slug on the liquor industry of 40 per cent. That tax is on people in the community who are recipients of unemployment benefits, social security benefits, or who are on fixed incomes, be they pensions or otherwise. They can go to bed tonight happy in the knowledge that the Burke Labor Government really “cares” about them.

They have taxed the couple of small luxuries that they may well have enjoyed—the occasional beer that an unemployed person might be able to afford and the cigarette he might enjoy with it. This Government has significantly increased taxes and charges for those people.

To give members an idea of the impact upon such poor unfortunate persons I indicate what the price of a middy of beer is today. Members may not be aware that in 1983 it cost only 87c. If one went down to the public bar in any hotel in our community one would discover that the price of a middy of beer is now \$1.27, which works out to be a 46 per cent increase over three years. I hope the Minister and the Premier realise that inflation over that period, on the Government's figures, has been approximately 21 per cent, so the price of a middy of beer has risen at a rate double that of inflation. In no small part is that increase in the price of a middy of beer due to direct actions of this Government.

Of course, the latest increase is due to the liquor tax and I am sure that those fixed and low-income earners in the community, many of whom I represent, will be unhappy to say the least about the manner in which they have been so fiercely attacked through this taxation legislation.

I also indicated that a hallmark of this Government which is becoming more apparent to both the Opposition and industry is that legislation of this type is being introduced into the Parliament without consultation. It is fair to say the hospitality industry is a major industry which employs hundreds of thousands of Western Australians. These people have a major influence on the tourist industry of this State, particularly in regional areas, and the fact that there was no consultation with the industry about the broad thrust of this legislation can be taken in no other way than as a complete insult to the industry itself. I assure the Minister that they are outraged because the

Government made no approach whatsoever to them.

It is amazing, to say the least, that the Minister's second reading speech says that no approach was made to the industry when we consider the Bill's effects. I refer to the opening paragraph of the Minister's second reading speech which reads as follows—

The Bill before the House incorporates the majority of the recommendations of an interdepartmental committee on liquor licence fees assessment procedures plus a restructuring of liquor licence fees.

It seems strange that such an important document, produced by an important committee examining such an important issue, was not at any time, certainly not in its final form, referred to the industry. In fact, in answer to a question I raised in the Parliament, the Minister indicated that the Government is not even prepared to let us have a look at the final report of that committee.

At the very least, the Minister owes the Parliament an explanation as to which recommendations of the committee were not accepted. In fact, if this legislation incorporates the majority of the committee's recommendations, as the Minister says it does, which recommendations were not proceeded with, and why not? Why has the report not been made public? If this report has led to the legislation we are currently debating, why are we, as the people who are asked to debate that legislation, not allowed access to the report? What can be so confidential about the report which precludes us from having access to it?

A very important question to which the Minister should address herself is: Did that committee in fact recommend that rate of increases that we now see? Did it recommend an increase of 11 per cent? I hear no answer at the moment and I sincerely hope that the Minister has the courtesy to answer that question in her reply, a courtesy of course that she has not extended to the public or to the industry. My final question in this area is: Why in fact was the industry itself not consulted at this time about the legislation?

The Minister has done herself, the Government, the industry, and the community a grave disservice by not consulting the industry at this time. She would have found the industry quite willing to sit down and in a constructive way put to her some good ideas about how we could in fact improve the method of collection of the liquor tax.

I do not claim that the industry would have at any time supported the increase, certainly not to the extent which has resulted from the Government's decision. In recent days I have discussed this matter with several industry representatives who have indicated that they would have been prepared to put to the Minister some suggestions as to how the liquor tax could be better assessed. The tax could be much more efficiently assessed and calculated. Consequently it could have been reduced and hence it would have had a lesser impact upon those unfortunate people whom I mentioned earlier in the debate.

A suggestion which warrants very close examination by the Government is the suggestion that the tax should be levied upon the wholesalers rather than the retailers. Over the last two days I have not had time to examine why that cannot be done, but it certainly seemed to be a sensible suggestion. It would mean that a lower number of wholesalers than retailers would be affected, as I will indicate in a moment. It could have been levied in the same way as sales tax is levied by the Commonwealth, that is, on a calculation of the previous year's sales, therefore, it would be a more appropriate and relevant tax. Had the Government made the proper inquiries, the level of tax increase could probably have been contained at approximately nine per cent, which is the Australian average, and not 11 per cent which is currently being imposed by the Government.

On my brief examination it appears that suggestion would provide some significant advantages. As I indicated earlier, there are fewer wholesalers than retailers. There are only about 50 wholesalers, yet there are in excess of 1 000 retailers. Based on those figures, I do not need to explain why it would be far easier to administer the liquor tax in that manner. Initially we could make significant savings in the staff levels at the office which is charged with the responsibility of administering this Act. There would be less paperwork and, if only 50 people are involved on the wholesale side, surely the ability of the department to police payment of the tax would be greatly enhanced. One wholesaler a week could be approached and, if one person each week checked out one wholesaler, on an annual basis that would give a much greater level of surveillance than exists currently. It would certainly ensure the efficient collection of the tax.

This proposal put to me by the industry over the last two days could have significant advantages. It is a matter the Government could have

considered prior to its ill-advisedly rushing into the Parliament with this legislation, rushing headlong after its purpose of taxation increases.

As I indicated earlier, such a tax, levied in the same manner as is the sales tax, could also have been levied on current sales. The industry is very concerned at the moment that the current tax is retrospective as it is in some respects.

The worst part of the retrospective aspect of the legislation is the effect on those poor unfortunate people, many of whom live in country areas—those businesses whose business has turned down at present. If one is living in a country town which is going through a hard time and has had a bad season this year, although it may have had a good season last year. Perhaps as one finds the farming community cannot afford to spend the same amount of money. If sales are down and one is required to pay tax at the rate of 11 per cent instead of seven per cent, and that is calculated on last year's sales and not this year's sales, it will obviously have a significant impact on small country hoteliers. That could be overcome by a change in the administration of the Act. The tax could have been charged to wholesalers rather than retailers, and be paid on current sales and not past sales. That would have ensured a more efficient and appropriate form of tax.

I would be amazed if as a consequence of this change the Government could not have kept the level of the tax to nine per cent rather than 11 per cent. That two per cent saving could have been implemented as a consequence of the system I indicated. The Government did not take that opportunity; it did not take the time to consult industry and say, "We will be increasing the tax and we want to find a more efficient way of collecting it". Even if the Government did not indicate it was going to increase the tax it could have said, "We are looking at more efficient ways of collecting it; how about giving us your ideas?" The Minister has indicated via a question in another place that there was no consultation on the basis that this was a budgetary decision and part of the Premier's economic statement.

I do not think that is an appropriate answer. The method of collection of the tax is affected by this Bill; so are the records to be retained by the licensee; the differentials involved; the change to the principal receiver; and the change from two per cent to 1.15 per cent. It seems to me all those aspects could and should have been canvassed with the industry prior to the

legislation being introduced to Parliament for approval.

The third principal upon which this Government increasingly is operating is that it knows best and the industry really is not worth talking to. It has not consulted the industry, and as a consequence we have a piece of legislation that is not as good as it could have been, and a level of taxation that is greater than it should have been.

The fourth standard of this Government's performance by which it is increasingly being judged is the growing bureaucracy and the bureaucratic nature of the legislation it is bringing down. That is highlighted by two principal factors in this Bill—the first being the increase in the number of years a licensee is required to retain records. The Act currently requires licensees to keep records for a period of two years; this Bill increases the length of time to six years, but there is no apparent explanation as to why that is so. Some claims have been made of avoidance in the industry, but we have been given no specific details of the extent of the avoidance, who is involved, and to what extent. It seems to us to be a very bureaucratic and heavy-handed approach to say that a licensee must keep records for six years instead of two years without taking into account the cost such a decision places on businessmen and women in the industry.

A significant area of concern relates to the change outlined in clause 4 of the Bill where the word "Court" is deleted and the words "Principal Receiver of Revenue" are substituted. The change was not foreshadowed, and I understand from discussions with the industry that there was no consultation about the change. More importantly, we have been given no explanation about the change or about its implications. The best way to sum up the concern of both the industry and the Opposition on this section is to quote from a letter dated 1 July to the Minister from the Liquor Industry Council of Western Australia. In talking about this part of the Bill the letter said—

The effect of the proposed transfer of many of the penal, fiscal and administrative powers from the Court to the Principal Receiver of Revenue is viewed with some caution. We would need to be assured that the Principal Receiver's new powers do not serve as a foundation for increases in bureaucratic impositions on the industry.

That adequately summarises our concern.

I have another concern. It seems to me that if there is a Licensing Court whose job is to administer the Act, why should some functions be separated from it? The best way of organising virtually anything, be it a political party, the Licensing Court, or some other department, is to have an overall structure administered properly and efficiently under one roof. We saw previously that the Road Traffic Authority was separate from the Police Department, but it is now under one section, administered effectively and properly, in my view, by one department. Why do we need to take this apparently retrograde step under which this aspect of the court's activities and this section of the Liquor Act is to be administered by a separate department altogether? Why is it so? No explanation can be found in the Minister's second reading speech, and we are entitled to one.

I indicated when addressing the five standards of the Burke Labor Government that the standard most aspired to by the Premier was the attempt to mislead. In this instance it was done by the Minister herself. This comment by the Minister in her second reading speech is true. She said—

I would also point out that the percentage fees have not been altered since 1975.

What the Minister did not say was that the revenue to the Government since 1975 has increased significantly because of inflation and Federal Government excises which get added on to the price of alcohol. The revenue raised in the year ended 30 June 1979 was \$14 062 166; for the year ended June 1985 the figure was \$23 272 320. I recall having put a question on the Notice Paper to find out what revenue the Government received in 1986, and if I am any judge it will have gone up again. Does the Minister know what the revenue figure was in 1986? The Minister shakes her head to indicate she does not know.

Mr Clarko: It would have to be about \$24 million.

Mr MacKINNON: I would have thought it would be about \$24 million or \$25 million. In 1983, when the Burke Government came into office, it was \$20 million. By 1985 it had risen to \$23 million. That is a significant increase of about 14 per cent over a two-year period. It is certainly in line with the rate of inflation, so it is fair to say that percentage fees have not been altered since 1975. However, that is only half the truth; the full truth is that the revenue collected from the industry has been keeping pace with inflation, and adequately so as the records

indicate. One needs only look at the facts to demonstrate that.

Perhaps a more important comment followed that sentence in the Minister's second reading speech when she said—

As announced on Tuesday, 24 June 1986, it is proposed to amend the Act to bring the fee structure into line with that in the Eastern States, as follows—

Never was such a misleading statement made to the Parliament of Western Australia.

I repeat that the Minister said, "... it is proposed to amend the Act to bring the fee structure into line with that in the Eastern States, as follows". To indicate to the House how the Minister has misled the Opposition in her comment, I will refer to the answer to question 240 which was asked by the Leader of the Opposition of the Leader of the House in the Legislative Council on 1 July 1986. Hon. G. E. Masters asked the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming what the current liquor licence fees in percentage terms were in other States. I will read the reply by the Leader of the House in the Legislative Council to this House to show that the Opposition has not cooked up the information. His answer was—

Victoria 9 per cent

Queensland 8 per cent

New South Wales 10 per cent

South Australia 11 per cent

Tasmania 8 per cent

Northern Territory

11 per cent (consumption on licensed premises)

16 per cent (consumption off licensed premises)

The Northern Territory can be disregarded in this answer because the Minister, in her second reading speech, said that it is proposed to amend the Act to bring the fee structure into line with the Eastern States. Therefore, we can ignore the Northern Territory for the sake of the Minister's argument. If we do that, the average of the liquor licence fees in the Eastern States is nine per cent—not 11 per cent which this Government has chosen. That is a message in itself. Not only is the Minister's second reading speech clearly and patently wrong, but it is also misleading the House, the Parliament, and the people of Western Australia. It is clearly out of line with the facts of the situation.

Is it not an admission by this Government of its own inefficiency? I would have thought that this Government, which is attempting to show Australia how, would attempt to show Australia that we have the lowest taxation level of all the States. Instead, we have the highest electricity charges and the Government is proposing to have the highest payroll taxes in Australia. Certainly, we have the highest land tax and stamp duty charges in Australia. To show Australia how Western Australia can have the highest and the best charges in Australia, it is now proposing to have liquor licence fees which will equal those charged in South Australia. The Northern Territory also has liquor licence fees of 11 per cent for consumption on licensed premises, and we will equal that.

This Government has shown the rest of Australia that it does not have an effective and efficient administration and, as a result, it needs to have the highest taxes in order to maintain its profligate levels of spending. It is not surprising when one considers the first standard by which this Government can be judged; that is, slug them quick, slug them often, and make sure it is done in the first year of office and not in the latter years. We have seen it done with the fuel tax levy and electricity charges, and we will see it this evening in relation to payroll tax.

With reference to the Minister's statement to the Parliament, I sometimes regret, Mr Speaker, your ruling regarding the proceedings of this House.

Of course, the Opposition has other concerns about this legislation. Firstly, the Opposition queries the method by which the amount of liquor tax will be changed. Historically, the change to this tax has been affected by a change in the legislation. As I indicated previously those changes have been infrequent and that is probably the reason the Bill is now before the House.

Indeed, we now see the Government moving to change the method by which the tax is levied. In other words, in future the tax will be changed by regulation. The regulation will be tabled in the Parliament and the Government of the day will not have to bring legislation before the Parliament and provide an explanation to illustrate the reason that the tax should be increased. I do not believe that is appropriate. The Minister, in her second reading speech, did not give an explanation for the proposed change. I indicate that this is something to which the Opposition objects.

Secondly, over recent years it has been the practice in this State to differentiate between hotels and taverns in regard to the tax levied. If we are serious about wanting to promote tourism in this State we must bear in mind that hotels have licensing requirements imposed on them which are far more onerous than the requirement imposed on taverns or other licensed outlets. As a result, it is my view that some benefit should be given to the hotel industry. Under this legislation the benefit will be reduced significantly and the Minister has not given an explanation as to why. The Opposition would appreciate it if the Minister would advise the House of the reason for this action.

The third area which is of concern not only to the Opposition, but more importantly also to the industry, is the level of premiums being charged to the industry. Every time the Opposition meets with the hotel section of the liquor industry—

Mrs Beggs: When you were in Government what did you do about the premiums?

Mr MacKINNON: That is an interesting question. We did not do anything.

Mrs Beggs: I wonder why.

Mr MacKINNON: That does not make it right.

Mrs Beggs: I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition what he did about it?

Mr MacKINNON: I was not the Minister.

Mrs Beggs: Why didn't your Government do something about it?

Mr MacKINNON: The Minister will have to ask the Minister of the day.

Mr Speaker, I have often told a joke in this House which I will not repeat today. It concerns a Minister who came into Government to solve a lot of problems—he blamed the Government, blamed his predecessor, and ended up resigning.

There is no justification for the Minister to ask, "Why didn't you do something about it when you were in Government?" That is history. We will not look back; we will go forward, and very soon we will be in Government. If members give me an opportunity I will indicate exactly what we will do about premiums when we are in Government.

Mrs Beggs: I know why you didn't do it when you were in Government. I know about the premiums, but obviously you do not.

Mr MacKINNON: The Minister is quite brilliant. Not only does she know why her Government did not change the legislation relating to premiums, but she also knows why we did not do it when we were in Government. I expect her to explain to the House the reason we did not implement premiums when we were in Government. When we return to Government our attitude towards premiums will be different from that of this Government.

Mr Speaker, I give you and the liquor industry an undertaking that when we are returned to Government we will, together with the industry affected discuss the whole question of premiums and ascertain whether charges—that is premiums—should be levied. Perhaps that examination will recommend not to continue imposing these charges—the feeling in the industry at the present time is that the charges should not be imposed. On the other hand when mature thought and attention is given to the issue, a reason may be forthcoming to charge premiums on an equitable basis. I do not want to pre-empt the finding of such a discussion but an appropriate examination would be undertaken at that time. If it is considered that premiums should be charged we will examine, through such an inquiry, the best method of implementation.

Obvious anomalies exist at the present time that are of concern not only to the Opposition, but also to the industry.

[Questions taken.]

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr MacKINNON: It is a little strange when one looks at question 189 which was asked in the Legislative Council on 24 June, because one sees that the revenue raised from premium income in 1984-85 was \$679 000. That is not a large amount of money, but it is of great concern to the industry and causes it a lot of consternation. The industry quoted to me an example of a country hotel in which a \$1.5 million investment was made but no premium was charged; yet right across the street from the hotel is a tavern in which \$300 000 was invested and in that instance a premium of \$25 000 was charged. There is seemingly no logical explanation for the difference. We express our concern and give a commitment that we will examine the whole question immediately we are returned to Government at the next election.

There are other areas of concern in respect of this legislation. One relates to the late amendment which the Minister has placed on the No-

tice Paper. It is in clause 5 and the Minister proposes on page 2, line 14 to change the figures so that the definition of liquor within the Act will read—

“liquor” means spirits, wine or beer with an alcoholic content of more than 1.15% by volume at a temperature of 20 degrees celsius

The figure contained in the Bill is two per cent. Bearing in mind that this is a change that has been proposed since the Bill was introduced into the Parliament, it would be appreciated if the Minister could explain why the change has been made.

Mrs Beggs: It is a very simple explanation, and I will be happy to explain it in the Committee stage. I do not think there will be any problems at all.

Mr MacKINNON: I would appreciate that, particularly in the light of the fact that the reduction appears to me to be designed to increase the Government's revenue at the expense of those people who are providing low-alcohol drinks.

We support the Government in its proposal not to charge liquor licence fees on beer containing less than two per cent alcohol.

Mrs Beggs: I can reassure the Minister on that.

Mr MacKINNON: Hopefully the Minister will explain, at the time, the reasons for that amendment.

There are other matters to which the Parliament is entitled to have answers. The first relates to the question of trading hours. I asked the Minister a question on Thursday, 10 July about whether she had any plans to deregulate trading hours that have to be complied with by those operating in the hospitality industry. The Minister indicated that consideration was being given to requests from sections of the liquor industry which include more flexible trading hours than those currently in existence. What does the Minister mean by that answer? Does she mean that she is planning to make changes to trading hours in which each section of the industry operates? If so, when is it likely that that decision will be made?

Mrs Beggs: That has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr MacKINNON: The Bill, as I understand it, seeks to amend the Liquor Act and therefore relates to the whole of the liquor industry.

Mrs Beggs: I am happy to talk about that. However, it is inappropriate to do that as that section of the Act is not being amended.

Mr MacKINNON: We can debate it during the debate on the Supply Bill next week. However, I thought it was appropriate, when we were debating a Bill to amend the Liquor Act, for the Minister to provide a response quickly to a question that is of concern to many people in the industry, people who have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in an industry that can be significantly affected by the decisions that the Minister makes. Those people are, understandably, very concerned about the impact that the changes being considered by the Minister might have on them.

Mrs Beggs: Those changes will be made in consultation with the industry. That consultation process is already under way. I have seen every section of the industry in the few short months that I have been the Minister for Racing and Gaming. I assure you that the decisions will be made in direct consultation with the industry. However, it is still irrelevant to this Bill.

Mr MacKINNON: When?

Mrs Beggs: The decisions are being made right now, in consultation with the industry.

Mr MacKINNON: When will the industry be advised of the decisions?

Mrs Beggs: Some time before the next session of Parliament.

Mr MacKINNON: The next session of Parliament is two months away. I appreciate that this is when the industry will be advised and so I will advise those interested parties accordingly.

Mrs Beggs: They have already been advised.

Mr MacKINNON: If they have been advised, they are not aware of the position, because they would not have approached me.

The point to be made in relation to this issue is that the Minister needs to be very aware that changing the hours or the method by which licensed premises or people who operate licensed premises can trade must be looked at very closely. I am not opposed to changes in that regard, but the Minister needs to be sure of the impact those changes are likely to have on people who have built up significant investments under the current regulations.

I thank the Minister for her advice that the final decision will be made in the next eight weeks. I will advise the people concerned accordingly.

Many people have also indicated to me that they are concerned about the recommendations of the Honorary Royal Commission. It is some time since that inquiry handed down its report. Questions have been asked in the Parliament about the report and all we get is that the matter is still under consideration. It seems to me that such an important report deserves better explanations to the Parliament and to the industry.

A third and associated point relates to the membership of the Licensing Court. The membership of that court is three persons. One of those persons has retired, so there are now only two members of the Licensing Court. A quorum of the court is two of its members. If one of them is ill or leaves the court, the court is unable to sit. I am advised that that happened recently when the court did not sit for the whole of the month of June because only one member was available. I do not believe that is reasonable for the industry. It takes quite a deal of time now for members of the industry to have their matters resolved in the court. If the vacancy is not filled until a decision is made on the recommendations of the Honorary Royal Commission the industry will be badly affected. People in the industry borrow large amounts of money for investment in the industry, and delays cost money.

Before I conclude I do not want the Minister to think that we oppose the legislation totally, because some sections of the Bill have our full support. The upgrading of penalties in the Act seems to be acceptable. It is some time since they were upgraded. We also give our total support to clause 10 of the Bill which amends section 163 of the principal Act. It means retailers will not be required to include volume details in their returns. I received representations about that matter and have corresponded with the Minister or the court—I cannot recall which—in that regard and did not receive a very satisfactory response.

I am pleased that the Government in this instance has seen reason and that reason has prevailed. The industry, the Opposition, and individual people affected by the imposition welcome that decision. We support the continued exemption for beverages with alcohol content of two per cent or less. The only proviso to that support is a sufficient explanation as to the amendment reducing that figure to 1.15 per cent.

In summary, we object to the manner by which the Government has so savagely increased this taxation. We do not oppose that

part of the Bill because it is a budgetary matter and it is not part of our brief to oppose such matters. However, it seems to us that if such a massive and unprecedented increase were necessary at all, then it should have followed extensive industry consultation. The lack of that consultation is an insult to the industry that is so regulated by this legislation. It should also have followed a demonstrable example provided by the Government that it too would cut back in its areas of administration and that it would live within its so-called reduced means prior to imposing upon the community such large taxation increases. Sadly, the Government has not indicated any such desire.

We object to the move of the Government to increase licensing fees by regulation. We believe that that should be retained within the Act as at present and, unless there is sufficient explanation to the contrary, we also object to the change of the requirement for licensees to retain records from two years to six years. On that latter point it must be remembered that this legislation indicates that that requirement will be imposed by regulation; it does not indicate the difficulties such an imposition will cause. I will make further comment about that particular clause when we get to the Committee stage of the Bill, at which time it is more appropriate to do so.

I indicated also that we would want certain questions answered, in particular, those questions in relation to the principal receiver, the reduction of the definition of "liquor" below that two per cent figure, the records figure of six years that I have indicated, what will happen in the future with respect to the industry and the hotel-tavern differential, to name a few. In conclusion, I again advise that as soon as we are returned to Government, we propose a joint Government-industry inquiry into the section on premiums which has been of such great concern to the industry over such a long period.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [7.33 p.m.] This Bill represents an attack on business and it is an attack on our community. Specifically it is an attack on the liquor industry—hotels, taverns; liquor outlets, and the like—but more generally it is an attack on clubs, whether social or sporting. In essence, this Bill is overwhelmingly a fund-raising measure. It is a Government grab at what has been estimated to be revenue amounting to approximately \$12 million in the first full year of the operation of the legislation. It represents an increase of approximately 40 per cent in liquor licensing

fees. The community and business cannot absorb increases of that sort. The odd place or two may be able to do so, but I predict that people involved in this industry will have to cut back on labour and purchases. That will flow on to the community and damage the economy in the State.

Overall, Australia is going through a time of intense business competitiveness. The Australian economy is in turmoil. It has not been in such turmoil since the days of Gough Whitlam. The inflation rate today is of the order of eight per cent or nine per cent, which is about twice the average for the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development countries. People in the liquor industry must bear interest rates of the order of 17 per cent on their overdrafts. The rate may be even higher, depending on the source of the loan. By comparison, if one wanted a loan to buy a motor car in the United States, for example, the interest rate on that loan would be six per cent. In Australia, one would probably pay 22 per cent or 24 per cent. In the United Kingdom, the top interest rate is about nine per cent or 10 per cent by contrast with our 17 per cent or 18 per cent. These are heavy burdens for all businesses to bear. Tonight we talk about them as they apply to people in the liquor industry.

Last year the Prime Minister with great euphoric zeal made the remark that Paul Keating was the greatest Treasurer in the world. It has been recently pointed out to me that the man who was given that title the year before was the Treasurer of Mexico which at present has one of the worst levels of debts in the world. Unfortunately, that is what is happening in Australia. That same kind of financial burden being carried by people in this industry can be interrelated with the statement made by Paul Keating when the Fraser Government introduced import parity pricing for petrol. He said that every bowser in the land would become a branch of the Australian Taxation Office. With the legislation to increase liquor licence fees by 40 per cent, the Burke Government is creating in every one of these liquor outlets what is virtually an office of the Government. Without any disrespect, we could call it the "highwayman Government". In 1983 when the Premier put up Government charges by 23 per cent he was called "Highwayman Burke" or "Put-em-up Burke".

In the first year after the Burke Government was elected Government charges increased by 23 per cent. We are now moving through the same phase and finding that many of the major

public utilities have increased their charges by 12 per cent. As my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, said, these increases will bear disproportionately on businesses such as hotels and the like. Their water charges have increased, their payroll tax is up, and there is an increase in the fuel levy. All these things will bear very heavily on them at a time when they are being assailed by Federal taxation changes. Yet this Government seeks an estimated \$12.5 million extra from this industry.

The figures for the last three years show that revenue from liquor licensing as of 30 June 1983 was \$20.13 million; the following year it was \$22.6 million, an increase of \$2.5 million; in 1985 the figure was \$23.3 million, an increase of only \$0.7 million as compared with the increase between the previous two years of \$2.5 million. Thus it can be seen that the rate at which this amount had been increasing was slowing down. The Minister has quite reasonably indicated that she is unable to give us the annual collection figure for the last 12 months. That is quite reasonable, but I wonder whether it will be about \$24 million and whether we have had a further slow down in that rate of increase. Are we getting to the situation that occurred under a previous Government in Australia which increased a wine tax which subsequently produced less revenue than before its introduction? That will not happen in this instance if the take is to be increased from \$24 million to \$36 million, an increase of 50 per cent.

The Premier has attempted to defend his pre-election statement that charges would be increased at or about the level of inflation. The Australian inflation rate is twice what it should be due to the mismanagement of the present Government in Canberra; nevertheless, we are to have an increase of 50 per cent in this area.

That highlights how inequitable is this impost imposed by this piece of legislation. The liquor industry has had enormous difficulties in recent years, and I commend the Burke Government for instigating an inquiry in 1983, and later an Honorary Royal Commission which presented its findings in 1984. It addressed very constructively the question of a moratorium on licences. That was applied in 1983, and later extended.

Everybody associated with the liquor industry welcomes it, because this industry is in a real malaise overall, although some parts of it continue to grow. That is largely due to the innovative skills of the people concerned. However, there is a limit to how much they can

dress up the pig in terms of earning extra profits. They are spending much more money and taking bigger risks.

Basically, everyone knows there is a decline in the consumption of liquor, particularly of beer. These changing consumption patterns have had a very significant effect on the income of people in this industry. The rationalisation of the industry as proposed by the Honorary Royal Commission headed by Judge Syme addressed itself very precisely to that area.

All sorts of new schemes are being put forward to try to help this ailing industry, if members will excuse the pun. One of the suggestions is that a hotel may stay open for a 24-hour period. Hon. Des Dans is reported to have said that he knows of no western country which allows 24-hour trading. I remember Hon. Gordon Masters telling me how dreadful he felt the licensing laws in this State were, and how the hotels should have the opportunity to stay open for as long as they wished. He never mentioned that the English pubs he applauded closed in the middle of the afternoon.

There are many reasons for the industry's problems throughout the State. One is the change in drinking habits. The Swan Brewery should be applauded for the tremendous effectiveness of its light beer. Its marketing has been successful, not only in Western Australia but also throughout Australia and possibly overseas. It has been something of an answer to the increasing attempts by road authorities and people concerned with the carnage taking place on the roads in Western Australia and in Australia.

The question of the various forms of police action should be studied. Random breath testing, or something allied to it, has obviously had a significant effect on the consumption of alcohol in liquor outlets. There has been a movement recently from drinking beer to drinking wine, and from drinking full-bodied reds to drinking light white wines. A whole new range of wines are now being drunk, and there has been a tremendous lift in the consumption of what one would call Australian champagne. All that will add to people's opportunity to enjoy a meal and alcohol.

At the same time there is tremendous pressure for the provision of better facilities. The sort of places which were acceptable in this State 25 years ago, where if one asked for a shandy one would be asked to go across the road, are disappearing. This is encouraging many people in the hotel industry particularly

to expend significant sums of money on upgrading their premises.

Side-by-side with this, people in Australia are mirroring the situation in the United States a few years ago and going into health and fitness. The health industry is growing at a great rate and people are becoming involved in jogging and all the rest of it. I do not think it did Jim Fixx much good; he did not do too well. I thought that was a lovely name.

The whole nation is under pressure to improve the general standard of health and to take up some sort of fad. No doubt it will change. People are tremendously worried by the dangers on our roads from drinking drivers. Various States in Australia have tried different ways to face up to this problem.

Some years ago I read a report on the Victorian experiment of bringing in random testing. A superintendent or inspector of police wrote that report and virtually said, "Our experience is that careful, conservative, cautious people have greatly reduced their incidence of drinking and driving, but to a certain class of people it has made no difference whatsoever."

Unfortunately young people particularly were in that class, and heavy drinkers were not affected either. They had not modified their behaviour, and that is why, when we were in Government at the time of the Court Government, we did not move into random testing.

We now have a system of subterfuge random testing, and I do not think that is very appropriate. Recently we have had policemen parking their cars near places supplying liquor and catching people as they come out of those hotel carparks. Again, if we are not after revenue but are seriously concerned about saving people's lives—the innocent as well as those who are driving while affected by drink—why do we not say to people who are about to enter their cars, "It would be a better idea if you did not get in, because if you do you might be in trouble"? That would be better than waiting till the person gets in and then catching him.

Hotels and clubs are in fierce competition, both amongst themselves and with each other. One reason is the increased activity of police squads concerned with drinking drivers and so on. The other is a social change. It existed some years ago in the United States, and like most things it follows its weary way here a year or two later. People now drink much more at home than in public places. This has meant that bottle sales have increased dramatically and bar sales have dropped just as dramati-

cally. We have had a tremendous expansion in the last decade or so in liquor stores, and they are very much in competition with hotels.

A member interjected.

Mr CLARKO: I am about to talk about topless barmaids, and that will take a minute or two. It is an absolute disgrace that in this State beer is served by topless and bottomless barmaids and we even have naked men serving in a butcher's shop. It is the absolute pits when such methods have to be used to try to boost one's trade. I am pleased that the Government has at last taken some steps in this matter. I might say that if we were in office we might not have been any faster off the mark, but there is no reason for this method to be used in Western Australia; that is, exposing the private parts of people.

A friend of mine once had the great privilege of hiring a yacht in the Greek Isles. He went with a couple of his friends and their wives in about 1975. He said he remembered calling at some island with a modern hotel, and in the lounge was a sign asking customers to cover their private parts in the bar, or perhaps it was the lounge. It reminds me of the sign in the Osborne Park Hotel saying everyone must wear a singlet. I once saw a fellow there who had a suit on and he was opening his shirt buttons to see if he had a singlet on.

I understand that the brother of the licensee in Boulder has a similar operation elsewhere. I encourage the Government to do everything it can to stop this practice.

Mr MacKinnon: By increasing liquor taxes the situation will certainly not be helped. Some publicans will be even more desperate to get businessmen to come to their premises.

Mr CLARKO: To go to extremes, we may have the situation where there is a sign which says, "clothed barmaids"; that will be the abnormal situation. These people have reached the extreme. We could then have a foolish butcher decking himself out similarly. If we do not have laws to stop those sorts of situations, we should introduce such laws. It is most unedifying. We are coming to a Nero-Roman situation. People are justifying such practices on the grounds that they are trying to keep their trade up.

Australia is eleventh overall in consumption of liquor on a per capita basis. Australia comes third in world rankings for consumption of beer. In the consumption of wine we come fourteenth in the world—we have moved a long way in the last decade—and in regard to

spirits Australia ranks twenty-ninth. There has been a fall in the average annual consumption of beer in Australia, in 1985, of 13 litres a head when compared with the year before. There was a considerable increase in the consumption of table and sparkling wines in 1985 compared with 1984. Figures for spirit consumption remain steady. I hope the people who take it do, too. During 1985 there was a 10 per cent fall in the consumption of beer in Australia compared with the rate for 1981, whereas the consumption of wine increased by 14½ per cent.

Another survey found that approximately half the beer drinkers in Australia drank less in 1985 compared with 1984. I guess one can twist statistics around to suit oneself. About 20 per cent of people who took part in the survey said they would be more likely to drink wine than beer. The prime reason given was price. They cannot know their wines! I think one drinks wine for its quality and flavour.

The club associations of Western Australia publicly assert that they are having problems because of the change from beer to wine and to drinking at home rather than out. They also express concern about the police and their anti-drinking campaigns. I must say that the police anti-drinking campaigns would generally be supported by the people of Western Australia, as long as they are carried out in a responsible way. I do not support the principle of random breath testing. I do believe it is essential that the police take every step they need to take to prevent unnecessary fatalities on our roads.

As a result of previous Government announcements the Opposition expects that the Minister will announce what the drinking hours will be during the America's Cup defence. Perhaps in her reply she might give us some idea of when she will be in a position to indicate what rules will relate to liquor outlet hours during that period. I suspect she will do it carefully and responsibly because she would realise that they will not only affect the America's Cup period but also that those areas which are successful will be encouraged to continue after the America's Cup. That statement will be looked forward to keenly by those people interested in drinking and also by those people against drinking. No doubt the Minister has to put up with approaches from people in the anti-drinking business. I respect the people who adopt that view.

Another serious effect which will eventuate from the great tax rip-off will be the further decline of country towns. Country towns are in a parlous condition, and have been for some

time. I worked in the country in the 1950s and later taught there in the 1960s. One could see over that decade a dramatic change in the economic viability of country towns in Western Australia. There was a declining social impact. It is a lonely life in the outback. The local hotel was a significant factor of people's enjoyment in those towns. There used to be a significant little town in the wheatbelt every 15 miles. Over the 10-year period from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s the distance changed to 30 miles. We are moving to the stage where there will only be a significant town 100 miles from the next town. That must be to the disadvantage of people in the country. At present these people are suffering because of the falling trade as a result of the problems in the agricultural industry. It is another knock for those country businessmen in small towns around the State.

I gather that the industry is perturbed as to what it sees as a lack of consultation by the Government over these changes. I refer to the annual report of the Australian Hotels Association which was submitted on 18 June 1986. In regard to licensing fees it says—

The Association is aware of a recent Inter-Department Enquiry into the revenue raising responsibilities of the Licensing Court.

The last thing that this industry needs is an increase in licence fees in Western Australia and if a recommendation to this effect is made by the Inter-Departmental Committee it has been asked that it be firmly turned aside.

I believe the AHA did not get a proper opportunity to discuss this matter with the Minister. Perhaps she might care to respond to my remark.

I recently asked the Minister two questions in which I tried to explore whether the matter was retrospective. She made it quite clear that the Government and her advisers do not believe it is retrospective. I can assure members that people in the industry still think it is retrospective.

I was speaking to a liquor store manager who advised me that he allowed \$100 000 for liquor tax for the current financial year, 1986-87. He now has estimated that he will need \$122 000. Because he has just changed his business location and upgraded it and has gone heavily into cut-price liquor, he can probably shrug his shoulders. He believes many small liquor stores will go out of business because of the extra impost. He referred to a friend who had re-

cently bought a liquor store. Because of this new set of fees to be implemented he will be \$36 000 worse off in this financial year than he had budgeted for when he first purchased the liquor store.

Mrs Beggs: How can that be? If you give him four months' grace and he can now apply for the new 11 per cent tax in this four months, the only way that could happen is if there were a significant downturn in the amount of sales between July and October. The information that I have suggests that that would be an isolated case. There would be very few liquor outlets that would have a downturn in the volume of liquor they sell in that four months compared with the four months in 1985.

Mr CLARKO: I know the Minister feels that way. However, the industry still believes it is retrospective.

The liquor store manager also said that he regarded the new fine of \$2,000 as far too heavy. Despite the wording in the Bill, if a person makes an honest error, that is far too heavy a burden. He believes there will be difficulties in meeting the commitments provided in this legislation. He said, "Why not allow such operators a five per cent error margin rather than coming down with this draconian penalty of \$2 000?"

The AHA says that a hotel licensee who had purchases of \$100 000 in 1985-86, at a liquor tax rate of seven per cent, would have paid \$7 000. Under the new scales, he will pay \$9 805, which is an increase of \$2 805, or 40.07 per cent. That is a very hefty increase in an age where these people are struggling to survive.

A lot of concern has been expressed about the proposal that in the future, changes may be made to these fees by regulation. The liquor industry is suspicious about this possibility, as it has every right to be—and it does not even know my story about the Minister for Education! Members may recall that last year while Parliament was in recess the Minister introduced a change to the Education Department regulations to enable him to promote women to the position of deputy principal in the Education Department. When Parliament resumed in spring, the regulation was rejected in the upper House, and did not become law. I challenged the Minister at the time and he said, "You cannot do anything about those women who have been appointed; they will take up their positions. What is more, if the upper House continues to do what it did, I will do the same thing every year". So, naturally, certain

people, including myself, are a little suspicious at the regulation system. I am not suspicious of the Minister for Racing and Gaming, of course, but her successor might be the sort who would make those sorts of changes.

Some 1 740 licensed premises in this State will be affected by this legislation, so it can be seen that the Government will upset and threaten the jobs of a huge number of people. This is a very serious matter. The Government did not touch the rate applying to function premises; it put up everything else, but, perhaps for political reasons, it left that rate at \$6.

The AHA is particularly concerned that it now will be required to keep its records for six years, so if there is a need to check previous consumption figures it will have a mountain of records to go through. At present, only two years' records must be kept, and the association thinks the new provision is crazy; I think it is unacceptable.

There is also a problem in regard to premiums.

The Minister stated in her second reading speech that it was estimated that \$3.5 million-worth of liquor had not been declared, resulting in the evasion of \$280 000 of liquor tax. That is a very small part of the total of \$12.5 million which has now been imposed. When we get to the end of it and we remind ourselves that the liquor industry is suffering from the draconian measures currently being imposed, such as the non-deductibility of entertainment expenses, the fringe benefits taxes, and so on, we can see how harsh the effect of these new taxes will be on these people. This is part of Burke's 1986 rip-off and although I am advised that I cannot vote against this Bill because it is a Budget Bill, certainly it will not get my support.

I am totally against the legislation.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [8.04 p.m.]: I assure the member for Karrinyup that if he really wanted to he could oppose this Bill:

Mr Clarko: You heard me say I was advised.

Mr COWAN: Yes. I think the member's advice is wrong and I suggest he go somewhere else for his advice.

Mr Clarko: Do you intend to vote against it?

Mr COWAN: No, I do not.

Mr Clarko: Why not—because you support it?

Mr COWAN: No.

Mr Clarko: I think we are in the same position.

Mr COWAN: In replying to the interjection, I did not seek any advice to come to that opinion. I reached it myself.

Mr Clarko: I put it politely.

Mr COWAN: The National Party shares the concerns of the Liberal Party about the measures proposed by the Government in relation to the liquor industry. Quite clearly, the proposals that have been put forward breach the undertaking given by the Premier, I think even after the election campaign, that those areas for which the State was responsible in terms of taxation in Western Australia would increase only by the inflation rate. Clearly in regard to the Liquor Act in Western Australia that is not the case. The Premier and this Government are in breach of that undertaking; there is no doubt about that, nor that the public will judge this Government on that broken promise.

In regard to the measures themselves, initially the Minister in her second reading speech dealt with the six areas which the interdepartmental committee investigated and about which they made certain recommendations in relation to the assessment and application of liquor licence fees. Notwithstanding the penalties for non-compliance with the regulations and the rest of the bureaucratic material that is being demanded by the Government or its department, it appears that the Minister and her department have in no way made it easier for the people involved in the liquor industry to submit their returns.

I was involved for a very brief time, as I am sure most country people have been, with a small licensed operation in my area and I know how difficult it is to supply all the material and information required by the Licensing Court in its annual returns, so if the Government is prepared to increase the penalty to this extent for non-compliance with regulations relating to the licensing laws, surely it could make it a little easier for those people who are providing information.

It seems there has been too much preoccupation with increasing the penalties and increasing the need for licensees to supply or submit information and absolutely no thought to the people who are required to supply that information. I would have thought that perhaps some consideration could be given to making it easier for licensees to submit their annual returns.

The National Party has a history of being very strongly opposed to the introduction by way of regulation of changes in licensing fees, and during the Committee stage we will oppose a particular clause in the Bill. We will be prepared to divide the Chamber on it because of our opposition. I want to make very clear to this Government and the industry itself that we would prefer to see and to insist upon, proposed increases in liquor licence fees to require the approval of this Parliament rather than being introduced by way of regulation and presented to this Parliament and to the industry as a fait accompli.

Traditionally, debate on the Liquor Act has always attracted a large number of speakers from both sides of the House. I am not certain whether the Government will be better regimented this year and there will be fewer Government speakers. I can remember some time ago when we dealt with this Act when there were proposed changes to allow the public to purchase an unlimited quantity of packaged alcohol on Sundays, that debate occupied more than 30 hours in this Chamber. The following debate was in regard to the North-West Shelf agreement and, despite the fact that it was a \$5 billion project, the matter passed through the House in 30-odd minutes.

The National Party notes with some concern that the Minister has addressed issues upon which the interdepartmental committee reported. She made it easier for the bureaucracy but did not make it any easier for people involved in the industry. No consideration has been given to them. That is a weakness in this amending legislation. We are strongly of the opinion that the decision to give the Minister power to introduce, by regulation, any increases in liquor licence fees should be opposed.

Some comment has also been made on whether this Bill involves retrospective taxation. I am not convinced that that is the case. Nevertheless, I think that the people who have been advised that their fees will increase from 1 July will not be comforted to know that they now do not have to pay until 31 October. In the words of the member for Karrinyup, it will not be any easier for the person who has budgeted a certain amount in his annual cash flow for the payment of his liquor licence fee to suddenly discover that it has been increased by 40 per cent. He will not be terribly pleased to find that he has four months in which to start meeting those payments. I am sure that that increase, for which the industry has not

budgeted, will cause some difficulty in the industry. Naturally the industry will attempt to pass it on. That raises the question whether it can all be passed on to consumers. As a consequence, it will make it even more difficult for the small businessman to succeed because we should remember that, in most cases, his profits will be eroded.

The Minister, by interjection, indicated that there has been a maintenance of sales from most liquor outlets. When she is responding, I want her to give proof of that fact because I suggest that there are some instances where there has been a downturn in sales and, in many cases, where there has been a levelling out of sales. I do not believe for one moment that the Minister can substantiate the claim that liquor sales are on the increase other than that which would naturally be attributed to population increases. I suggest that liquor sales are being maintained, at best.

Mr Clarko: It would be interesting to know what the figures are in real terms.

Mr COWAN: Yes. I would appreciate it if the Minister would supply that information.

The National Party believes that the Minister has taken too much notice of the interdepartmental committee's recommendation on how it will assist the bureaucracy rather than on how it will assist the industry. We are strongly opposed to the introduction of any increases by way of regulation. I am also interested to hear her comments on how the 40 per cent increase will affect the profitability of those involved in the industry and whether she has any compassion for those people. It is a serious impost for them to have to absorb or attempt to pass on to their customers.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [8.15 p.m.]: Many speakers from this side of the House know a great deal more about this Bill than I do. They have raised many points and other speakers will raise many more. However, I wish to indicate the basic unfairness of these increases to the industry.

There is a strange irony in this matter. The Minister, as well as being Minister for Racing and Gaming, is also Minister for Tourism and is involved in trying to build an industry and to assist and encourage the development of the tourist industry in this State. That is her charter as Minister for Tourism. The irony is that, as Minister for Racing and Gaming, she is introducing tremendous increases in taxes for the hospitality industry. It seems to be a sort of iron fist in a velvet glove attitude.

The increases are most unfair. It is interesting to note that three years ago when the Burke Government was elected, it moved very skilfully and cunningly on the tobacco industry and took another \$45 million to \$50 million from that industry in the guise of improving people's health. I am not suggesting that the overall impact was not of some benefit to community health. However, I believe that there was a much stronger motivation for the Government's raising of \$50 million. That motivation was to gain funds for its re-election. As a consequence, it was re-elected and we are now seeing enormous increases in taxes in a number of areas.

Over the last few days, I have been heavily involved in debate on the increase of 92 per cent in the fuel levy, which totalled \$39 million. That amount, together with the \$12 million to be raised from increases in liquor licence fees, will mean a total of \$50 million to be added to Government revenue. Increases in payroll taxes will total \$28 million, providing a grand total of \$80 million for the Burke Government immediately after the last election.

The increases in the fuel levy were totally unjustified and were extremely unfair to the motorists of this State. Government members were ashamed and embarrassed by the increase.

Mr Clarko: Put-them-up Burke—that is what he is known as.

Mr LAURANCE: Yes. The liquor industry is now coming in for its share of the attack on industry by this Government. The increases are totally unfair. We appreciate the difficult position in which the industry has been placed. I tell the industry that, despite what it might think of the Parliament's passing this legislation, as it will, it has friends in the Parliament—not on the Government side any more, but certainly on the Opposition side.

It is an important and powerful industry and has an enormous amount of employment potential. It is a frontline industry, especially for our tourists, and is important to our economy. The Opposition recognises that and believes those industries deserve a better deal than they are getting from both the Federal and State Governments.

This legislation represents a double whammy for the hospitality industry. First, the Federal Government moved in on the industry. If members look at the number of increases which have been foisted on the industry they will see

it has been harshly affected. The fringe benefits tax, negative gearing and capital gains tax have all had an impact on the hospitality and entertainment industries. It has been an accumulative effect.

The second half of the double whammy has come from the State Government. There is absolutely no justification for the steep increases this Government proposes through this legislation. They just cannot be justified. Despite that, the Government will go ahead and make its move.

I feel sorry for the Minister for Racing and Gaming because she will bear the brunt of this legislation. It was the new Minister for Transport who brought legislation to this House to increase the fuel tax levy. He had to carry the can and obviously he did not like doing that and he realised the legislation was totally unfair. However, he was forced by the Premier and the Cabinet to implement these changes and he was the person responsible for bringing the legislation to Parliament and inflicting it on the public. It was obvious that the Minister did not like taking that action.

The Minister for Racing and Gaming is doing her job well and hit her straps very quickly in settling into the Ministry. I was quick to congratulate the Minister on her elevation to the Ministry. It is a wonderful honour to be a Minister of the Crown and I am sure she appreciates that. However, as a new Minister the first piece of legislation she brings before the House will increase a tax applicable to the liquor industry. She realises it is hard and has to take it on the chin as, no doubt, she will. There is no doubt that she will not have the support of the industry and when this Government goes under she will be the reason for it. The Premier will be the first to say that it is people like this Minister and the Minister for Transport who brought down the Government. It is unfair, but that is what will happen.

Mrs Beggs: That is a very strange attitude to take.

Mr LAURANCE: The Minister for Racing and Gaming is too nice to have to take the blame.

Mrs Beggs: You are obviously in the wrong party. In the Labor Party we do not blame one another.

Mr Clarko: Did you watch the ALP conference in Hobart last week?

Mrs Beggs: The member for Gascoyne is suggesting that the Premier will say, when and if we lose Government, that it was my fault

because I increased the liquor licence fees. I hardly think those comments apply to this Bill. Carry on.

Mr Clarko: He will probably have a beer to drown his sorrows.

Mr LAURANCE: For the Minister's benefit I will move on from that point.

Mrs Beggs: I think you should.

Mr LAURANCE: The clear message to the Parliament is that the Liberal Party believes that the liquor industry is very important to the economy and that it is only fair, at a time when the industry is being saddled with these increases, to have some indication from the Opposition about its stance and attitude towards the industry.

The Opposition, when in Government, intends to govern by incentive and will give people the encouragement they need to advance and develop in the industry. More than any other industry this industry does need encouragement.

We all want the industry to upgrade its facilities and provide new and improved facilities and in order to do that it needs encouragement, and when we have the opportunity, we will provide it. The industry needs a better deal in terms of taxes and we must look not only at this measure, but also at all the tax measures which have an impact on the industry.

It is not right to say that the industry can afford a 40 per cent increase. Not one Government on this earth can justify a 40 per cent increase in liquor licence fees and there is not one Government on earth which can justify a 92 per cent increase in fuel tax. Both taxes are iniquitous and cannot be justified by this Government or any other Government.

The industry is concerned about all taxes incurred by it. When we are in Government we intend to sit down with representatives from the industry and consider the impact of the overall tax situation on the industry. We hope we can come up with something that is fair and that provides the encouragement and incentive which is required to expand the industry.

The question of premiums should be reviewed because they are very harsh. There appears to be no rhyme or reason with the imposition of premiums. Some people will not pay a premium and some will pay very high premiums.

Premiums will apply to people who have improved their facilities. For goodness sake, is not that what we want the industry to do? One

would think that the Government would give those people who improve their facilities a premium for doing so, rather than charging them a premium for improving their premises. It is back-to-front politics to ask an industry to improve facilities so that, when they do so, not only will they sell more liquor and pay higher taxes, but also they will pay a premium for improving their premises. It is unfair and the whole situation needs to be investigated.

Despite all the doom and gloom that will descend upon this industry as a result of the enormous increases which are proposed and which will be carried out by this Government, there is a ray of hope for the hospitality industry, because we are a sympathetic Opposition. When in Government in 1989 this Opposition will sit down with representatives from the hospitality industry and consider the overall situation and will offer it incentives to expand as an industry. That is the only message of hope the industry can derive from the Bill before the House, and for that reason I oppose it.

MR LEWIS (East Melville) [8.29 p.m.]: This is nothing but a piece of legislation to impose a tax in order to raise revenue for the State. It has very little to do with enhancing the administration of the industry. This Bill is principally brought in at this time to raise revenue for this Government.

Mrs Beggs: It is very bright of you to reach that decision.

Mr LEWIS: I know it is. I am glad the Minister for Racing and Gaming recognises my qualities. The terms of reference of the interdepartmental committee which investigated this matter were to review the current procedures and practices for the assessment and payment of licence fees payable under the Liquor Act and, if necessary, recommend changes to their procedures, practices, and associated legislation outlining the expected cost benefit of any recommendation. In fact the terms of reference have little to do with this Bill.

The terms of reference in fact stated that anomalies and certain matters in the existing legislation needed to be addressed. This Government has seized on the opportunity to accept some of the committee's recommendations and, more importantly, it has used this Bill as a vehicle to further tax the liquor industry and the people in the community who happen to enjoy drinking alcohol.

It is somewhat of an irony to think that the Labor Party, which professes to look after the little man and the wage earner in the community, is attacking those people and increasing costs on one of the small pleasures he or she may get from life. It is an indictment of the Labor Party which is supposed to look after the little people. It is forcing this increase in costs by increasing the liquor tax which will automatically be passed to the community.

It was also somewhat ironic to note the statement in the second reading speech that the revenue from the liquor tax has decreased. Perhaps that decrease in revenue is a manifestation of the acceptance by society that its members are drinking too much. The incidence of driving under the influence of alcohol has abated and perhaps society has accepted the desirability of drinking at home rather than in public places. Because consumption has been lower, naturally the income generated from the liquor tax has fallen. However, this is no excuse to move in and increase the liquor tax. It is a double take: We encourage people not to drink more liquor, as soon as they do so the revenue from liquor tax falls, the Government wants more revenue, so it then increases the charges. It is wanting the best of both worlds and, indeed, getting it.

After much deliberation, the joint committee inquiring into the Act, concluded that the principles of the current licence fees' collection system have the potential to be generally effective. In other words, it stated that the system worked reasonably well. However, it pointed out half a dozen problems associated with the administration of the Act and collections. As I said before, rather than using that as the thrust for amending the Act, and forgetting the inequity of increasing the fees, the Government has used it as a smokescreen to increase Government revenue by \$12 million this year. Basically that is a 40 or 50 per cent increase in liquor fees; the people of Western Australia know about it, the hospitality industry is well aware of it and, as the member for Gascoyne said, it is somewhat ironic. On the one hand we are trying to encourage tourists and the hospitality industry and on the other hand we are tying their hands behind their backs and putting cost monsters on that industry.

The committee of inquiry identified various areas that need to be corrected and legislated for, and I accept that many of those legislative measures are necessary. I know that the Opposition supports them. Indeed, the \$100 and \$200 fines for false statements, etc. are

antiquated and the industry accepts the increases in penalties for non-compliance.

Of course, the transfer of many functions of the court to the receiver is viewed somewhat cynically by the industry. It is seen as the creation of another bureaucratic department that will grow to the extent that the revenue raised will flow to servicing that bureaucracy. The industry sees that as a danger and I suggest to the Minister and the Government that they ensure that the receiver's department does not grow into such a monster that it takes most of the increased funds legislated for in this Bill.

Another point comes to light in this Bill; that is, the requirement to keep records for six years. Hitherto licensees were required to keep records for two years. It is accepted that previously these matters were not specified; it was not clear what should be kept, how the information should be recorded, or whatever. I know the industry accepts that certain amendments were necessary in this area to ensure that records were properly kept and that they were the right sorts of records. However, it would seem that the requirement to keep these records for six years is rather extreme. I refer for example to some of the major outlets, such as the Nookenburra Hotel and the Burswood Island Casino, which would need warehouses to store their records for a period of six years.

It is also interesting to compare this provision to that other inequitous tax imposed by the Federal Government which impacts also on the hospitality industry—the fringe benefits tax. The legislation in that case requires that records be kept for only three years. This Bill makes it necessary for licensees to keep records for six years. The curious part is that the Bill also contains a provision for inspectors to go back and reassess for the previous five years. Why is there a six year requirement for the keeping of records, yet the Bill gives the receiver the ability to go back five years? Perhaps the Minister can answer that question at the appropriate time.

The amending Bill has the ability to correct an anomaly whereby the previous Act did not allow for reassessments. In other words, if an assessment has been made and is subsequently found to be incorrect, the legislation will allow the receiver to reassess that situation and the necessary revenue to be collected.

Of course, the people in the industry welcome the amendment to section 163 which removes the need to submit volume details in their returns. This is sound and recognised by

the Government as necessary bearing in mind the wholesaling returns.

One of the main complaints I have received from the hospitality industry is that it has not been consulted as to these increases. It was imposed on its members out of the blue and they have not done their budgeting. I do not necessarily accept, as other speakers have implied, that this is retrospective legislation. However, I feel that small hoteliers in country towns whose turnovers are very limited, who live very frugally, and supply a service to the town—in many instances such establishments become the social hub of that particular country town—often have minimum incomes and they may find it difficult to find the extra money over the three or four-month period to pay the licence fees levied on the previous year.

We must bear in mind, of course, that they are increases of up to 50 per cent. What the leader of the National Party said is true. In this legislation there has been very little thought for the people within the industry. The Bill has been structured around the needs and wants of the receiver and the Government, and the necessity to get more funds. The Government has not thought about the imposition on the industry, particularly the need to keep records, the imposition of budgeting, and the regulation of cash flows to ensure licensees have the necessary moneys to pay the fees.

I agree with what the industry said in its Press statement; that is, it believes the increased tax will cause some small suppliers to go out of business. Indeed, it will impact on the smaller clubs which are, in the main, surviving on the basis of voluntary work. With these imposts of additional licensing fees, the fringe benefits tax, and all the other charges impacting on small business and society today, many of these people will find the battle too hard and will believe it would probably be easier to go out and get a job somewhere rather than battle on in their own businesses.

Members should accept that a 40 to 50 per cent increase in today's terms is too jolly much. I think the Government has identified the liquor industry as an industry that can be whacked, and it has gone ahead and whacked it. In her second reading speech, the Minister implied that over the past eight or nine years there had been no increase in liquor fees. That is an absolute nonsense.

Liquor fees are levied on the basis of turnover, and turnover is on the basis of adjustments to the CPI. Over the past six years

the liquor tax collection has increased by about 52 to 53 per cent. Therefore, automatically written into the legislation is the ability for the increase in liquor fees to increase as the inflation rate increases. To say there has been no increase in liquor fees for the last nine years is a nonsense and an untruth. The fact is that this Government, through this legislation, is increasing liquor fees by four or five per cent, which reflects in a 40 to 50 per cent increase in real money terms.

With the increase in CPI, there should be no need to increase the percentage tax. I give the example of the real estate industry, which operates on a sliding scale of percentages of total sales made. The analogy here is that that industry has not had an increase for 10 or 15 years either, and I advise the Minister for Housing that I understand the industry is presently lobbying for an increase in that area.

Mr Wilson: Very strongly.

Mr LEWIS: I will watch very carefully the determinations of the Government and the way in which it judges the lobbying by the real estate industry and the increases in percentages.

Mr Wilson: It is a matter for the board.

Mr LEWIS: But the Government will make the decision.

Mr Wilson: No, the board makes the decision.

Mr LEWIS: However that may be, I will be monitoring very carefully the outcome of those determinations in the light of this four to five per cent increase in the actual percentages of licence fees levied. I put the Government on notice that I will be watching for it, and listening to the arguments that will come forward when, maybe, those increases are rejected.

Mr Wilson: They have been rejected by the board.

Mr LEWIS: Okay, that lets the Minister off the hook, does it not?

Mr Wilson: Yes, it does.

Mr LEWIS: The statement that there have been no increases in liquor fees for nine years is a nonsense. It is a percentage increase, and the Government must be truthful and say it is a percentage increase. It is incumbent from a Government point of view that the Minister stand up in this Parliament and tell us that these increases have been made. What is the legitimate reason for the percentage increases, bearing in mind that tax is automatically indexed and increased as the CPI increases?

That is a question which the Minister should answer.

In the Minister's second reading speech she also stated that, within South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria, the fees are 11 per cent, 10 per cent and nine per cent respectively. She said Western Australia had the lowest fee in Australia; but I put to the Minister: Is that any reason to increase our fee to 11 per cent, to bring it into line with what they pay in South Australia? We should recognise that it is a jolly good thing our fees are lower than those of other States.

It is incumbent upon all Governments in these times to try to reduce taxes and charges on the community. The community has had enough of increases in taxes and charges. Just because the Government needs more and more money to spend, I do not believe it is necessary to say, "Because South Australia has a bigger percentage than we have, we will bring our fee up to that of South Australia's". That is no criterion. Perhaps South Australia is wrong and we are right. Where is the Minister's reasoning for increasing the fees? There is no reasoning within her second reading speech, and I will be listening with bated breath for her to give a credible answer to my question: Why do the percentages need to be increased by so much?

I now turn to the subject of premiums and the inequities that exist there. It may not be cited within this Bill, but I know that the industry has made representations to the Minister to try to sort out what is going on with premiums. For those members who may not understand what is happening with premiums, I will explain the position to the House.

A premium is an arbitrary figure imposed by the Licensing Court on someone who improves his premises and who, by virtue of improving those premises—by putting in capital and thereby hoping to increase turnover—pays more liquor tax. To my mind, the way the premiums are currently structured is completely arbitrary. An example of the way in which premiums have been struck can be seen at Margaret River.

The Margaret River Hotel underwent extensions costing \$1.5 million. I understand that hotel was associated with the Government tourist industry and with the Government, and it paid no premium on its extensions. Just down the road, the Settlers Tavern at Margaret River underwent extensions costing \$300 000 and paid a premium of \$25 000. There is no

reason that one establishment should have paid a premium and the other should not.

One can turn to extensions at the Nookanburra Hotel, where no premium was paid. Maybe that hotel had a smart legal adviser who said that, under section 95, they could show the court that the extensions were for the benefit of the industry. They did not pay a premium.

Then we get the chap in the little Grass Valley Tavern with the beer garden who wanted to enhance his premises. He scraped together \$25 000-worth of capital only to find that the court imposed a \$7 000 premium on him for his effort in upgrading his premises in order to increase his turnover, his profit, and the Government's taxes. The inequities with the premiums need to be looked at. The committee of inquiry should have been looking at premiums and the way they are struck. However, the Government was not prepared to pick up the thorny nettle of tackling the way in which the court arbitrarily sets premiums. The Act contains no special formula for the levying of premiums. It seems that it all gets back to the shape of one's head and how good one's attorney is. That is a glaring fault in the Act that must be addressed. The present inequities are not on.

I turn now to address the uncertainties facing the hospitality and liquor industries. This revolves round the special legislation passed to cover the America's Cup, legislation which gave the Minister the ability to advise of variations in trading hours and the like.

Most members of the Government have not practised in industry; they have not owned their own businesses. They do not know what it is like to worry about finding the wages for their staff at the end of each week. Government members have never had to budget and project their future profitability or their future staff levels. They have never experienced these commercial facts of life.

The America's Cup races will be starting in five or six months, but as yet the Government has given no indication to the hospitality industry just what hours it will be allowed to trade. It behoves the Government to get off its backside and to tell the industry what restrictions will or will not be imposed and what hours will be allowed so that the industry in this State can do its forward planning and consider its budgets and its staff resources required to service the needs of the industry. It is not good enough for the Government to sit on its

backside and say, "We will make our decision in our own good time when it suits us."

The Government must realise that the industry out there would not be employing bare-breasted barmaids if it were not concerned about its viability. If it were more viable, these barmaids would not be employed. The Opposition and the industry recognise this; they recognise the difficulties. The difficulties are being exacerbated by the Government's indecision in not telling the industry just what hours of trading will be allowed so that it can plan its budgets, its staff requirements, and so on.

I also draw to the attention of the House the report of the Honorary Royal Commission, which is both substantial and good. A week or two ago this Bill was introduced into the Parliament as a means to increase the licensing fees paid by the industry. The Bill should have addressed the recommendations of this commission, which sat for many months and produced this fine report. The report is now twelve months old and gathering dust. The industry wants to know what the Government intends to do about the report. The Government has insulted the industry and this Parliament by bringing this Bill to the Parliament under the guise of streamlining the administration of the Liquor Act. The Bill will screw up the cost to the industry and the public. That is blatantly obvious. The industry and the public know it.

This Bill is an attack on the small people of WA, the workers who like to have a drink with their mates after work. These workers will be paying more. They will know the Burke Government is out to do nothing other than to increase taxes and charges.

The Civil Service Association has identified the problem and its members are already rebelling against the Government. The Trades and Labor Council is telling the Government what it thinks of it. It wants to sack the Minister for Industrial Relations, and rightly so.

This is a socialist, taxing Government, and members opposite jolly well know it. It is about time the socialist Governments in Australia realised that the Australian people have had enough of high taxes. Members opposite should be looking at spending less money rather than forcing more and more taxes onto the people. The Government should curb its spending. All Australians are aware of this, yet the dummies opposite have not woken up to it yet. This socialist Government should be cutting its

Budget imposts rather than raising an extra \$300 million.

This legislation is nothing but a smokescreen to raise more and more taxes and to attack the small country pub and the small people in our society. The workers will now have to pay more for their glass of beer. The Bill is also an attack on the hospitality industry. Furthermore, it is an insult to the Parliament and the people of WA.

MR TRENORDEN (Avon) [8.57 p.m.]: I feel strongly about this Bill because it is the second in a matter of days in which the Government has paid no attention to the wants, the needs, and the interests of the business community. Last week we had the SGIO Bill, which was a prime example of the Government's ramming legislation down the throat of industry without even attempting to communicate with the industry. Now we have another Bill where the Government has made no attempt to discuss its provisions with the people who must come up with the dollars and cents.

The Minister's second reading speech indicated that the Government inspectors had found a discrepancy of \$3.5 million between the retailers' figures and the wholesalers' figures. Therefore the Government has decided it will wade out into the industry, and instead of recovering the \$280 000 which represents the discrepancy, it will pick up \$12.5 million. If that is not a grab for money, I do not know what is.

The Minister indicated that the appropriate records were not being kept up to standard and that inspectors were having trouble getting the details from the records. It seems that because the inspectors cannot get their figures down pat in their columns, the Minister is saying she wants to put further imposts on the time available to small business. This is what I object to very strongly because time and time again we see the Government imposing more imposts on the time of small business.

The Bill proposes to extend the time for small business to keep records from two years to six years. This is a most unnecessary impost on small business.

Even the horrendous fringe benefits tax requires records to be kept for only three years. Why does this Government require these records to be kept for six years? Does the Government realise the cost in doing that and that it has to be borne by the small business operator?

Mr Bertram: Your Government enforced the retention of records for seven years.

Mr TRENORDEN: For income tax? That is another impost on small business.

Mr Bertram: That is your Government.

Mr TRENORDEN: I have not been in Government.

The bureaucrats are telling us in this legislation that their time is worth more than that of small business operators because when they turn up to carry out an inspection they have to have things off pat otherwise they cannot read the documentation. That is the only interpretation I can place on the Minister's speech; otherwise it is implying that small business operators have all the time in the world and do not have to worry about running a pub or club.

Mr Lewis: The bureaucrats have never done it.

Mr TRENORDEN: That is half the problem, because small business operators are pressed for time and have to make a living. Some people like to spend time with their families. The whole implication of the Minister's speech is that there is wholesale avoidance in the industry of payment of licence fees and other moneys. The \$280 000 lost in revenue on the \$3.5 million referred to in her speech represents 1.2 per cent of 1985 revenue—a minuscule amount. Even the best of people such as Einstein ran on a three per cent mistake ratio; if the Government gets down to 1.2 per cent it is doing extremely well.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke earlier about the other imposts facing operators in the liquor industry such as the fringe benefits tax, the national wage increase of 2.3 per cent, the non-availability of deductions for entertainment expenses, the heavy increases in charges water and power of which hotels and clubs are big users, and the indexation of excise which will be another increase for the industry in August. Added to that the Government has thrown in a casino at which four million glasses of beer have been consumed since 30 December 1985—beer which might have been sold anywhere else. The Government has also organised roadblocks which affect the hotel industry but ignore the fact that 70 per cent of alcohol is consumed away from clubs and hotels.

The Minister's second reading speech says the industry will be given three months to pay the increase in licence fees. In that time the industry will also be looking for money for the fringe benefits tax and wage increases, and for

many people, particularly in the country, there will be a drop in business. The Government seems to be saying that the liquor industry will receive an inflow of income because of the America's Cup, therefore the Government wants its share of the profits. I ask the Minister what benefit is the America's Cup to the Grass Valley, Spencer's Brook, or Green Hills taverns? I can tell her it is not very much at all. They all face increases as a result of this Bill and the possibility of lower sales.

There is a crisis in the rural industry. People do not have the money they had last year or the year before. They do not have the dollars to spend over the bar, so the sales in many small country hotels and taverns will not be as high.

Mr Watt: They could be killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

Mr TRENORDEN: Small business is the goose that lays the golden egg, but it is being throttled. Country hotels and taverns have totally changed their method of operation in the last decade.

Mr MacKinnon: They have had to.

Mr TRENORDEN: That is right, but to the credit of country people they have become the meeting places for people in those areas. For example, the previous speaker mentioned that the Grass Valley Tavern had a premium put on it of \$7 000, but because it was able to manipulate the drinking area the premium was reduced to \$3 000. A beer garden was installed there, and we must ask why the licensee should bother to put in a beer garden. The answer is so that families can go there and enjoy it as a meeting place, not as a beer-guzzling and swilling bar.

That beer garden is fenced and is safe for children. Members who go there on any weekend will find that it is occupied by families, not heavy drinkers. The last two publicans at that tavern started a progress association. If members have been there they would have to ask what it was they hoped to progress. The answer is they are progressing the living standards of people in that area. They have a very happy, quaint community among whom it is a pleasure to be on weekends when they are out enjoying themselves in a reasonable way without getting blind drunk and doing all the other things that are said to happen in hotels.

The retrospectivity of this increase concerns me. Any publican whose sales are declining will be in trouble. Anyone who has purchased a hotel in a country area in recent months or years and has declining sales is in even greater

trouble. Many country hotels will not make any money or anything like the basic wage this year. Many are working for quality of life and not the dollar. That statement cannot be objected to because if one looks at reports one sees that many country hotels are earning as little as \$3 000 in taxable income per head with two partners.

Country hotels, taverns, and clubs need support; they do not need a kick in the ribs or increased costs. They have taken to heart the spirit of the change in community attitudes and in my electorate they are building respectable meeting places. I object to the fact that the smallest of these places, 20 or 30 miles away from regional towns, will face the prospect of losing a meeting place where the cricket or tennis team, or whatever the association, meets. They include the CWA and other people who use them for meetings. That will be taken away in some cases without doubt because the profitability of those hotels will be removed.

The AHA has given me some figures showing that a hotel turning over \$100 000 faces an increase in outlays of between \$2 500 and \$3 000. That is a substantial impost on a very low turnover.

The National Party, as already stated by my leader, opposes any move away from the court to the principal receiver of revenue. We do not have the numbers here to do anything about that aspect, but I do not believe any need has been shown for that change. Until the Government demonstrates some need and benefit I do not believe we should have change for change's sake.

We have here a big-spending Government that has belted out money with a size three shovel and which is looking for other areas from which to pull in revenue.

Mr Watt: Is a size three the big size?

Mr TRENORDEN: That is the one road gang workers lean on.

Mrs Beggs: Are you knocking public servants?

Mr TRENORDEN: How many public servants of the type we talk about lean on size three shovels?

Mrs Beggs: Road gang workers are public servants.

Mr TRENORDEN: Not too many road gang workers use size three shovels these days anyway.

Mrs Beggs: A number three shovel is not that big.

Mr TRENORDEN: No, it is not that big.

Mrs Beggs: It would take about 24 shovelful to fill a 44-gallon drum.

Mr TRENORDEN: That is a very interesting suggestion. I can see now why the Minister is the Minister for Tourism.

Mrs Beggs: I just thought you might be interested in that. I am just showing you I am a country girl.

Mr TRENORDEN: That is good. In appreciation, I will close my remarks and sit down in just a few moments.

Whether the Minister likes it or not, some country taverns, clubs, and hotels will be put under the hammer as a result of these substantially increased costs which come at a time when turnover is down. The fact that that is absolutely ignored in the clamour for income is an indictment of the Minister's Government. I believe that the Government will feel the pressures in the months to come.

MR WATT (Albany) [9.12 p.m.]: I am sure that most members of Parliament at times have attended functions at which they had to be the last of the speech makers. We may have prepared what we thought was a brilliant speech, but unfortunately those who spoke before us may have said it all. We then have to get out the pencil and cross out everything. I have not prepared a brilliant speech for this evening; nevertheless almost everything I had to say has been said. Thus, mercifully for the House, I will be quite brief.

I want to make some comments about the revenue raising aspects of this Bill and the effects of the legislation on country people. I compliment the member for Avon on his speech because he demonstrated that in many ways the situation in the country is different from that in the city. It seems to us that whenever the Government gets itself into a bit of financial bother, self-induced or otherwise, it automatically assumes that it can dig a little deeper into the pockets of the drinkers, the smokers, and the motorists. Almost every time extra revenue is required, those groups seem to be slapped a bit more. Despite the fact that the Minister is one of the few smokers in the House, I am not at all sympathetic towards smokers. I am a motorist and I am certainly concerned about what happens to motorists because the problems of increased motoring costs in the country are exacerbated because of the distances country people must travel.

I want to talk about the effects on hotels, taverns, clubs and other licence holders, including retail outlets, of hitting the pockets of the drinkers, particularly in the country, because they are all affected by these price increases to a greater or lesser degree. I think they are affected to a greater degree because they service smaller populations and therefore do not enjoy the economies of scale that larger hotels and liquor outlets in the metropolitan area might enjoy. Obviously some of the large suburban hotels and clubs that operate in the city can more easily cope with increases by virtue of the greater population alone.

The liquor industry unquestionably has been hard hit in recent years by a number of factors. Perhaps the greatest of these has been the Government's attempts to control the road toll by imposing heavier penalties and controlling drinking and driving. I endorse those actions, as would every responsible and thinking person. To the liquor industry's great credit, it has tried to be responsible in its response to the problems of drinking and driving. It realises that there is a problem and it has promoted a number of campaigns. Only this evening a pamphlet from the Liquor Industry Road Safety Association of Western Australia, explaining its objects and strategy, appeared on my desk. The pamphlet discusses some of the sorts of things done by the association. With the "Skipper" campaign one person of a group was appointed as the person not to drink on a given occasion so that he could drive the others. That is obviously a sensible and responsible way to go. Some hotels have provided buses for their patrons or, on occasions, taxis. The Taxi Control Board in the metropolitan area has also promoted the slogan, "Don't drink and drive; grab a cab." These have all been designed to lessen the impact of the road toll. However, it has been well established that more and more people are either drinking less or not drinking in hotels. Of course, it may well be that many people are drinking just as much elsewhere, but hotels and other licensed premises are required to maintain their premises at great expense. That is where the problem comes in.

Many established facilities basing their businesses largely on liquor sales have had to endure other increased costs. I refer to the recent Consumer Price Index-based wage increases, the non-deductibility of entertainment expenses for tax purposes, and increased utility charges for power and water. Every hotel is affected by such increases. The fringe benefits

tax also has an impact on the cost of running country hotels. Many sporting clubs will also be very much affected by these increases. To their credit, many of them have endeavoured to provide better facilities for country people by establishing new sporting grounds, new club-rooms, and the like to try to match some of the facilities that are offered to the folk who live in the city. However, they have the disability of having many fewer patrons to pay for those extra facilities. In the country, hotels are a community facility. That was the argument the member for Avon developed. Hotels in the country provide a meeting place for service clubs, and dinners and functions such as the occasional wedding are catered for by country hotels. However, such functions are too infrequent to enable hotel keepers to establish them on a regular basis.

In many country towns the hotel is also the place where young people gather for their entertainment. Throughout the ages young people have found their entertainment in music, and it is a great pity young people do not dance—and when I say dance I mean ballroom dancing—the way my generation did. They like to gather at the hotels and simply listen to the music.

In some cases the hotels charge a fee to try to cover their costs, but nevertheless many of them charge either a modest fee or none at all. So these are places where young people congregate. I spoke to one hotel keeper who said that these young people do not spend a lot of money; it is a bit of a dead loss; but the hotels have to do something to attract patronage to pay their way.

Reference has been made to topless barmaids and some of the undesirable things appearing in hotels purely and simply to attract patronage. That is not a healthy and desirable aspect. It is a shame that the price structure is forcing hotel keepers to do so many of the things they are. Once upon a time especially in the country, a hotel which was offered for sale would have people queueing up to buy it as it was regarded as something of a goldmine. Today when hotels are offered for sale people do not rush to buy them; they often remain on the market for a considerable time.

One hotel keeper in Albany told me that last year he was paying \$5 800 a quarter in licence fees. If each quarter was the same, that would amount to \$23 200 a year. This year, based on last year's purchases—which is how the fees are to be imposed—the fees will be \$11 000 per quarter or \$44 000 for a full year. Incidentally,

last year's purchases were sold at a price which did not account for the increased licence fee; there was no margin to cover that, but I will not dwell on the retrospective nature of these fees.

That is an increase of 52.7 per cent. He was somewhat horrified at the result of the imposition of these new increased taxes. When percentages are bandied around, people tend not to realise what the final impact will be.

The industry has copped not only these licence fees I mentioned before, but also a whole range of other things. They all tend to make life that much more difficult for people involved in these businesses. In presenting these fees, the Minister said, to justify them at least in part, that it brings them into line with some or most of the other States. That is an excuse. There is no justification for that at all. It is simply to try to raise a bit more money and justify it.

Last week in this Parliament we were debating the BLF and the code of conduct. The Opposition argued that the BLF should be deregistered, and the Government refused. By its own standard in this debate here it should now accept that the Commonwealth, New South Wales, and Victoria are all deregistering the BLF, and it should do the same, because that is what the majority is doing. It is, of course, a fallacious argument.

Worst of all, the industry has complained to me that the Government, the Minister, and the departments have failed to discuss these proposals to its satisfaction. Indeed it made the accusation that the Government has avoided discussing these things with the industry at all. That is not my claim; it is the industry's claim. If that is the case, it is a great shame, because at least with some sort of dialogue, even if there is a failure to agree, the case has been stated. At least the industry can claim to have had the satisfaction of being consulted. When imposts of this magnitude are imposed, a very sour taste is left with the industry, and it is most unhappy about it.

As the Opposition has stated previously, parts of the Bill we accept and support, and we will not be opposing the Bill in those parts. But it is a great shame that the Government has imposed these increases in the manner in which it has on an industry which can ill afford them at the present time.

MR SPRIGGS (Darling Range) [9.27 p.m.]: I would like to express my opposition to these increased fees or taxes. There are 332 licensed clubs in the State of Western Australia, and as I have been closely connected with one club, I

can assure the Minister this sudden increase of almost 50 per cent in tax will sorely hit many clubs. Bowling clubs throughout the metropolitan area will also be hit. This will not be confined to country clubs.

In the main, country clubs, which one or two members of the National Party have already mentioned, will be sorely hit because of declining population and declining patronage. Suddenly their fees are increased, although they have not budgeted for them and never expected them.

Sales are going down while taxes are increasing enormously. There is always an increase in taxation and bar sales with the Federal excise duty. This is a continuing increase. Added to that is this sudden tremendous increase in licence fees or liquor tax. The Minister may not believe this, but I am certain it will put many country clubs in particular into financial difficulties. The Minister may not think this is right, but a number of them will close. When they close it will be to the great detriment of the communities which they serve.

In the metropolitan area, practically every club provides sporting facilities for its members. The same applies in the country. They provide a facility which is paid for by their members and greatly supported by liquor sales. If it were not for clubs there would be a tremendous burden on the Government, local government, or local people to provide sporting facilities. To attack them by viciously increasing their taxes in this way is not very good thinking on the part of the Government, and I am sure there will be a reflection on the support the Government can expect.

As a result of added costs which keep on rising, many of these hotels will be placed in difficulties. I suggest to the Minister that no club, hotel, or business would ever have expected to have had an increase of the magnitude which has come forward in this legislation.

I realise we do not have the numbers in this House and we cannot defeat this Bill, but I put on record my opposition to it.

MRS BEGGS (Whitford—Minister for Racing and Gaming) [9.30 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for giving support to some clauses of the Bill. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition used this Bill in another of his attempts to attack the Government on its economic record. I do not intend to waste the time of the House because this Bill has already been debated for 5½ hours.

Mr Cowan: You are lucky it is not the bottle Bill. You would have another 32 hours.

Mrs BEGGS: I agree. Talking about drinking for that long would make me very thirsty.

No Government or Minister ever brings willingly to the Parliament a Bill which increases a fee or a tax. I am quite convinced that the Premier, after his economic statement, and I, as the Minister responsible for the liquor industry in this State, would not have brought willingly to the Parliament a Bill that increases the liquor licence fee by four per cent overall.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was very critical of my position as Minister and said I had no sympathy whatsoever for the industry. It is totally incorrect to say that I, at no time, have consulted with the industry.

Mr MacKinnon: I never said that. I said you have not consulted with the industry in relation to this legislation.

Mrs BEGGS: We are talking about a budgetary matter with respect to this legislation. I do not think it is appropriate for me to discuss with the industry a budgetary matter. It is important for me to say that I have been consulting with the industry since 25 February when I became Minister. During those few short months I have consulted with every section of the industry. Not only have I done that, but during the same time a hospitality industry committee has also had the benefit of a secretariat supplied to it by the Government. I have consulted with that committee. At no time has it raised with me—

Mr MacKinnon: Did you consult that body about the Bill?

Mrs BEGGS: Would the Deputy Leader of the Opposition please let me finish? At no time have the questions the Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised or those clauses of the Bill that have been brought forward, been raised with me. I am not saying these were not industry concerns—

Mr MacKinnon: They had no knowledge you were going to move legislation today, so why should they worry?

Mrs BEGGS: Those clauses of the Bill that do not relate to budgetary matters are not the things the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is concerned about. Part of the Bill is not of concern to the industry because it is a budgetary matter. Apart from that, the Government has given a very real indication of its concern for

the industry. The moratorium, for example, has proved—

Mr MacKinnon: An increase in the licence fee of four per cent shows real concern!

Mrs BEGGS: I think I was fairly quiet while the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was speaking. I do not want to be here all night and I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not.

Mr MacKinnon: I do not mind it at all. They pay us to work here.

The SPEAKER: I mind. From my memory, the Minister was absolutely silent while the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was speaking.

Mrs BEGGS: I have been speaking for about four minutes. The Government has acted in the best interests of the industry by its introduction of the moratorium which has succeeded in stemming a proliferation of new licences which has created a suitable industry in which most individuals have been able to make a reasonable living.

I have a great deal of concern for the country position. I make the point that the moratorium in many instances is not always beneficial to country licences because what is happening is that some of those licences are not viable. The moratorium has made some of the licences very attractive because those licences can be transferred to the city which means that very small country towns have only one licensed outlet. Those licensed outlets, for the reasons given tonight, are very strong meeting places for country people. Sometimes, because of the moratorium, the country towns are at risk of losing their licences. I am conscious of that; it is a matter the Government might have to address. I am supportive of the moratorium for the very reason that it has created a suitable environment for the industry and has resulted in a change in the proliferation of licensed outlets throughout the State. I understand the industry people are very happy with that. I am looking at giving consideration to extending the moratorium from December of this year.

Mr Watt interjected.

Mrs BEGGS: It was this Government which realised how detrimental that was to the industry and acted very strongly to change it. It is still sympathetic to the need for the moratorium to continue in the future.

Mr Cash: You still put the licence fees up.

Mrs BEGGS: I am getting to that.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also raised some questions about the report of the interdepartmental committee and why it was not a public document. I think the word itself should tell him that the interdepartmental committee is just that; it is an interdepartmental committee.

Mr MacKinnon: I gather that.

Mrs BEGGS: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked why its report was not a public document.

Mr MacKinnon: Just because it is an interdepartmental committee, does not mean its report cannot be made public.

Mrs BEGGS: It is virtually public now.

Mr MacKinnon: Which recommendations do you not agree with?

Mrs BEGGS: I will come to that in a minute. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition talked about the size of the increase. Perhaps, when comparing the Western Australian situation to situations throughout Australia, I should have said "other States". I made a mistake. I said, "the Eastern States". There is not a great deal of difference.

Mr MacKinnon: We are still the highest in Australia.

Mrs BEGGS: Western Australia had the lowest rate until these proposed increases. It is something many speakers have forgotten to mention.

The Government has a very big commitment to a national drug campaign and alcohol is a drug. While I said I do not happily bring to Parliament a four per cent increase in the liquor licence fee, that is another aspect we have to consider. Alcohol does have a health effect.

Mr MacKinnon: How much of the increase is going towards the drug campaign?

Mrs BEGGS: I think it was raised earlier that it puts everyone in a difficult situation. On the one hand, we are concerned about the viability of the liquor industry; and, on the other hand, should we be actively promoting the fact that people should drink much larger volumes of liquor? I do not think that is the case.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you going to ban advertising of alcohol?

Mrs BEGGS: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is like one of those little terriers. I have a maltese terrier at home which is delightful. I am not making the comparison that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is delightful,

but my terrier is at my heels all the time and will not leave me alone. That is what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is like.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said during his comments that he hoped the Minister would reply. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would be quiet for a few minutes I will do my very best. I am not going to talk for 36 minutes.

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us see if we can get through the 36 minutes without 36 interjections.

Mrs BEGGS: The Government recognises the fact that it has to make increases. A responsible Government and Minister will look at ways it can best increase revenue on the things where the consumer has the discretion as to whether he or she uses that product. Alcohol falls very readily into that category.

The percentage has not been reviewed since 1975. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that in 1983 a middy of beer cost 87c and that in 1986 it now costs \$1.27. The price has risen prior to the increase, which suggests that the industry has already increased the price of a middy of beer because of the notification by the Government that its liquor licence fee was to be introduced, because prior to that a middy of beer cost \$1.21. The 6c increase cannot be attributed to this four per cent increase and if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did his sums he could work that out, because the component of the price of a middy of beer that was made up of the licence fee was seven per cent prior to the increase, so on that basis a one per cent increase is attributable to the liquor licence fee, which is not 6c. I understand that the industry as a whole has had to look at other aspects and many other overheads and to take them into consideration. I am not being critical of the industry for raising the cost of a middy of beer by 6c.

The rationale behind the need to establish an interdepartmental committee was first brought to Treasury's notice by the discrepancy in growth in consumption and growth in the liquor fee collection, and while many factors could be involved in this discrepancy, including the introduction of low alcohol beer, it was discovered while exploring the reasons for the discrepancy that the procedures used for fee assessment and collection came under scrutiny and an examination revealed that significant potential for fee evasion existed. I was asked in this Parliament recently who comprised the committee. It comprised a State taxation

officer, a Treasury officer, an Office of Racing and Gaming representative, and a consultant from the Public Service Board. The report which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition seems to regard as a scurrilous document, something we are trying to hide—

Mr MacKinnon: I did not say that. I asked why we could not have a copy of it. I did not indicate it was scurrilous. How would I know?

Mrs BEGGS: The committee reported to the Minister for Budget Management and the Minister for Racing and Gaming. It was not a public inquiry. It was part of the usual advisory process by departments to Ministers, and this sort of report is always confidential.

Mr MacKinnon: Only because you say so. You can make the decision to make it public.

Mrs BEGGS: There is really no necessity to make it public.

Mr MacKinnon: That is your opinion.

Mr Cowan: Is there any real necessity to keep it secret or confidential?

Mrs BEGGS: No.

Mr MacKinnon: Make it public.

Mrs BEGGS: That point is not relevant in terms of discussing this Bill because all the things the Government considered were necessary to change have been incorporated in this legislation. The things that the Government did not consider necessary to change, of course, did not form part of the Bill, so it is irrelevant.

Mr Cowan: To the Bill, but it is not irrelevant to the liquor industry.

Mrs BEGGS: If the liquor industry has real concerns that some unused recommendations would be of benefit to the industry, we would be happy to incorporate them in the Bill.

Mr MacKinnon: How do they know what they are if you do not make the report public? You are a drongo.

Mrs BEGGS: The industry can ask me. I can give members an absolute assurance now that nothing is contained in that interdepartmental report that has not been incorporated in this Bill that would be of any benefit to anyone in the industry whatsoever.

Mr MacKinnon: In your opinion.

Mrs BEGGS: All right, in my opinion.

Mr Cash: That is a qualification, of course.

Mrs BEGGS: The cost of keeping records should not be seen as onerous. Most of the information required by retailers and wholesalers is necessary for taxation and other pur-

poses and is normal business practice. Legislation elsewhere actually prescribes what information must be kept and how. A number of members of the industry have acknowledged that there is no good reason that efficient record keeping should not apply to the industry in relation to its application to Government and, in general, industry members would accept that, in the interests of their businesses, they should keep very accurate records.

I was asked why was not the Government looking at applying a tax on wholesalers? I want to make a couple of points about that because the subject will not arise in Committee. Retailers can purchase goods direct from the Eastern States or from overseas, which would make it very difficult to apply the tax just to the wholesaler. Wholesalers could also be retailers and a problem could result because of it. A constitutional problem could arise in regard to Commonwealth tax. I am willing to examine that matter because that could be a much easier way of collecting the tax for the Government and if it would save some pain and assist the industry I would be more than happy to look at it, but I suggest to the member who raised it that the matter is not as simple as it seems.

Mr Rushton: You are only taking a bureaucratic approach.

Mrs BEGGS: No, I am not taking a bureaucratic approach; I am taking a very practical approach.

Commonsense tells me that while it might appear very simple to achieve, if we can achieve it, it would make the job of the bureaucracy very easy. However, there are problems associated with it and I am prepared to look at the matter. I give this commitment to members of the House, and to the industry: If it seems to be the most sensible way to collect the licence fee I am sure we can progress that in the normal manner.

While it is not relevant to the Bill before us, almost every speaker raised the question of premiums and I suspect their reason for doing so is that the question of premiums has been raised with me several times, including in a letter from the Liquor Council, and I understand most members of the Government and the Opposition received that letter. I point out, particularly to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that the Licensing Court is an independent judicial body. It sets the premiums and it is absolutely inappropriate, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested, for an

interdepartmental committee to review the activities of the Licensing Court.

Mr MacKinnon: I did not make that suggestion.

Mrs BEGGS: Yes, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did make that suggestion. He asked me specifically, unless I am going deaf—

Mr Cash: You are going deaf.

Mrs BEGGS: I am definitely deaf then.

Mr Cowan: I did not raise the issue of premiums, but I defy members to inform the House how the Licensing Court actually determines the premiums to be paid, because I will bet they cannot do so.

Mrs BEGGS: I am coming to that. Some of the examples that were given, particularly the Margaret River example, have been brought to my attention. This has indicated to me that there may be inequities in the way premiums are set. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition gave a commitment from the Opposition that once it gets back into Government it will remedy the situation. I really feel quite sorry for the industry because I do not think it can wait that long on the premium issue, because it will be a long way off and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will probably be retired, playing golf, and buying his liquor at the Dunsborough store at that stage.

For two months I have been examining the matter of premiums.

Mr MacKinnon: That will be good news to the industry because it wasn't aware of that.

Mrs BEGGS: The member is obviously speaking to sections of the industry that are not consulting with me. I have seen every section of industry, not once but several times, and if the member goes back to his contacts and asks them, they will not deny it. They know I am actively looking at all sections of the industry. They have presented me with updates of their impressions of previous reports that have been produced and I am considering all matters that have been raised with me. They know it will result in some action from the Parliament.

Mr Nalder: That is not true because the Liquor Industry Council of Western Australia and the Western Australian Hotels Association do not know you are doing that.

Mrs BEGGS: They do not know what I am doing?

Mr Nalder: No.

Mrs BEGGS: About what?

Mr Nalder: What you were just talking about; that is, how you have been looking at reviewing premiums and matters like this. These bodies do not know you are doing this.

Mrs BEGGS: They might not know about all of them.

Mr Lewis: But you said they did.

Mrs BEGGS: They know I am looking into it.

Mr Lewis: They don't.

Mrs BEGGS: They have to know because they know I am looking at the Licensing Court and they know I am looking at trading hours. They also know that I have looked at the reports governing their industry which have been produced previously. They have made submissions and have updated those submissions. They have given me information. If they think that I am putting in the bin their questions and information on their opinions of what should happen, I do not know what else I can do. I assure them that that is not the case.

Mr Rushton: When do they expect you to make a decision?

Mrs BEGGS: I cannot tell the member or them when I will make a decision. They know that the decision I make in relation to major changes to the Liquor Act will affect them for a long time. I hope that most of them know that I want to be a very responsible Minister and that I will certainly not make any decision that will adversely affect them. It is hard to make decisions in relation to the Liquor Act because some sections of the industry will be happy with a decision and others will not.

Mr Rushton: It is then up to the Minister to make the right decision. It depends on the quality of the Minister.

Mrs BEGGS: The member for Dale is absolutely right—it depends on the quality of the Minister.

Mr MacKinnon: They want a decision right away.

Mrs BEGGS: I think it is right to make some changes quickly, but a responsible Minister will not introduce legislation into this Parliament in haste or in a way that will have a detrimental effect on the industry. This Minister will be happy to introduce legislation to this Parliament after the legislation has been thought out and after all sections of the industry understand the implications of the legislation.

Mr MacKinnon: Is that likely to be in the next session?

Mrs BEGGS: I cannot tell the member whether it will be in the next session, but the industry will certainly know before he does.

Mr Lewis: Is that a responsible statement to make?

Mrs BEGGS: The member has complained that the industry does not know about the proposals.

Mr Lewis: Is that still a responsible statement to make? Should you not be talking to everyone?

Mrs BEGGS: The member for East Melville absolutely astounds me. He contradicts himself. He said I had not spoken to the industry. I have assured him that I will speak to the industry. Now he does not want me to. I think the best thing the member can do is to be quiet so that he can understand what the Bill is about. Perhaps if he listened more and spoke less he would understand what I have been trying to say for the last five minutes. I will not introduce into this Parliament, either in this session or in any other session, legislation which affects the liquor industry until I am absolutely sure the changes I propose to make will not have a detrimental impact on one section of the industry to the benefit of another.

Mr MacKinnon: But this Bill detrimentally affects the whole industry.

Mrs BEGGS: I think I explained to the member earlier that it is not with any great pleasure or with a willing heart that I introduced a proposal to increase the liquor licence fee.

Mr Lewis: Why did you?

Mrs BEGGS: Because it is a Budget matter and it is necessary for the Government to raise revenue.

Mr Rushton: You have broken your word. You said you would only introduce legislation that would satisfy the industry.

Mrs BEGGS: I refer to my comments—

Mr MacKinnon: I think you had better.

Mrs BEGGS: I have not finished the sentence.

The Leader of the National Party commented about the simplification of the forms. Presently we are in the process of doing just that. It does not require legislation. That was recognised in the interdepartmental committee report. The forms will be simplified to enable the industry to keep records without a great deal of trouble.

I suppose the most difficult part of the Bill to explain is the retrospectivity provisions. This Bill does not change the formula by which licence fees are assessed. I think that needs to be understood. A licence fee is not a tax but a fee by which the industry operates for the current year. A question was asked of me by the member for Karrinyup and I explained how it works. The new fee will not come into operation until 1 October and the first payment will be due on 31 October, effectively giving four months' notice to the industry.

The member for East Melville seemed to misunderstand certain aspects of the Bill. From what he was saying, he appears to think that a decrease in revenue is the reason for the Bill being introduced. That is not the rationale for the fee increase. A discrepancy between revenue and expenditure on alcohol led to an increase. As I outlined in the second reading speech, the terms of reference of the committee did not mention fees. It is not the premise of an interdepartmental committee to talk about fees.

Mr Lewis: I understand that.

Mrs BEGGS: It did not sound as though the member did when he made his comments on the Bill.

Most other speakers raised similar matters. I think most of them can be adequately answered during the Committee stage.

The only other point I make by way of clarification, even though it is irrelevant to this Bill, is that I was questioned about the uncertainty in the liquor industry regarding the trading hours to apply during the America's Cup defence. I think the liquor industry knows well that special legislation will be introduced. It will give me authority to allow certain things to happen during the time of the America's Cup competition. Applications will be sent directly to me for my consideration. I cannot see how there can be any uncertainty in the industry about that aspect, or about the terms of the legislation. The time for which it will operate will be proclaimed shortly and the industry will be notified how it can best approach me.

Mr Lewis: That is all I was suggesting.

Mrs BEGGS: I think the industry already knows that.

Mr Lewis: I do not believe it does, when I have spoken to members of the industry.

Mrs BEGGS: To which section of the industry is the member referring?

Mr Lewis: Particularly hotels in Fremantle.

Mrs BEGGS: If that is the case, I am more than happy to ensure that the industry is well informed about how that legislation will operate so that it will know exactly how it can refer matters to me.

Mr MacKinnon: The races start in about 100 days.

Mrs BEGGS: That is quite some time away. I think it must be understood that there will not be any drastic changes made under the legislation. It will have to be demonstrated to me that the things the industry wants to alter during that time are applicable to what will happen with the America's Cup.

Mr Lewis: That is the point I was making.

Mrs BEGGS: I am not arguing with that. If the industry is not sure, I will make sure that it is notified as quickly and effectively as possible.

Mr MacKinnon: When?

Mrs BEGGS: If I told the member at 2 o'clock next Thursday, he would probably ask me a question at 5.30 p.m. I will communicate with the industry as soon as possible.

This matter, however, has nothing to do with this Bill; it is irrelevant. If I have left any questions unanswered, I will be happy to answer them during the Committee stage of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mrs Henderson) in the Chair; Mrs Beggs (Minister for Racing and Gaming) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 6 amended—

Mr MacKINNON: First, I ask the Minister whether she could explain to me exactly what is the implication of the change imposed by this clause. As I understand it, the clause will transfer the responsibility for the administration of the collection procedures under the Liquor Act from the Licensing Court to the Office of Racing and Gaming. Secondly, I ask the Minister on whose advice she made that decision. Was that a recommendation of the interdepartmental committee? If so, is it exactly in line with that recommendation? Thirdly, what assurances can the Minister give us that such a change will be beneficial to the industry and the administration of the legislation? Nowhere in the second reading speech is that indicated and nowhere this evening has the Minister indicated to us that this is a sen-

sible move. The Leader of the National Party indicated that he has some concerns in that regard. The industry and the Liberal Party likewise have such concerns.

I also take this opportunity to reject totally the Minister's explanation about the report of the interdepartmental committee. She alone makes the decision as to whether that document is made public. She should be condemned for not making it public, because we are debating important legislation. The industry has not been consulted. The interdepartmental committee is not a committee that is discussing Budget matters. The Minister herself in the second reading speech indicated that the increase in the licensing fees is the Budget matter to which we refer. The interdepartmental committee is another issue altogether. That report should be made public or, at the very least, the Minister should explain to the Parliament and the industry concerned which recommendations that committee made were not proceeded with. I accept the Minister's comment that she did not believe that anything of any importance in that report was not brought forward to the Parliament. If she is so confident in that regard, I challenge her to let us have a look at the report. We could well agree and the industry could well agree. Why keep the report secret? Why hide it away? Why not consult the industry concerned when these changes are to be made to an industry which, as the Minister would be well aware, is heavily regulated? Any regulatory change to such an industry has the potential to have devastating impacts on the people who have invested many hundreds of thousands of dollars, in many cases their whole life savings and their livelihoods. They should not be dependent on the insensitive actions of the Minister.

Essentially, I would appreciate it if the Minister would indicate to us the implications of this change and on whose advice the change is being made.

Mrs BEGGS: There is a very simple explanation. Section 6 (2) of the Act reads as follows—

(2) Any person who sells liquor pursuant to the exemption provided by paragraph (h) of subsection (1) of this section shall furnish to the Court in such form and at such intervals as are prescribed returns of all liquor so sold to licensees other than holders of wholesale licences.

With this clause we are deleting "Court" and substituting "Principal Receiver of Revenue". The Deputy Leader of the Opposition seems to

think that there is some strange reason for this change. The anomaly was found by the Crown Law Department when the amendments to the Bill were being drafted. The court is made up of the judge and two members who were appointed. They are not responsible for collecting the revenue. The principal receiver of the revenue at the Office of Racing and Gaming is responsible for collecting the revenue.

Mr MacKinnon: How can you say that? In the same Act the definition of "Licensing Court" is the Licensing Court of Western Australia established by this Act. As the Minister well knows the Licensing Court is composed of members of the court and employees.

Mrs BEGGS: No, you are wrong. The employees are employees of the Office of Racing and Gaming. They are not employees of the court.

Mr MacKinnon: So the current administration of the Act is not under the control of the Licensing Court but of the Office of Racing and Gaming?

Mrs BEGGS: I am not saying that at all.

Mr MacKinnon: And there is no intention to make any change whatsoever in the administration of the Act? I understand that there will now be a change in who is responsible for the administration of the revenue provisions of the Act. The Minister has said that there will be no change; it will still be administered by and under the control and authority of the Licensing Court as it always was.

Mrs BEGGS: The Act is under the control of the Licensing Court but the principal receiver of revenue is not the court. It is the Government department.

Mr Cowan: That person is already in existence. He is appointed.

Mrs BEGGS: Yes, he exists. He is there. It is an anomaly. When the Crown Law Department was drafting the amendments it came across this anomaly and said it should be changed. There is a person who is called the principal receiver of revenue.

Mr MacKinnon: I understand that, but I am asking the Minister to give us an assurance that this clause is changing in no way the manner in which the Act is currently administered.

Mrs BEGGS: No.

Mr MacKinnon: That is all the assurance I wanted.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 7 amended—

Mr MacKINNON: The Minister has foreshadowed an amendment to change the figure "2%" to "1.15%". What are her reasons for that change?

Mrs BEGGS: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 14—To delete "2%" and substitute the following—

1.15%

This is just a technicality. The percentage of 1.15 by volume is absolutely identical to two per cent of proof spirit. Liquor is described now in containers and so on by volume, not by proof spirit. This was inadvertently overlooked in changing the description.

Mr MacKinnon: Could you repeat that? I did not understand.

Mrs BEGGS: It is rather complicated, but the definition of liquor is based on the South Australian definition of liquor. The percentage of alcohol that a liquid must contain before it becomes liquor is 1.15 per cent by volume at 20 degrees Celsius. This is the criterion which has existed since 1967. The temperature is specified because alcohol and water expand at different rates, especially as the temperature approaches 78 degrees Celsius.

The point members should understand is that this is just a technicality, because 1.15 per cent by volume is absolutely identical to two per cent proof spirit.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 6: Section 159 amended—

Mr MacKINNON: As indicated during the debate, the Opposition opposes this clause, which provides that in future the level of licensing fees, or the term "Liquor taxes" can be changed by regulation. As the leader of the National Party indicated during his contribution to the debate, if changes are to be made to the Liquor Act in terms of fees to be levied, Parliament should be the place to make that decision. I agree with him.

It is not as though these fees have been changed on a regular basis, as history will show. If we make those changes by regulation we are not given the appropriate opportunity to debate them actively and properly. All one can do with regulations is to disallow them; one cannot amend or change them in any way. It is not appropriate with such an important piece of legislation that change be made in this way. I

indicate therefore that we will be opposing this clause.

Mr COWAN: The National Party also will be opposing this clause for the very reasons I stated before. We prefer to have these types of increases in taxes, charges, or whatever one might want to call them, deliberated by the Parliament and determined in that way, not presented to the Parliament as a fait accompli.

Most members will be aware of the one example I always quote where a regulation has been used with telling effect to increase the revenue to the State by increased taxes and charges, and that relates to the State's fuel franchise levy.

There may not be a similar history in this legislation, but this clause is allowing that to happen. We feel the industry is suffering enough of a burden now without the Government, whenever it feels short of a few bob, slugging the liquor industry a little more.

Mrs BEGGS: The rationale behind this provision, apart from making it simpler administratively—particularly if the Parliament were not sitting—is that it could be done by regulation. It would allow notice to be given to the industry.

The member for Karrinyup raised another point. If the increase were to be applied from 1 July, as is customary, if the Parliament were not in session the industry could be notified of the intention to raise the fee. In this instance we had to defer increasing the licence fee rate so that we could give the industry adequate notice.

If one looks at the history of licence fees as a means of Governments's raising revenue one sees that in 75 years they have been raised by only six per cent.

Mr MacKinnon: You are changing that record pretty dramatically.

Mr Lewis: You have changed it 30 per cent in one fell swoop. You want to do it by regulation in the future.

Mrs BEGGS: Yes, because it is much simpler.

Mr MacKinnon: That is a good reason to oppose it.

Mrs BEGGS: It makes it much simpler to administer that part of the Act. If it were decided an increase was necessary and the Parliament was not sitting it would be easier for the Government to convey to the industry its intentions in that regard without there being any delay, which was the case this time.

Mr CLARKO: I think the Minister has unwittingly put her finger on the concern of the Liberal Party, and possibly of the National Party, when she says it makes it administratively simpler. What she means is that it is easier for the Government to put its hand in the public's cookie jar.

A very interesting book which I commend to every member is by a man called Thouless, called *The Use and Abuse of Statistics*. The Minister says the fees have gone up only six per cent. They have gone up from five per cent to 11 per cent, which is an increase of 120 per cent. That is a big difference.

If members have not read the book I recommend it to them; they will thoroughly enjoy it. Members should be careful when talking about percentages in circumstances like this.

What the Minister can do if she wants to get to the end of her continuum of administrative complexity is to do what the Hawke Government has done, which is to automatically index it, first once a year and then twice a year. They do not have any problems at all. Whatever the CPI increase movement is, on those dates—in February and August, I think—it is automatically indexed.

If the taxes are put up, that will push the CPI higher, and the Government can get its double serve of icecream with no problems at all. That is what I object to, as I said during the second reading debate.

It is nice to see the Leader of the House back here. I do not mean that in a nasty way. In regard to changing the regulations covering the promotion of women in the Education Department, the Leader of the House said the regulation might have been knocked back in the upper House but the principle would stand, and that is the law of the land because he can do it every year. That is a great weakness of the use of regulation. The Government is not prepared to follow what are the traditional practices and could play that game every year. In a sense the Government can do that with the liquor business—put the fee up and afterwards challenge people to take it away. Responsible Oppositions would probably be put into too difficult a position to do that. That is the problem.

If my predictions are right—and I believe the 30 June figures are not yet available—and if we are going to collect in the order of \$24 million; and if it is true that these increases in charges collectively are going to bring in \$12.5 million,

that will be an increase of 50 per cent just by this Bill. Then the Government is changing the rules as well to make it administratively simpler—to put it into the Minister's language—so that it can rip off the liquor industry and all its customers at the other end of the line. That is why I am opposed to this clause, and why the Opposition is opposed to it.

Mr COWAN: This clause of the Bill is the one sending warning bells ringing throughout the liquor industry. The Minister mentioned in her response that it has not been necessary to alter the licensing fee for a long period. From memory, the last increase was in 1975.

On that basis alone, it would be fair and reasonable to suggest that there is no need to change this to a regulatory provision. Yet that is what the Government is doing, which means it is making it—on the Minister's admission—administratively simpler to increase the licence fee; and the whole of the liquor industry feels that a situation is being set up which allows the Government of the day to turn the liquor industry into a revenue-earning bonanza for the Government. That is really what worries most of the people involved in the industry, and that is why we reject it.

We support all those businessmen and women who have decided to establish themselves in this industry to provide a service. We believe that this heralds a completely different approach to the liquor industry, and that the Government of the day will be able to use it as a source of taxation. That is something we reject completely.

Mr MacKINNON: I have one further point to add to the contributions just made. The Minister seems to overlook the fact that neither the National Party nor the Liberal Party is in fact opposing the actual fee increase by dividing in this Parliament. We oppose the Government's decision to do so, but we respect the right of the Government to pass budgetary legislation, which this is. It is not as though we are opposing it for an ulterior motive, or that this clause of the Bill and the increase cause us great concern to the extent that we are keeping the Parliament here for days or hours.

But, as the member for Karrinyup and the leader of the National Party have indicated, it is the principle involved. The industry fears that successive Governments may well use hotels as their taxation petrol pump, as indeed this Government and the Federal Government use petrol bowsers as their taxation base.

Mrs BEGGS: I can see from the comments made by the leader of the National Party that perhaps this clause is making the industry nervous, and I am happy to concede that point. I accept that members want to pass the Bill in this House, but perhaps the best way for it to be handled is for me to speak to the Minister for Budget Management to see whether we can have an amendment put on the Notice Paper in the upper House to that effect.

Mr COWAN: I appreciate the comments made by the Minister, and we will look forward to what happens in another place. I really would like to place on record our appreciation of that undertaking. Despite the fact that we are going to oppose the clause and will divide the House, it is still a fine thing to have the Government recognise that there could perhaps be a need for the change, and that not all the good ideas come from the Crown Law Department and the people who draft legislation for the Government.

Mr MacKINNON: I also extend thanks to the Minister in this regard, but hedge those thanks by saying—and advisedly, I think—that last week we heard a debate about the Premier's commitment to this House which was not worth the paper on which it was written or the air into which it was breathed. I sincerely hope the Minister's commitment is a sincere one and that she does look seriously at this clause in the Bill, about which we are concerned, and about which industry is concerned.

I also indicate to the Parliament that despite that commitment by the Minister, we will be opposing the regulation at this stage and dividing the Chamber.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 22

Mrs Beggs	Mr Marlborough
Mr Bertram	Mr Parker
Mr Bryce	Mr Pearce
Mr Terry Burke	Mr Read
Mr Carr	Mr D. L. Smith
Mr Peter Dowding	Mr Thomas
Mr Evans	Mr Troy
Dr Gallop	Mrs Watkins
Mr Grill	Dr Watson
Mr Tom Jones	Mr Wilson
Dr Lawrence	Mrs Buchanan

(Teller)

	Noes 17
Mr Cash	Mr Rushton
Mr Clarko	Mr Schell
Mr Court	Mr Stephens
Mr Cowan	Mr Thompson
Mr Grayden	Mr Trenorden
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr Lewis	Mr Watt
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Spriggs
Mr Nalder	

(Teller)

	Pairs	Noes
Ayes		
Mr Bridge	Mr Blaikie	
Mr Brian Burke	Mr Mensaros	
Mr Taylor	Mr Williams	
Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Lightfoot	
Mr Hodge	Mr House	
Mr Burkett	Mr Hassell	
Mr P. J. Smith	Mr Bradshaw	
Mr Tonkin	Mr Crane	

Clause thus passed.

Clause 7: Section 159A inserted—

Mr MacKINNON: This clause imposes the increased licence fees on the industry. In the Minister's response to the second reading debate she indicated that one of the justifications for the increased fee levy was expenditure on the drug campaign, and she commented on the health implications of alcohol consumption. I would like her to explain exactly how much is being spent by the Government on the drug campaign and exactly how much of that expenditure relates to preventing abuses of alcohol consumption. As the revenue increase brought about by this clause will total \$12 million to \$14 million, I would be interested to learn how much of that money is to be earmarked for the prevention of alcohol abuse.

It is interesting that only today we have seen in the Press an article about a report on alcohol consumption among Aborigines. Today the Minister has said that the Government would take time to look at that problem, yet here we have a Bill to increase the tax on alcohol. It seems the Government displays a much greater urgency when considering taxes than when considering problems affecting the Aboriginal community.

My second point relates also to the previous clause and perhaps is one of the very real reasons that the industry is looking with very grave concern at this proposal to increase fees by regulation rather than through the Act. The Minister said words to the effect that "all responsible Ministers look to increase the taxation revenue to Government by looking at where they can impose taxes on a broader base". Other Opposition members and I have always believed that Ministers should look primarily at ways of reducing taxes rather than

looking at broadening the tax base in order to collect more tax revenue. Ministers should not look at increasing taxes.

Mrs Beggs: I went on to say "if it was necessary".

Mr MacKINNON: The Minister did not say that at all. In any event I challenge her to show that this is necessary at present. Not once this evening has she indicated where she has endeavoured to save the taxpayers' money while she has been responsible for her various portfolios. I ask her whether she has implemented any major changes which have saved the taxpayers' money and which would have precluded her bringing in this legislation. After all, if she were a responsible Minister she would not have looked at taking further taxation from the community but at saving revenue. The Minister can pull all the faces she likes, but she should realise that the public of WA are not only requesting but are also demanding that Governments take a damned sight closer look at the expenditure side of the equation before rushing in to impose new taxes.

The Opposition does not believe it is necessary for the Government to impose an increase in charges of 40 per cent. Further, the Minister has not indicated at any time that she believes her first priority to be one of trimming Government expenditure and implementing savings which would have meant that we would not be debating tonight this unnecessary measure to increase taxes—taxes she could reasonably have saved by proper and prudent administration of her areas of responsibility.

Mrs BEGGS: Ignoring the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's four or five minutes of verbiage which seemed to be irrelevant to the clause, he asked initially how much money was to be set aside for an education programme related to the effects of alcohol consumption. I cannot give him the figure involved because it is part of the budgetary process.

Mr MacKinnon: You said it was one of the major reasons for the increase in fees.

Mrs BEGGS: I did not say it was a major reason. I indicated that alcohol is a discretionary purchase and that I had some personal concerns about alcohol consumption and health matters. I repeat that I cannot give the member a figure because as yet the Budget has not been brought down.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8: Section 161 amended—

Mr COWAN: I refer the Minister to subclause (c) which provides for the insertion of a new subsection (4). Section 161 of the Act indicates that the principal receiver of revenue is authorised to allow an extension of time for an annual licence fee to be paid. Is it true that presently he has to seek the approval of the Licensing Court to allow that extension? If that is so, does this amendment indicate that he will no longer have to refer any application for extension to the Licensing Court?

Mrs BEGGS: The principal receiver has not previously had to seek permission of the Licensing Court to allow that extension, and this amendment will not change that.

Clause put and passed.**Clauses 9 to 11 put and passed.****Clause 12: Section 163B inserted—**

Mr MACKINNON: Again I express concern with this clause, which indicates firstly that the records to be kept by a licensee will be in a prescribed form or in the form approved by the principal receiver. It also provides that the records must be kept "for six years after the date on which the records were made". What is the justification for this new section.

I quote from the Minister's second reading speech to indicate what I mean. The Minister said—

Because records are not being maintained in a proper or uniform format, the ability of licensing inspectors to adequately examine records and effectively check the accuracy of fees assessed by licensees is greatly reduced. This automatically creates a situation in which fee avoidance could quite easily take place.

That is the important part. It is not giving examples of where fee avoidance takes place but where it could quite easily take place. The Minister went on as follows—

It is difficult to determine the extent or magnitude of fee avoidance which occurs as a result of weaknesses in the current requirements to maintain records, but it is considered to be very significant.

Here we have a significant change to the legislation and we are saying to the Principal Receiver of Revenue, "You have the absolute power now to prescribe whatever records are to be maintained by any licensee in the manner in which you think appropriate. The licensee is required to keep those records for six years". However, the Minister has not given one

example of why that is so or why it is necessary for such a significant change to be made to the legislation. It seems strange to me that that significant change is made in view of such a poor explanation given to the Parliament.

I also seek from the Minister an assurance that the records to be kept or prescribed by the Principal Receiver of Revenue will not be so prescribed until such time as she has consulted the industry as to the form of those records. With all due respect to the people involved in the Department of Racing and Gaming, they are not business people and they do not operate in business on a daily basis. They would not have an understanding of the difficulties of maintaining significant amounts of records for six years. That information must be retained on the licensed premises. That seems to be an impractical suggestion, bearing in mind that many licensed premises are not large. It seems ridiculous to require that all the records be kept in one place, and it shows little understanding of what it is like to run a business.

I ask firstly for some explanation or justification for the clause. Secondly, as the Minister has not explained to my satisfaction why it is necessary to triple the time from two years to six years, what practical difficulties have been involved, rather than could be involved? Finally, can she give an assurance that before the records to be kept are prescribed she will consult the industry and provide it with a copy of the prescribed format prior to its being tabled in Parliament. In that way the industry will be given some opportunity to comment on the form of the regulation, and particularly on the impact that the regulation will have. The industry has not had that opportunity to date, and the impact will be quite significant.

Mr TRENORDEN: I appreciate the fact that the Minister has taken some notice of what has been said tonight. On her own figures there was a loss of \$3.5 million between the wholesale and retail figures. That is a loss of 1.2 per cent on the total revenue figures in 1985. Surely she is not saying that by requiring licensees to keep records for six years she will be able to pick up 100 per cent of the \$280 000 that has been lost? Obviously the Minister is not saying that, but I would ask her to take on board the fact that she is putting a considerable impost on small business to keep records for a long time, considering that most of the people we are talking about are small operators.

Mrs BEGGS: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised the question of the prescribed form which would be approved by the

Principal Receiver of Revenue. As I pointed out earlier, the industry itself would welcome any form that is uniform and which all sections have to abide by.

It came to the attention of the people on the interdepartmental committee that in many cases there were boxes of unsorted invoices, delivery documents, and other documents, and things referring to non-liquor purchases which made up the licensee's record of transactions. Having a prescribed form is good business practice. If the industry has any concern that the prescribed form may not meet its needs and can show to the Principal Receiver of Revenue that its records are kept on computer, for example, and the format of the print-out does not exactly match the prescribed form, the receiver may approve another format that is acceptable. It may be appropriate for me to consult the industry on how the form will be prescribed eventually by regulation, and I will keep that option open.

Mr MacKinnon: You are not giving a guarantee that you will?

Mrs BEGGS: It may be very difficult because each section of the industry may say they want to do it another way. If an operator or a licensee says, "This is the way I keep my forms", or he has a computer, the Principal Receiver of Revenue can agree to that format and approve it on the spot.

Mr MacKinnon: Where does it say that in the regulation? It says the records shall be in a prescribed form.

Mrs BEGGS: Or in a form approved by the Principal Receiver of Revenue.

Mr MacKinnon: So some people will be approved although their records are not in the prescribed form?

Mrs BEGGS: Some sections of the industry have complained that there is not a prescribed form or that when they are questioned about the way they keep their records they say they have always kept them like that and they do not know how to keep them any other way. This is to assist the industry; I have not received any complaints about that at all.

Mr MacKinnon: Assist it by imposing another red tape burden!

Mrs BEGGS: The industry does not seem to be worried, going by the indications I have had from the people I have spoken to. They have

looked at the Bill, considered it and decided to have a prescribed form because they need—

Mr MacKinnon: If I was in business I would be objecting.

Mr Wilson: The member for East Melville was in agreement with this.

Mr MacKinnon: Unlike people on the other side of the Chamber, the member for East Melville is entitled to have an opinion.

Mrs BEGGS: The question of keeping records and working papers on the premises for six years has been introduced to assist with the reassessment provisions of the Bill.

Mr MacKinnon: It is not designed to assist the businessman, is it?

Mrs BEGGS: I do not know whether the Deputy Leader of the Opposition considers this is draconian; I do not.

Mr MacKinnon: Why on the premises?

Mrs BEGGS: I have been in business. A good business person does not throw away his records after two years. I can assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition of that.

Mr MacKinnon: What does that have to do with keeping them on the premises?

Mrs BEGGS: Apart from the fact that it helps with the reassessment provisions it is also very helpful if the business changes hands because in some cases when businesses are sold and the records are not on the premises the licensee would be able to take them with him.

Mr MacKinnon: Crazy!

Mrs BEGGS: Why is it crazy?

Mr MacKinnon: What difference does it make where you keep the books? No difference whatever, so long as you keep them.

Mr CASH: I listened with interest to the Minister when she said that this clause would cut out red tape. I am reminded of a public document put out by the Australian Labor Party prior to the last election some five months ago and is titled, "People in Business—Encouraging Innovation and Enterprise". It states—

Maximum economic performance and growth is possible only through hard work, initiative and co-operation. The Government's task is to create and maintain a business environment most conducive to this outcome.

Further on it states—

The first three years of the Burke Government have seen unprecedented reforms in taxation and charges particularly for Payroll Tax, FID, Stamp Duties and Fuel Levies.

It seems to me that what the Minister has said flies in the face of everything listed in this document. On the one hand the Government is saying that it will have regard for reducing taxes, and we find that all taxes and fees have increased. On the other hand the Government is talking about reducing red tape and yet we have a Bill before the Chamber which will require more forms to be completed with a requirement for additional taxation.

We have a document released about five months ago which states one thing and a Bill which has been introduced into this Parliament which will, in effect, cause the opposite to occur. Business is entitled to ask what this Government is about.

Mr MacKINNON: I go back to the point I raised with the Minister a moment ago. Subclause (3) reads, "Records made under subsection (1) shall be kept on the licensed premises to which they relate, together with all working papers used in making those records". It is interesting to note that the penalty for not complying with this requirement is \$2 000.

Let me explain the situation that could arise if I had a business in the liquor industry and employed the services of an accountant to handle my records, and his business was conducted from premises in St George's Terrace, West Perth, Subiaco, or South Perth. What would happen? The records which would be kept in the prescribed form would not be kept on the licensed premises because it would be impractical to do so, and yet it is good business practice.

The second point is that the Minister has not explained to me the point I made earlier; that is, the magnitude of the avoidance. The Minister has not indicated how she has made that judgment. How significant will the avoidance need to be and on what basis will she make her assumption?

It would be very easy for the Minister to give a rock solid commitment to consult with the industry before the prescribed forms were tabled in this House. I cannot understand why she will not make that commitment.

As the member for Mt Lawley has outlined, it appears that business will be loaded up with red tape in contradiction to the Government's commitment. The least the Government can do is consult with the people who will be affected and ask for their opinion prior to the forms being tabled in this Parliament.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 put and passed.

Clause 15: Fourth Schedule repealed—

Mr COWAN: When we were debating clause 6 the National Party indicated it was opposed to the concept of the Government increasing liquor licence fees by regulation. In my party's view the appropriate course for the Government to consider in another place would be to oppose the original clause 6 and then to introduce an amendment to the schedule which would give the percentage which the Minister has stated should be the licensing fee as from 1 July. This will allow the Minister to apply the increases that have been determined, and at any time in the future the Government would have to come before this Parliament seeking an amendment to change the schedule of the Liquor Act to a higher figure—if I live to see the day, perhaps it will lower the figure.

Mr MacKINNON: The Liberal Party shares the view expressed by the Leader of the National Party.

I express my extreme dismay that the Minister was not courteous enough to respond to the point I made in respect of the records to be kept on licensed premises. It seems clear to me that the interjection made by the member for Dale earlier today is accurate. This Bill is designed to benefit the people who administer the legislation. It will not benefit the people who will be affected by it.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

House adjourned at 10.58 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Appointments: Annual

592. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

How many persons were appointed to the Commission of the Peace in each of the years 1980 to 1985 inclusive?

Mr PETER DOWDING replied:

I am advised as follows—

1980	200
1981	163
1982	179
1983	217
1984	178
1985	135

PRISONERS

Costs

735. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Prisons:

Would the Minister advise the estimated annual cost of keeping prisoners in the following centres—

- (a) Albany;
- (b) Bandyup;
- (c) Barton's Mill;
- (d) Broome;
- (e) Brunswick Junction;
- (f) Bunbury;
- (g) Canning Vale;
- (h) C. W. Campbell Remand Centre;
- (i) Eastern Goldfields;
- (j) Fremantle;
- (k) Geraldton-Greenough;
- (l) Karnet;
- (m) Pardelup;
- (n) Roebourne;
- (o) Wooroloo;
- (p) Wyndham;
- (q) East Perth?

Mr PETER DOWDING replied:

The cost per prisoner for 1984-85 was—

	\$
(a) Albany	27 664
(b) Bandyup	29 039

	\$
(c) Barton's Mill	14 693
(d) Broome	20 462
(e) Brunswick Junction—Closed December 1982	
(f) Bunbury	28 515
(g) Canning Vale	30 398
(h) C. W. Campbell Remand Centre	36 277
(i) Eastern Goldfields	28 530
(j) Fremantle	25 393
(k) Geraldton-Greenough	29 352
(l) Karnet	23 546
(m) Pardelup	26 261
(n) Roebourne	24 720
(o) Wooroloo	19 173
(p) Wyndham	34 068
(q) East Perth Lock-up	4 199

The above figures are based on 1984-85 gross recurrent expenditure divided by average muster. They do not include head office administrative costs or the cost of maintaining the central services unit at Canning Vale.

The cost of the East Perth Lock-up is not indicative of the true cost as the facility is operated in conjunction with the Police Department.

STATE FINANCE: BUDGET

Wage and Salary Costs: Allocation

740. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

Referring to his explanation of the 11 per cent allowance to be made for increases in wage and salary costs in the 1986-87 Budget, would he please explain—

- (a) how 3.7 per cent of that figure can be attributed to award increases in the previous year when the previous year's Budget already included an amount of 3.3 per cent for award increases; and
- (b) in the same answer that the Government saved \$16 million by overestimating award increases last year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) The 3.7 per cent increase does not relate to award increases in the previous year but represents the initial estimate of the part-year effect of likely in-

creases to be granted in 1986-87 by the Industrial Relations Commission. The estimate has now been revised downwards in line with the recent decision of the commission.

- (b) The savings resulting from the delay of the recent wage decision are reflected in transactions on the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the financial year ended 30 June 1986.

MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT

Letters: Lists

741. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that during debate on 19 June when asked how Main Roads Department employees received personally addressed envelopes containing letters from the Minister for Transport denigrating Opposition policies, the Minister indicated that the envelopes were personally addressed on the basis that, "It (the list) was supplied to me and ALP members put the list together, yes."?
- (2) Is he also aware that in a Press report of 24 June the Minister is reported to have indicated that, "They (the letters) had been prepared for distribution by Labor Party members working on my campaign committee."?
- (3) Given that information, if—as he claims in answer to question 608 of 1 July—he was "not aware that what the member is alleging has taken place", can the Premier now advise as to whether or not he supports the practice of providing outside parties with the names and addresses of Government employees—without their approval?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. However, I am advised there was no such comment made by the Minister during the debate. It was an assertion made by the Opposition, not the Minister.
- (3) No. The answer to question 608 of 1 July is correct.

PORTS AND HARBOURS

Fremantle: Disputes

743. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many stoppages have there been at the Port of Fremantle since January of this year?
- (2) What was the date of each?
- (3) What was the duration of each?
- (4) What was the subject of each dispute or issue?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) to (4) In answer to the Leader of the Opposition's questions I would like to table three schedules as follows—

Schedule A—Stoppages and bans resulting from local issues.

Schedule B—Stoppages and bans which are the result of national issues such as WWF agreement and superannuation negotiations.

Schedule C—Stoppages and bans which are the result of national directives relating to apartheid and nuclear protest issues.

As can be seen from these schedules the local issues are relatively few in number, generally relate to operational matters such as manning and safety disputes, and are of typically short duration.

You will note that there have been virtually no stoppages due to disputes over local issues by the combined unions during the period, which is a reflection on the success and effectiveness of the system of a paid full-time convenor.

(See paper No. 282.)

WA EXIM CORPORATION

Tractor Purchase

750. Mr HASSELL, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) Did WA Exim Corporation Ltd agree to purchase four tractors from Acremaster?
- (2) Does Exim Corporation or any of its subsidiaries have an interest in Acremaster, and, if so, what is that interest?

- (3) If there was an agreement to purchase tractors was a deposit paid, or was any other payment made, and if so, in each case how much?
- (4) Were any of the tractors delivered?
- (5) Did Exim Corporation agree to sell one of the tractors to WA Livestock Holdings Ltd?
- (6) Has WA Livestock Holdings Ltd taken delivery of the tractor?
- (7) Is Acremaster now in receivership?
- (8) Are the deliveries of any tractors delayed by that receivership?

Mr BRYCE replied:

I am advised as follows—

- (1) No.
- (2) WA Exim Corporation Ltd has a 50 per cent interest in Acremaster Marketing Pty Ltd.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) WA Livestock Holdings Ltd bought one tractor from Acremaster Marketing Pty Ltd.
- (6) No.
- (7) No.
- (8) Not applicable.

If the member has any concerns about the matter, I suggest he contact the Chairman of the Exim Corporation.

PRISON

Metropolitan: Alternative Sites

752. Mr CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Prisons:

- (1) Will the Minister provide details of the alternative sites which were evaluated for the proposed maximum security prison?
- (2) What were the reasons that the alternative sites were not considered adequate?
- (3) What is the area of the land comprising the metropolitan prison complex, Canning Vale?
- (4) Does the Government or any Government agency or authority own or control land in the near vicinity of the metropolitan prison complex, Canning Vale?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), will the Minister provide details?
- (6) (a) Is it feasible to build the proposed maximum security prison adjacent to or in the near vicinity of the existing metropolitan prison complex, Canning Vale;
(b) if not, why not?
- (7) Will the Minister table the plans of the proposed maximum security prison?
- (8) Has the Environmental Protection Authority or any other environmental agency been requested to comment on the environmental impact which will occur if the maximum security prison is constructed on the Orton Road site?
- (9) If "Yes" to (8), will the Minister table the advice or such other environmental statements which have been considered in choosing the Orton Road site?
- (10) What is the area of the Orton Road site and what area will be occupied by the proposed maximum security prison?
- (11) What is the estimated capital value of the Orton Road site?
- (12) When did the Government first identify the Orton Road site as a potential location for a maximum security prison?
- (13) What is the current local authority zoning and the current Metropolitan Region Planning Authority or State Planning Commission zoning of the Orton Road site?
- (14) Under the local authority's district planning scheme, will the Orton Road site need to be rezoned to permit the construction of a prison?
- (15) Has the local authority been advised of the Government's proposal to construct a prison in Orton Road, and if so, is the local authority in favour of the proposal?
- (16) (a) Did the System 6 report make specific recommendations in respect of the Orton Road site;
(b) if "Yes", will the Minister give details?
- (17) What are the compelling technical and operational reasons which caused the Government to choose the Orton Road site as the most suitable for erection of a maximum security prison?

Mr PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (17) The Orton Road site has a total area of approximately 180 hectares, of which about 30 hectares will be occupied by the prison itself. A further 30 hectares will be required for a perimeter security area. The land is zoned for Government purposes. The site was selected after comprehensive assessment of a large number of potential locations. Technical, operational and environmental factors were carefully considered over a lengthy period. The Government's decision having been finalised, it is not proposed to provide a list of rejected sites, as that would serve no useful purpose. For the same reason, I am not prepared to authorise the substantial resources which would be required to provide all the detail requested by the member. However, in respect of his query on the Canning Vale site, I can advise as follows—

- (1) The Canning Vale site already accommodates the C. W. Campbell Remand Centre (maximum security), Canning Vale Prison (medium security), and a minimum security prison which is at present unoccupied.
- (2) Additional use of the site has been reserved for extension of the existing facilities.
- (3) There is very strong professional opinion against the excessive concentration of numbers of prisoners. This is supported by international experience and advice. The addition of another 300 prisoners on the Canning Vale site would go beyond acceptable limits.

The Kwinana Town Council has been advised of the Government's decision, but has not yet provided an official response.

Because the site comes within a System 6 area the Government has allocated \$100 000 to the Department of Conservation and Land Management for the purchase for conservation purposes of other land in the district.

PRISON

Metropolitan: Alternative Sites

758. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Prisons:

- (1) Will he list the alternative sites considered by the Government in deciding to locate the new maximum security prison at Casuarina in the Town of Kwinana?
- (2) What planning procedures are to be implemented before approval can be given for construction of the new prison?
- (3) What avenues are available for the Town of Kwinana and the local people to express their opinions on the proposed siting of the prison at Casuarina?
- (4) Why is the proposed new maximum security prison not being located adjacent to the present Canning Vale prison?
- (5) For what reason is the Government apparently reversing its own approval for System 6 recommendations for Reserve C31874 Casuarina?
- (6) Why was the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale not given the courtesy of the Government's advising it of its intentions and seeking the shire's opinion on behalf of its residents and its territory as the new prison is proposed to be located on the joint boundary between the Town of Kwinana and the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale?

Mr PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (5) The member is referred to the answer to question on notice No. 752.
- (6) The Town of Kwinana was advised as the new prison site is wholly within its local government area.

WA LIVESTOCK HOLDINGS PTY LTD

Expenditure

764. Mr COURT, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) What were the budgeted and actual expenditure figures for Exim Corporation's subsidiary, Western Australian Livestock Holdings Ltd for the 1985-86 year?

- (2) What level of new capital was introduced to Western Australian Livestock Holdings Ltd in the 1985-86 financial year?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Audited figures are not yet available.
(2) None.

WA EXIM CORPORATION

Goldrock Investments: Sale

765. Mr COURT, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) Further to question 422 of 1986, has Exim Corporation been paid for the shares in Goldrock Investments it sold to Auscorp Holdings Ltd?
(2) If "No", when will they be paid for?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) Not applicable.

TAXES AND CHARGES

Withholding Tax: Public Authorities

766. Mr COURT, to the Acting Premier:

What is the estimated cost of the extension of the interest withholding tax to securities and overseas borrowings by public authorities within Western Australia?

Mr BRYCE replied:

It is difficult to provide any meaningful estimated cost for Western Australia of the withdrawal of the withholding tax exemption as it affects borrowings and refinancings offshore.

There will be many variables likely to affect the impact, including, for example, the willingness of lenders to absorb all or part of the tax, the annual coupon rate which depends upon currency and maturity and the nature of the debt instrument negotiated.

POLICE

Aircraft: Operations

769. Mr CASH, to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) How many, and what type of aircraft are operated by the Police Force?

- (2) What was the purchase price paid for each aircraft?
(3) What was the number of hours flown by each aircraft in—
(a) 1983-1984;
(b) 1984-1985;
(c) July 1985-March 1986?
(4) Does the Police Force pay air navigation charges, insurance, landing fees and hangar fees in respect of its aircraft?
(5) If "Yes" to (4), will he give details of these specific costs for—
(a) 1983-1984;
(b) 1984-1985;
(c) July 1985-March 1986?
(6) What is the estimated annual running costs of the police air wing and its personnel?
(7) How many personnel are attached to the police air wing?
(8) Does the Police Force conduct regular cost-benefit studies in respect of the annual fixed costs and recurrent costs of the police air wing?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (1) Two—
(a) Partenavia P68 Observer;
(b) Cessna 182.
(2) (a) \$179 000;
(b) \$185 000—less \$39 000 trade-in.
(3) (a) Partenavia—626.1
Cessna—646.1;
(b) Partenavia—706.1
Cessna—877;
(c) Partenavia—782
Cessna—796.
(4) Navigation fees—Yes
Insurance—Yes
Landing fees—Some shire-owned fields only
Hangar fees—No.
(5) (a) Navigation charges—\$5 458
Insurance—\$6 678.80
Landing fees—approx. \$100;
(b) Navigation charges—\$4 511
Insurance—\$7 378
Landing fees—approx. \$100;
(c) Navigation charges—\$4 421
Insurance—\$7 424
Landing fees—Nil.

(6) \$300 000.

(7) Six.

(8) While the direct costs of operating the unit can be ascertained, the benefits are interwoven with those of other police functions, all of which by their nature are not capable of objective valuation in dollar terms.

In these circumstances, a formal cost-benefit analysis is not carried out. However, the Commissioner of Police is of the view that the operations of the air wing are justified.

CRIME

Prostitution: Report

771. Mr CASH, to the Premier:

(1) Did his department commission a Perth lawyer, Jill Toohey, to write a report for the department's womens' interests division of Western Australia's prostitution laws?

(2) If "Yes", has the report been completed and what was the title of the report?

(3) Was a copy of the report forwarded to—

(a) the then Minister for Police, Hon. J. P. Carr, MLA;

(b) the Human Rights Commission?

(4) Will he table the report?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) The Department of the Premier and Cabinet commissioned Jill Toohey to prepare a background paper on the current legislation and practice of prostitution in Western Australia.

(2) The background paper has the working title "Prostitution in Western Australia". It is in draft form.

(3) A draft copy of the background paper has been sent to—

(a) the Minister for Police;

(b) the Humans Rights Commission.

(4) It is not intended to table the draft background paper.

CRIME

Prostitution: Report

772. Mr CASH, to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

(1) Has he or his department considered a report titled "Legal aspects of prostitution in W.A." written by a Perth lawyer, Jill Toohey?

(2) Does he intend to make any changes to the current policy in respect of prostitution in Western Australia?

(3) Does he support the current containment policy in respect of prostitution in Western Australia?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

(1) A draft background paper on the current legislation and practice of prostitution in Western Australia has been considered.

(2) and (3) The Government has the question of prostitution under consideration.

TECHNOLOGY: COMPUTERS

Contracts: Olivetti

775. Mr HASSELL, to the Deputy Premier:

(1) In regard to the recent tender for supply of computer base office automation system, reference No. 889 A 1985, contracted to Olivetti—

(a) what was the lowest price offered for the tender;

(b) what was the original Budget expenditure for the tender;

(c) did the tenderer's price exceed the Budget allocated for the particular tender in question;

(d) if so, where will the shortfall in the Budget allocation come from;

(e) what guarantees did the department receive from Olivetti regarding "associated benefits"?

(2) In regard to the DOCIT office automation tender reference No. 891 A 1986—

(a) why was an outside consultant used in evaluation of the tender project, and at what cost;

(b) why did DOCIT have to go outside its own department to have a tender project evaluated

when it could have used its own internal expertise;

- (c) did the consultant go to Italy and how was the trip funded?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) (a) The member would realise that the lowest tender price is "commercial-in-confidence";
 (b) the original budget was \$209 200;
 (c) yes;
 (d) overrun was financed by savings in other areas of the Department of Industrial Development's expenditure;
 (e) associated benefits arising under the contract between the Department of Industrial Development and Olivetti Australia Limited will be the subject of a legal agreement between the State and the company which is currently being negotiated.
- (2) (a) DOCIT's own technical resources were fully committed to providing services to other public sector agencies. The consulting cost for technical evaluation was \$35 227;
 (b) see (a);
 (c) yes, funded by DOCIT.

ENVIRONMENT

Mandurah Estuary: Sand Bar

777. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware—

- (a) that the sand bar entrance to the estuary at Mandurah is currently closed;
 (b) that several cray and fishing boats are trapped inside the estuary and are therefore prevented from putting to sea and earning a living;
 (c) that a dredge is set up near the mouth of the estuary and would only take three days to clear the bar if directed;
 (d) that the dredge is about to move and the return to the mouth of the estuary would be delayed for some time?

- (2) If he is not aware of these matters would he acquaint himself with the problem and direct the immediate dredging of the mouth of the Mandurah estuary so that fishing and cray boats trapped in the estuary can go to sea?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) (a) As is normal in winter, sand has shoaled the ocean entrance at Mandurah and is restricting boating movements. The entrance is not, however, closed to all boating traffic;
 (b) I can understand that some difficulties are being experienced but the owners of fishing vessels at Mandurah are aware that shoaling normally occurs during the winter season. In accordance with long-standing practice, the Government will arrange for maintenance dredging of the entrance channel to be carried out immediately prior to commencement of the next rock lobster season in November;
 (c) and (d) it would take the dredge at Mandurah a minimum of three weeks to properly deepen the entrance channel. This would be an ad hoc approach as sand movements during winter storms will cause further shoaling.
- (2) Not applicable.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Westrail: Sale

778. Mr HOUSE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Government currently considering the sale of the Westrail country passenger bus service?
 (2) If "Yes", will the Government assure country people that—
 (a) the cost of the service will not increase above normal Consumer Price Index increases;
 (b) the number of services and regularity of services will not be reduced;
 (c) the quality of the buses will be maintained?

- (3) How many drivers would be based in the country?
- (4) Can he assure the House that the size of the buses will not be reduced?
- (5) What profit or loss did Westrail's country bus service make in the last financial year?
- (6) What profit or loss did the Bunbury city service have in the last financial year?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) to (4) Following a review of Westrail's country bus services, a number of recommendations were made jointly by the Commissioners of Railways and Transport. These are summarised in the 1985 annual report of the Commissioner of Transport tabled in this House on 25 September 1985.

The short-term recommendations referred to in this annual report have not been fully implemented and the longer-term recommendations are still under consideration by the Government.

The issues of fare levels, service frequencies, and so on, are handled in the normal course of events, taking into consideration the transport needs of country residents and the need to contain Government expenditure.

- (5) The direct subsidisation of social transport services provided by Westrail's country bus services during 1984-85 was \$2.2 million.
- (6) Following the calling of tenders, the shortfall subsidy accepted by the Government for the first year of operation—to 31 December 1986—was \$515 915.

DEFENCE

Dibb Report: Examination

787. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Defence Liaison:

- (1) Has the Government examined the Dibb report and its effects on defence expenditure and basing defence forces in Western Australia?
- (2) If "Yes", does the Government support the findings of this study?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) The Western Australian Government noted that the Dibb report has only provided recommendations to the Commonwealth, on defence force development, equipment and structure. Notwithstanding the advisory nature of the report, the Government of Western Australia welcomes the general approach of Mr Dibb whereby he recognises the necessity to defend the resource-rich northern and western areas of the continent. The Government is willing to cooperate to the fullest with the Commonwealth on the development of defence facilities and capabilities as is occurring now with the expansion of *HMAS Stirling* at Garden Island, and the basing of RAN submarine and surface vessels in this State.

The WA Government accepts that decisions on the size and deployment of the Australian defence force are matters for the Commonwealth, but appreciates opportunities to discuss defence developments in this State as appropriate. The Government notes that the Dibb report confirms the logic of decisions already taken by the Commonwealth, and announced by Defence Minister Beazley, in relation to *HMAS Stirling* and submarine basing.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Staff Movements

789. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Industry and Technology:

Was it factually reported in his department's magazine "Milestone" No. 11 of December 1985 that 61 new staff were appointed between January 1985 and December 1985 and that 49 left in the same period?

Mr BRYCE replied:

"Milestone" is not a Department of Industrial Development magazine. However, an article titled "Milestone" was published in an internal departmental newsletter vis. "Department of Industrial Development Update", No. 11.

The figures quoted related to the period January 1985 to October 1985 and included all staff—temporary, additional assistance, and permanent

items—who joined and left the department and the Industrial Lands Development Authority or were seconded to the Small Business Development Corporation and the Department of Regional Development.

WA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Treasury Funds: Investment

792. Mr COURT, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) What percentage of the Treasury's surplus funds were invested with the Western Australian Development Corporation during the 1985-86 financial year?
- (2) What were the other investment options which the Treasury used for the investment of surplus funds?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The average daily balance of Treasury's investments for the year ended 30 June 1986 was \$512 157 954. The average of investments with the WADC for the same period was \$401 419 973—78.4 per cent. The difference of \$110 737 981—21.6 per cent—reflects investments in Commonwealth and State Government guaranteed securities and deposits held with banks and other dealers in the money market maturing after 1 July 1985.

ENERGY: OIL

Power Stations: Tenders

797. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

When will a decision be made to award tenders for fuel oil to be supplied to country power stations as referred to in question 225 of 12 June 1986?

Mr PARKER replied:

A recommendation will go to Executive Council shortly.

GOVERNMENT TRAVEL: BOOKINGS

Holiday WA Centre: Circular

799. Mr MacKINNON, to the Acting Premier:

I refer him to circular to Ministers No. 24/86 of 29 April 1986, which instructed Ministers to ensure all de-

partments, statutory authorities and instrumentalities utilised the services of Holiday WA Centre when making travel bookings.

- (1) Does this directive extend to all Government authorities including the Western Australian Development Corporation and Exim Corporation?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If not, will he provide me with a list of bodies excluded from that directive and the reason for their exclusion?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government does not direct the Western Australian Development Corporation or the Western Australian Exim Corporation Ltd.
- (3) All other agencies have been requested to comply with the circular.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

Name Change: Consultants' Fees

805. Mr LIGHTFOOT, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With reference to the change in name of Metropolitan Transport Trust to Transperth, what was the cost in consultants' fees to change the name from the Metropolitan Transport Trust to the Transperth logo including incidental and ancillary costs?
- (2) Because of differential colour applications in relation to the new logo, what is the expected cost—
 - (a) extra to normal repainting; and
 - (b) the total cost of repainting the standard-type Metropolitan Transport Trust bus?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) \$27 845.90 including all presentation, incidental and ancillary costs.

Although consultancy is incomplete and further costs will be incurred, they are included within the total implementation budget of \$100 000 over five years. This budget is to cover all fees, the design and production of a corporate manual, the application of the Transperth logo onto important signs that cannot wait for change under the normal maintenance pro-

gramme, and any incidental or ancillary costs.

(2) (a) Buses: Nil.

Ferries: Nil.

Rail: Some costs will be incurred for the supply and installation of Transperth symbols on the side of stainless steel rail cars as this rolling stock is currently devoid of any form of corporate identification; and

(b) the standard cost of preparing and repainting an MTT bus as part of the normal maintenance programme is \$2 312. The new and simpler livery is expected to somewhat reduce painting costs. Buses will only reflect the new image as they are repainted under normal painting programmes or when they are delivered new.

PASTORAL LEASES

Cobra Station: Status

806. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Lands:

What is the current position in relation to Cobra Station in the Upper Gascoyne?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

The lessees of Cobra Station have initiated a feasibility study into the future of the pastoral lease. A submission to the Pastoral Board is expected by the end of August.

PASTORAL BOARD

Restructuring

807. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Lands:

(1) Does the Government have any plans to restructure the Pastoral Board?

(2) If "Yes", what are these plans?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1) and (2) There are no firm plans at this stage.

MINERAL

Iron Ore Industry: Fringe Benefits Tax

808. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

(1) Is he aware of a report commissioned by the iron ore industry entitled "Fringe Benefits Tax Impact Study" which indicates that the industry may be faced with a fringe benefits tax bill of almost \$25 million per annum?

(2) What is his department's assessment of the impact of the fringe benefits tax on the iron ore industry?

(3) How is the impact of this new Federal tax expected to affect employment levels in the industry?

Mr PARKER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The impact on Western Australian iron ore producers is expected to be in the range of \$16-17 million.

(3) It is not expected that employment levels in the iron ore industry will be affected by the new tax.

ROADS

Port Hedland-Newman-Wittenoom Roads Junction: Roadhouse

809. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Lands:

What stage has been reached with the release of a roadhouse site at the junction of the Wittenoom Road and the new Port Hedland to Newman Highway?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

Agreement to the excision of a four hectare site from the Hamersley Range National Park at the junction of the Wittenoom Road and the new Port Hedland to Newman Highway has been reached between relevant departments and authorities.

Excision will require parliamentary approval prior to the site being released. A suitable clause will be included in the next Reserves Bill.

ENERGY: GAS

Liquefied Petroleum: Tax Component

810. Mr LIGHTFOOT, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is he aware of the total tax component of cost of liquefied petroleum gas expressed in cents per litre in all mainland States of Australia with the exception of Western Australia?

- (2) If so, would he please advise me?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) I understand there is not direct taxation of liquefied petroleum gas sold in any of the States referred to.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

Ballast: Supplies

811. Mr TRENORDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What track ballast did Western Quarries Pty Ltd supply to Westrail in total tonnage?

- (2) What was the purchase price per tonne of the ballast?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) and (2) Under the terms of the joint venture agreement this information is confidential to both partners.

ROAD BRIDGE

Shelley: Widening

813. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) (a) Are there plans to widen the Shelley bridge to a six-lane bridge in the future;

- (b) if so, when is it anticipated that such work will commence?

- (2) (a) Do these future plans make provision for pedestrian traffic on Shelley bridge;

- (b) if not, why not?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) (a) Yes;

- (b) it is not anticipated that work will be undertaken at an early date to widen the Shelley bridge. Funding available for work on arterial roads is declining and some congestion must be tolerated.

- (2) (a) and (b) A pedestrian facility will be provided when Shelley bridge is widened.

CRIME STATISTICS

Cockburn

814. Mr MacKINNON, to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What were the total crime statistics for the Cockburn police station for the period 30 June 1986?

- (2) What number of police officers were based at the Cockburn police station as at—

- (a) 30 June 1983;

- (b) 30 June 1984;

- (c) 30 June 1985;

- (d) 30 June 1986?

- (3) What were the total crime statistics for the year ended 30 June 1986 at—

- (a) Brentwood police station;

- (b) Cannington police station;

- (c) Hilton police station;

- (d) Palmyra police station;

- (e) Gosnells police station?

- (4) How many police officers are currently based at the police stations listed in (3)?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (1) Total offences reported to Cockburn police—955.

- (2) (a) 4;

- (b) 5;

- (c) 5;

- (d) 5.

- (3) (a) Total offences reported to Brentwood police—3 424;

- (b) total offences reported to Cannington police—3 937;

- (c) total offences reported to Hilton police—1 608;

- (d) total offences reported to Palmyra police—1 519;

- (e) total offences reported to Gosnells police—2 648.

- (4) (a) 12;

- (b) 18;

- (c) 8;

- (d) 8;

- (e) 11.

ENERGY

Polychlorinated Biphenyls: Storage

818. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is the State Government considering the use of the South Fremantle power station as temporary storage for polychlorinated biphenyls?
- (2) If so, does he still stand by his answer provided to my question 670 of 3 July 1986?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Yes, but the proposal has been deferred indefinitely.
- (2) Yes.

HEALTH

Foodstuffs: Irradiation

820. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does the Department of Health permit the use of "irradiation" in Western Australia?
- (2) If "Yes", under what circumstances?
- (3) If "No" to (1), is its use being considered and under what circumstances?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) No. I presume the member is referring to the preservation of foods by ionising radiation.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The National Health and Medical Research Council has developed a standard for the preservation of fruits, vegetables, cereals, spices and poultry by irradiation. Those standards have been distributed to all States for their consideration.

FORESTS

Jarrah Dieback: Area

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

- (1) What is the estimated area affected by jarrah dieback disease in the State forest and timber reserves respectively?

- (2) What is the estimated rate of spread of the disease in the respective areas referred to in (1)?

- (3) What is the area of State forest in previously quarantined disease-risk areas that has been logged in each of the years—

- (a) 1983-84;
- (b) 1984-85;
- (c) 1985-86?

- (4) What is the estimated area of State forest to be logged in disease-risk areas in 1986-87?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The most recent broadscale estimate of the area of State forest affected by jarrah dieback disease was 223 000 hectares as reported in the Forest Department's general working plan 87 of 1982.

More recent mapping has been localised and has not assisted in updating this figure.

No separate estimate has been made of dieback disease in timber reserves.

- (2) The annual increase in the area of State forest and timber reserves affected by dieback disease varies greatly according to environmental conditions. Those years when significant rainfall occurs during the warmer months are recognised as having the highest risk. An estimate of the average rate of dieback spread would be difficult to establish and possibly be inaccurate.

- (3) The requested information for disease-risk areas is more readily obtained for calendar years—

1983—981 hectares
1984—2 040 hectares
1985—6 378 hectares.

- (4) 1986—12 740 hectares.

Mr BRUCE BEGGS

Employment

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

- (1) With respect to Mr B. Beggs, former Conservator of Forests, what positions does he still hold within the Public Service?

- (2) What positions associated with the timber industry, but outside the public service, does Mr Beggs hold?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Mr Beggs is no longer a public servant and therefore does not hold any position within the Public Service.

He does, however, hold a position on a statutory body, as Chairman of the Lands and Forest Commission.

He is also Chairman of the Sandalwood Export Committee.

In addition to these, Mr Beggs is contracted as a consultant to the Department of Conservation and Land Management and the Public Service Board.

- (2) Any positions held by Mr Beggs in a private capacity with the timber industry would not fall within my ministerial responsibility.

MANJIMUP CANNERY

Assistance

824. Mr TRENORDEN, to the Minister for Industry and Technology:

Referring to a question without notice asked on 9 July 1986 by the member for Albany concerning the Manjimup Cannery, his reply to part (4) referred to substantial Government assistance. Could he detail that assistance?

Mr BRYCE replied:

The Government assistance referred to is as follows—

- (1) The Government purchased the Festing Street land and buildings from the receiver-manager of Hunt's Foods for \$180 000. These premises are leased to Southern Processors for a rental of \$500 per annum. Southern Processors has a 10 year option to purchase these premises at the original purchase price—\$180 000.
- (2) In addition, the company received a \$100 000 interest-free loan which is to be progressively converted to a grant over a period of three years.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

SHIP BUILDING

Bountiable Vessels

164. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Regional Development:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Geraldton boat builder, Millman Services, has lost orders for small ships to the value of \$3 million in the past year because of the Federal Government's continued refusal to allow it to be licensed as a builder of bountiable vessels?
- (2) Why has not the Department of Industrial Development, as well as the Minister's Department of Regional Development, been able to assist this highly reputable, long-established boat builder?
- (3) Will the builder have to go broke before action will be taken to ensure that it becomes licensed as a builder of bountiable vessels?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) I am aware that the Geraldton boat company, Millman Services, has encountered considerable difficulty over the past two years in seeking a licence to build bountiable boats under the Federal Government's policy. It is certainly true to say, as the member for Nedlands has, that the company has been seriously disadvantaged by a quite unreasonable exercise of its function by the Federal Government.
- (2) and (3) I point out that the State Government has been very active in attempting to persuade the Commonwealth Government to reverse its decision on this matter. During last year when Millman Services made application for a licence, the Department of Industrial Development, the Department of Regional Development, and I in my capacity as the local member, made representations to Senator Button and his committee on behalf of Millman Services. Again this year, when a second application was made, both departments represented the matter to Senator Button.

It has been a matter of considerable disappointment to us that the Commonwealth Government has simply not been able to see reason on this particular matter. It is a classic example of a local boat builder, who has for some years built vessels for the local fishing industry, having now encountered the difficulty that that fishing industry has grown to the extent that it needs larger vessels. This has brought about the situation in which Millman Services has had its market taken from it. This policy unfairly and unreasonably discriminates against the company.

At the time when Senator Button announced his second refusal of the application, I made no secret of my opinion that he was out of touch with both the needs of Western Australian regional industry and this boat builder in relation to other established boat building operations around Australia. It has been a matter of great disappointment to us and of annoyance to Millman Services, but I emphasise to the member that this State Government has pursued the matter as vigorously as it has been able with the Federal Government. We are disappointed that we have not been able to persuade the Federal Minister to recognise the justice of the case.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Orbital Engine Co Pty Ltd: Discussions

165. Dr WATSON, to the Deputy Premier:

Will the Deputy Premier please inform the House of the outcome of the latest meeting held today between representatives of the Western Australian Government and the Orbital Engine Co Pty Ltd?

Mr BRYCE replied:

The member for Canning articulates that question far more effectively than do the members for Nedlands and Moore. Nevertheless, I appreciate her interest in the subject.

Today representatives of my office and the Department of Industrial Development—

Mr MacKinnon: Could you find these blokes?

Mr BRYCE: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants the unexpurgated copy of the answer, or if he intends to whinge and take a deputation to the Speaker about the length of time available for questions, he had better start to think pretty seriously about the number of interjections being made during question time. I will accommodate the member up any blind alley he likes to go with regard to his interjections.

Today representatives of my office and the Department of Industrial Development met with Mr Ralph Sarich and representatives from the Orbital Engine Co to discuss how the WA Government could assist the Orbital Engine Co to establish a manufacturing facility in Western Australia. It has been agreed that during the next few weeks key Government officials will work full time with Orbital Engine Co officials to establish the basis of a package which would assist the establishment of a manufacturing facility to manufacture engines for world markets.

I also intend to approach the Federal Government with a view to overcoming any barriers that could affect the commercial viability of a major investment in Australia's manufacturing future.

Mr Sarich and the Western Australian Government have always been pro Western Australian manufacture for this revolutionary indigenous product and the WA Government is wholeheartedly supportive of his plans to manufacture locally.

CRIME

Disorderly Conduct: Charges

166. Mr THOMPSON, to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Did the Minister see the report in this morning's edition of *The West Australian* that a 23-year-old woman was convicted of disorderly conduct for acting in an indecent manner?
- (2) Did he also note that evidence was tendered that part of the indecent act involved participation by at least three men, two of whom placed dollar

coins, one with his tongue, in the G-string of the apparently otherwise naked woman?

- (3) Have any of the men involved been charged with any offence arising from the acts which led to the woman's conviction?
- (4) If no charges have been laid against the men, would the Minister explain why not?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) and (4) I do not know. I will find out and I will let the member know.

LIBERAL PARTY

Presidency

167. Mr THOMAS, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of reports that the President of the Liberal Party, Mr Barrie Payne, has today announced that he will not be contesting the position of president of the Western Australian branch Liberal Party?
- (2) What are the implications of such a decision for the Labor Government of Western Australia?

The SPEAKER: I have some difficulty with this question and I would appreciate receiving a copy of it. I am sure that in some way it conflicts with Standing Orders. I will look at it to see if I can assist with some advice after the next question has been asked.

GOVERNMENT COMMITTEES

Fringe Benefits Tax

168. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Of those voluntary committees established under provisions contained in Acts for which he has responsibility, how many members have resigned rather than pay fringe benefits tax for the purpose of carrying out tasks?
- (2) Have any soil conservation advisory committees been forced to adjourn or abandon any meeting for lack of a quorum?

Mr GRILL replied:

I missed the first part of the question. Was the member for Merredin referring to an answer I gave to a previous question?

Mr Cowan: On a point of clarification, I was talking about the membership of voluntary committees that were established under provisions of Acts for which the Minister is responsible. How many members of those committees have resigned their positions rather than be forced to pay fringe benefits tax that they may incur on any transportation during the course of carrying out their duties?

Mr GRILL: In reply—

- (1) and (2) I know of only one committee that has resigned, and that case has been fairly well publicised in the media. Outside of that committee, to date I do not know of any other committees that have resigned. It is a pity that that committee has resigned, but that was the decision of its members.

I know it is a bit of a bother to us to have to fill in these log books, but if people are involved in voluntary action, filling in a log book from time to time might take up three to five minutes of their day.

Mr Cowan: That is not the point. The fact is that it is not going to be a deductible item against their fringe benefits tax.

Mr GRILL: The member would need to give me some details of the committees that have resigned. I am aware of only one, and that is one of the soil conservation committees set up by the Government. Any extra impost there will not reflect upon the people on the committee, but on the Government. The only impost they will have is spending a few moments each day filling in a log book during the time they work. If other committees have resigned, I do not know about them. I have not seen the article in the *Daily News*. There might be others, and I will certainly look into the matter.

ENVIRONMENT

Mandurah Estuary: Sandbar

169. Mr READ, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to question 777 asked by the member for Murray-Wellington, will the Minister advise what action the Government is taking to develop a permanent ocean entrance channel at Mandurah, and what the cost of that work is expected to be?

Mr TROY replied:

I appreciate the member for Mandurah's concern, because he took the trouble to ring me from the Eastern States a couple of weeks ago on this very matter.

The situation is that, following an announcement by the Premier in August 1985, the Government is negotiating with the Shire of Mandurah for joint participation in a scheme to develop and maintain a permanent navigable ocean entrance channel. Only by undertaking a substantial and ongoing dredging programme will that entrance not shoal during the winter storms. A scheme for the development of the permanent channel includes backlog dredging to clear much of the sandbar and create a silt trap at an estimated cost of \$1 million, followed by an annual bypass dredging at an estimated cost of \$465 000 per annum. The Government has offered to meet all development dredging costs and is prepared to share ongoing annual bypass dredging costs with the shire.

If a case can be put to justify a greater commitment by the Government, then I am prepared to give the matter further consideration.

LIBERAL PARTY

Presidency

170. Mr THOMAS, to the Premier:

I have revised my earlier question and now ask the Premier—

- (1) Is he aware of reports that the Liberal Party President, Barrie Payne, has today announced he will not be contesting the position of President of the WA Liberal Party?

- (2) Are there any implications for Government in Western Australia in this decision?

- (3) If so, what are they?

Point of Order

Mr MacKINNON: Mr Speaker, on a point of order, it would seem to me from my reading of the Standing Orders that the question is out of order. I quote from page 44 of the Standing Orders—

Questions to Ministers should relate to public affairs with which they are connected, to proceedings pending in Parliament, and to matters of administration for which they are responsible, but not to matters arising from a Minister's actions as a private citizen.

I fail to see how the presidency of the Liberal Party relates in any way to the Premier.

Mr Pearce: If the implication is for the Government, then the answer would be "No", would it not?

The SPEAKER: I thank members for their interjections in support, and advise the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that I think the interjections are correct; and that asking what the implications are for the Government does legitimise the question.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am delighted to be able to answer the question and to say that the implications might be tritely put as being implications of a certain persistence for the present Government.

The reason that I am pleased to be able to answer the question is simply that it gives me the opportunity to say that, unlike the impression that some people in the Opposition ranks are trying to create, the accession of Mr Simpson to the presidency of the Liberal Party is unlikely to make one jot of difference. It is high popolorum or low popohigherum. The only difference is that the bark is cut from a different height on the tree. In this case the dogs having been barking for

at least the last week that the deal has been done with Mr Simpson to permit the Colin Street junta to have its vice presidential nominee—we were not to know that that was Mr Payne—elected to the position of vice president, whereas the position of president, I was led to believe, would be left for Mr Simpson, so that nothing much would change.

I may be wrong and Mr Simpson's accession to the lofty position of President of the WA branch of the Liberal Party, with the broad vision and prospects that that position has, may well see a complete turnaround in the Liberal Party's fortunes, and may well see the Government confronted with a substantial and vibrant Opposition of the sort we have been promised for the past four years.

Mr Stephens: Do you guarantee us you will not add to the number of advisers in order to counter the effect that it has?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I should think we would be able to halve them. I want to go on public record as saying that at least the Government knows there is no difference in the party president being Mr Payne or Mr Simpson. If both of them are put in a bag and the bag shaken up and one is tipped out, then grab him by the scruff of the neck and put him back, because there is no difference whatsoever. I wanted that to be public as our position, and to say that we watch what happens in the Liberal Party with some detachment but with not enough insulation to know that that sort of thing has never happened in our party either; but that we do believe strong Oppositions contribute to strong Governments. However, the accession of Mr Simpson is unlikely to change the strength or otherwise of the Liberal Party in any way.

PREMIER

Hobart Flight: Class

171. **Mr CLARKO,** to the Premier:

- (1) During his recent flight from Perth to Hobart for the Australian Labor Party Conference, did he fly first class?

- (2) Did any of his accompanying party of Government employees fly first class during his visit to Hobart?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) As per the guidelines that I think were tabled in the Parliament in answer to a question, I flew first class and one of the officers who was flying with me was nominated to fly first class.

Mr Clarko: Did you say who he was?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I was going to say that that officer changed from time to time and was, variously, Ron Barrie, and Kevin Edwards.

Mr Clarko: Did your driver fly first class?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: No, he did not, but should I require him to fly first class, he will, and I hope he will enjoy it. I know the member for Karrinyup's driver would cling to the tail plane and the member would lean out the window and throw stones at him.

Mr Clarko: The CSA would like to know who flies first class.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am happy to tell the CSA. If the member for Karrinyup is the agent for the CSA, I will tell him, but I am happy to tell the CSA. I do not have any hang-up about my driver, or ministerial services officer, or whatever the member wants to call him.

Mr Clarko: Or whatever you call him.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Or whatever I call him. As far as I am concerned, whichever officer is nominated, be he the commissionaire or the director general of my department, then we will comply with the guidelines and one will be permitted to fly first class. I do not know why it is that the member has such a set against these working people—

Mr Clarko: I asked a straightforward question. You do not know my motives other than what I told you.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I know the member did, and I do not know what his motives are but because these people are not as highly educated as the member, with MACE after their names and things like that—

Mr Pearce: AE.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: AE—Aerial Excellence! It is no good being a Mr Grouch, going around from day to day trying to deny them the right to breathe the same air as the member does.

Mr Clarko: All Australians saw you grouch last week when Gerry spoke.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I give up, Mr Speaker.

TECHNOLOGY DIRECTORATE

Acting Director

172. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Industry and Technology:

- (1) Has the Acting Director of the State's Technology Directorate, who took over from Dr Darryl Hull, resigned?
- (2) If so, when will a new director and a new acting director be appointed?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) Consideration is being given to the time frame. I have not made a decision yet about advertising the position.

Mr Stephen Beere from the Technology Development Authority agreed to act in a temporary capacity to take over the helm of the Technology Directorate upon the resignation of Dr Hull.

As to whether he has actually submitted his resignation, I suggest that the member for Nedlands read the columns of tomorrow's newspapers and discover the good news, because I do not think I have enough time under Standing Orders to give him chapter and verse. He will find really good news associated with appointments which Mr Stephen Beere and one other key member of my staff are taking up

WA COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Leadership

173. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Education:

I refer to an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of Saturday, 5 July in which the Minister was reported as saying, "The WA College of Advanced Education has a leader-

ship dearth at the moment, though something will be done to correct this in the short term".

- (1) What does he mean by "a leadership dearth" at the college?
- (2) What will be done "to correct this in the short term"?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) In my view there are a number of problems in tertiary education at present. The WA College of Advanced Education has always been a slightly uneasy amalgam in terms of the way in which the amalgamation was forced on the previous Government by the Commonwealth Government some years ago. When I first became Minister there was quite a deal of sorting out to be done and I think members will recall that in 1983 we legislated to give a more secure basis to the college.

I do not want to reflect on individual discussions I have had with a range of people at the college, but I am concerned that in the context of some of the things involving the State's needs in regard to tertiary education and the State's plans for tertiary education, the college is not fitting quite as neatly as it might into those arrangements. There seems to be a little loss of direction among staff members at the college, and I do not want to put it more firmly than that.

I have asked the Director of the WA College of Advanced Education, Dr Jecks, and the chairperson of the college council, Dr Paige Porter, to see me in order to discuss these matters. We are also looking at the composition of the council of the college in terms of the Hetherington report with a view to having some relationship in the way the decision-making functions of the college operate.

I want to make clear my comments in the general context of the newspaper article. I asked WAPSEC to report on the viability of an amalgamation of Murdoch University, the Western Australian Institute of Technology, and the Western Australian College of Advanced Education. The amalgamation proposal indicated a number of problems we currently face in tertiary education, but the proposal does

cause other problems. I have asked WAPSEC to report on what it believes ought to be done.

In response to the reporter's question of why I felt that that proposal ought to be considered, I indicated that I felt there were difficulties in each of the three institutions that would be involved in the amalgamation.

The problem with Murdoch University is that although it is in some senses institutionally strong, it is a little aberrant in terms of some policies which are pursued and particularly in terms of trying to get coordination by the Government on an approach to tertiary education. It has the particular effect of restricting the number of university students in WA to 40 per cent of total tertiary enrolments, whereas in NSW university students comprise 60 per cent of total tertiary enrolments. That means that the differential in funding between CAE students and university students is denied to WA for 20 per cent of students, and that money goes to NSW instead. Although that is not Murdoch's fault directly, the fact that Murdoch is such a small university and there is no other university, apart from the University of WA, is the main contributing factor for that loss of funds and research capacity to Western Australia.

The problem with the WA College of Advanced Education is that it is diverse, but because it operates purely at an advanced education level it does not have the capacity to get into a research and development role, which it sees to be important.

With WAIT the problem is basically a lack of resources. It has strong leadership but its resources are scarce.

The amalgamation proposal was suggested as a way of overcoming those three problems at once in the State's interest. In putting forward that proposal I did not seek to reflect adversely on any tertiary institution. Obviously an amalgamation proposal of that kind sets a whole range of vested interests in train, and some of the comments which have been made by various people have been some-

what intemperate. But my intention in promoting that proposal was not to attack individual institutions, and I do not seek now to attack the WA College of Advanced Education, but merely to recognise that there are problems in tertiary education in WA which this Government is trying honestly and courageously to address.

SMALL BUSINESS

Rural: Assistance

174. Mr SCHELL, to the Minister for Small Business:

As Treasury assistance to small business is confined to areas declared drought affected, and there are many rural businesses outside those areas in need of financial assistance, will he give consideration to changing the conditions of the small business guarantee scheme in order to allow this scheme to be used to assist small rural businesses which have severe short-term liquidity problems?

Mr TROY replied:

The member for Mt Marshall's question cuts across the inquiry that has been in progress for some weeks. This matter relates to the working party which I indicated last week had submitted its report which is before Cabinet for consideration. I am not in a position to reveal the contents of the report other than to say the point raised by the member is covered by one of the recommendations currently being pursued to see whether that avenue of assistance is possible. I can well and truly appreciate the concern of small rural businesses, but one of the great predicaments we faced, which I am sure the member would acknowledge, is that the approach came at a very late stage. It was crucial to that part of the season and certainly the question of a legislative solution to the recommendations brought forward make it even more difficult within the time frame facing us. We are examining the recommendations very carefully to see what avenues are open to us, and we hope to make an announcement in the near future.

ENERGY

Gas Pipeline: Bennett Brook

175. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is he aware that in a recent court case in an action involving the Swan Valley Fringedwellers the SEC indicated that unless the connection of the gas pipeline across Bennett Creek was made, consumers in the northern suburbs would be without gas this winter?
- (2) Are those consumers now in danger of being without gas, bearing in mind that the report of the case indicated that the connection had to be made very quickly?
- (3) If so, what action is to be taken to resolve that problem?

- (4) When can we expect the whole question of Wagyl and the Bennett Creek saga to be resolved?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (4) I am aware that such a comment was made in the Supreme Court. My understanding is that there is no current problem with gas supplies to the northern suburbs for either domestic or industrial users. The SEC has obtained legal advice in relation to the decision made last week by Mr Justice Rowland of the Supreme Court, and it will be taking action as a result of that advice at the earliest opportunity. Obviously to some considerable degree we are in the hands of the Supreme Court as to the timing of that action and, as a result, I am unable to answer the third part of the question. The matter is unfortunately out of my control.

