

good record on drugs. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that. Therefore, I think it is appropriate that I make those comments in response to what has already been said.

This is a suspension of standing orders so that we can rearrange business, which had previously been rearranged, to give us more time to deal with a matter.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

CHILDREN AND COMMUNITY SERVICES AMENDMENT (BODY PIERCING) BILL 2007

Second Reading

DR J.M. WOOLLARD (Alfred Cove) [4.05 pm]: I move -

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill is required to give children under the age of 18 years the same protection against body piercing as they currently have against branding and tattooing. The bill amends the Children and Community Services Act 2004 to make it an offence for a person to pierce any part of the body of a child, defined in the act as a person under the age of 18, without obtaining written consent of the child's parent. The bill will provide the same penalty for body piercing a child under the age of 18 as already exists for tattooing or branding a child.

In 2004 I proposed a similar amendment to the children and community services legislation when it was being debated in Parliament. Although the Liberals in this house supported the amendment, the government refused at that time to support the amendment, which would have protected young children, often only 13 or 14 years of age, from having their bodies pierced and leaving them open to acute and chronic health problems. I proposed that amendment because of concerns raised with me by constituents, particularly distressed mothers who found out that their children had body piercings only when there were serious medical complications. Distressed parents have called the police, the Department of Consumer and Employment Protection and Legal Aid WA when they have discovered that their children have had mutilating or disfiguring body piercings, and have been told that there is no legislation relating to body piercing in Western Australia and that current legislation covers only branding and tattooing. At the moment in Western Australia, children can come home mutilated and disfigured with pins, rings and studs embedded in all parts of their bodies, and there is nothing that parents can do to prevent it.

Queensland already has legislation in place, and recently South Australia and Victoria have moved to introduce similar legislation. I believe that we should be legislating to protect our children. I was extremely pleased when the current Minister for Child Protection, Sue Ellery, stated publicly that she would personally support protection for children from body piercings. I hope that she is able to persuade members of her party to support this legislation so that it has bipartisan support.

Under current legislation, the fine for branding or tattooing a child under the age of 18 is \$12 000 and imprisonment for one year. This bill will see the same penalty applied for body piercing. The bill does not affect piercing for medical or therapeutic purposes, such as acupuncture.

Medical problems arising from body piercing are well documented. It can cause mutilation and disfigurement, permanent body scarring, blood poisoning, toxic shock, hepatitis, AIDS and cartilage damage. Although body piercings may seem fashionable and trendy to young children, we should be legislating to protect them against potential serious health consequences. Serious infections and problems breastfeeding later in life can result from nipple piercings. Male and female genital piercings and scrotal skin piercings carry the highest risk because they involve deep tissue. That is why the bill does not allow these types of piercings for a child under the age of 18 even with parental consent. Many piercings can take a long time to heal. Lip piercings take up to six months and nose or navel piercings can take up to a year to heal. People who have their tongues pierced may suffer complications such as infection or blood poisoning. Other problems include tongue swelling, bleeding and nerve damage, as well as chipped teeth and speech impediments.

I urge everyone, as responsible members of Parliament, to support this legislation to ensure that young people in the community are protected from making a trendy lifestyle choice that could have dire consequences for them in the future.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr D.A. Templeman (Minister for the Environment)**.

POWER GENERATION - ALBANY

Motion

Resumed from 13 September 2006 on the following motion moved by Dr G.G. Jacobs -

That this government develop infrastructure to allow power generation out of Albany to power proof the great southern region.

DR G.G. JACOBS (Roe) [4.11 pm]: At the outset I would like to say that this does not mean I have moved my interest to Albany; however, it does affect a significant amount of my electorate as it stands today.

My motion, to which I have already spoken somewhat on 13 September 2006, proposes the development of infrastructure to allow power generation out of Albany. I put this as a proposal, project and exercise in lateral thinking because what appears to be developing - although given as the easiest and least expensive option in the long term - might not be best for the region. I would like, at the outset, with the Minister for Energy in the house, to commend him for his announcement today of a headworks subsidy program. The headworks charges for electricity connection in areas of my electorate are prohibitive. The problems in Ravensthorpe in connecting residential, semi-commercial and commercial enterprises are significant. I believe they impede the development of the region, particularly in Ravensthorpe where there is the development of a very big nickel mine run by BHP Billiton. The problems of electricity and the supply of electricity in a region such as Ravensthorpe are part of the issues that I want to examine today. The minister well knows the problems. He has been down to the area to see the problems. One problem is the very long transmission lines, which lead to problems with capacity because of high resistance over very long distances - we are talking about 270 kilometres for the town of Ravensthorpe. There are resistance losses and reliability issues, as well as power outages and problems with capacity. It is the capacity of electricity in the regions that is very significant.

When the issue of Grange Resources Ltd's Southdown project came up and was on the horizon, as it were, there were again issues of power. That was not only for the project, but also for those places along the way between Kojonup and Southdown, which is just out of Wellstead. Central to the issue is the advent of a very important iron ore project, the Southdown magnetite project. It is a high-grade ore body that is located 90 kilometres north-east of the port of Albany on the south coast of Western Australia. Very much north of that are areas of my electorate in the lower great southern, including Jerramungup, Ravensthorpe, Gnowangerup, Ongerup and all places in between that have traditionally had both capacity of power and reliability issues for a very long time.

The evaluation of the Southdown magnetite deposit commenced in the mid-1980s with airborne and ground magnetic surveys outlining a magnetic anomaly. This has been developed to a project that is ready to go ahead in that region. My involvement came about when the concept of supplying the much-needed power for the project was first brought to my attention. Significant amounts of power were involved. We are talking of the magnitude of 100 megawatts. If members are non-engineers like me, that might not mean a lot to them. To put it in perspective, the whole City of Albany on peak load will pull about 25 megawatts. Essentially, on the doorstep of Albany was a big project that required a lot of electricity.

Initially, the preferred option was supplying power to the Southdown project with a 300-kilometre high-voltage powerline on 42.5-metre towers running across country via Kojonup from Muja. This was when it was brought to my attention by some landowners. Landowners often feel aggrieved by easements and, understandably, no-one is particularly amenable or happy about high-voltage towers and powerlines running across his or her land. Putting aside the nimby syndrome - not in my backyard - there are some issues concerning the supply of the 100 megawatts of power to this project via powerlines. There were some community concerns about not only the easements for the powerlines, but also - if members understand the term - the vista. The initial route planned for the powerline was just to clip the north-east corner of Stirling Range National Park. When I attended a public forum in Borden some time ago, there were some concerns. Since that time - the minister will elucidate this, no doubt - there have been other options since the original option for the route of the powerline. Other routes have included going south of Stirling Range National Park. The third option was to develop the easement of the Kojonup to Albany line to supply extra capacity down that line. No matter what route is chosen, there will be easement and vista issues and landholders will have concerns. The tendency will be to play one off against the other. In an ideal world, no-one would have high-voltage powerlines across or close to their land. The reality is that we must supply power to the Southdown project, because it will provide employment opportunities for people in the region and add to our economy.

At this point I will use a bit of lateral thinking. There may be other ways of supplying power to the project that will benefit not only Albany, but also the smaller regions I have talked about. I have been told by some engineers that although a high-voltage powerline could be built through or around some of the smaller places that have had capacity and reliability power problems for a number of years, it is almost unviable to develop a substation that will allow those smaller centres to benefit from that line. Building a substation to transform the power to usable household power is unviable because it would cost in the vicinity of \$10 million. That is almost like rubbing salt into a wound, because although a high-voltage powerline will be built for the Southdown project, people in the smaller areas will not be able to access that power and they will continue to experience capacity and reliability problems.

There is one option that could solve all these problems and dispel concerns in the region. Rather than building high-voltage powerlines to projects such as Southdown or to any other project that may pop up in the region, we should power proof the region by extending the Dampier to Bunbury gas pipeline to Albany. That would mean a base-load gas-fired power station in Albany with the capacity to supply not only the Wellstead Southdown

project 90 kilometres up the road, but also Albany's capacity into the future. It would reticulate domestic gas to Albany, gas that is now trucked. There is reticulation, as you would know Mr Acting Speaker (Mr P.B. Watson); however, under this proposal, it would be supplied by a gas pipeline. A gas-fired power station would be cleaner and greener - it would not be pristine - than burning coal. If the Dampier to Bunbury gas pipeline were extended to Albany, there would be many users. The smaller regions such as Jerramungup, Ravensthorpe, Gnowangerup and Ongerup could be supplied with power.

Before I number-crunch that proposal, the question I put to the house is: can we look at this proposal differently? If another project pops up in the region, will we run another high-voltage powerline to that project? Do we think of the region as a whole and build a gas-fired power station with capacity in Albany? The hematite that is carried via a pipeline to Albany would have to be dried. That would require seven megawatts of power. A gas-fired power station with supply from a gas pipeline would provide the potential to run gas heaters to dry the slurry.

Members should consider the capacity of Wignall's winery. It does not have the ability to connect to power to drive its vats. The winery must use a standalone power source, even though it is not too far from the City of Albany. A 100-megawatt power station uses about 25 terajoules of gas a day. When I discussed this matter earlier in the year, one terajoule of gas - this figure is subject to change - cost \$5 000. That is about \$125 000 a day, which equates to \$52 per megawatt an hour. Admittedly, we are looking at about \$33 per megawatt an hour for a coal-fired power station. A 10-inch pipeline would need to be built to deliver 25 terajoules of gas to Albany. The pipeline could be buried at \$5 000 per inch per kilometre. A 10-inch pipeline would cost about \$50 000 per kilometre. To run a pipeline from Bunbury to Albany, 320 kilometres, would cost about \$160 million. Admittedly, natural gas prices have doubled in the past 18 months. However, this state has oodles of gas in the North West Shelf. We must support the Premier's stand to earmark 20 per cent of that gas for Western Australia's domestic use. A significant amount of gas must be earmarked for projects that benefit Western Australia. We will have to think outside the square if we are going to power proof the great southern region, including the lower great southern region, as stated in this motion. If we simply install high-voltage powerlines directly to a project and none of the local communities benefit either from improved capacity or reliability in electricity services, where are we going and why?

This is an opportunity. We have a big user of electricity that will take 100 megawatts of power. The City of Albany uses 25 megawatts of power in total. This is an opportunity for a big power user to develop the necessary infrastructure in partnership with the government, because the Grange project is a big customer. If the big power user gets the power it needs, local communities benefit along the way. With sufficient electrical capacity, the region will be power proofed into the foreseeable future.

The minister could say that, as things stand at the moment, this project is not viable. I will admit that if we were to crunch the numbers and stack the figures against one another, this project would probably cost a third more than the cost of a high-voltage powerline. However, we need to think about the wider issues, including those communities with no electricity supply today or in the foreseeable future. The option of building a substation, at a cost of \$10 million, to tap electricity from a 130-kilovolt line and transform it into a useable domestic supply is never going to happen for these communities. The issues of reliability and capacity, headworks charges and connection fees are always going to be a problem in these smaller areas.

If members are able to think outside the square for just a moment, the Grange Resources project might in fact supply the required electricity to this project, and to any other project that may pop up along the way in the region, without the need for 300 kilometres of high-voltage cross-country powerlines. It might supply electricity to the smaller regions and to Albany, as well as provide Albany with the capacity to run a fully reticulated domestic gas supply. If we do not think outside the square and use opportunities like this to take advantage of the big customers that come along, and if all we are going to do is think about the easy or the cheapest option, there will be no development in the region around this project.

This is a good project. I believe, minister, that the power requirements are now set at 75 megawatts, not the 100 megawatts initially thought to be required, with the initial power requirement to be stepped up as the project develops.

This is a good opportunity, yet we continue to burn coal. We continue to put all our eggs in the one basket. I suggest to members that the requirement for 100 megawatts of power supplied by burning coal is putting all our eggs in that one basket. An alternative solution might be to combine the generation of electricity supply with the Muja electricity source. It might be that we can generate those 100 megawatts using a hybrid of gas and coal generation methods. However, to do that would mean transporting the electricity across country some 300 kilometres. On average there is probably a 10 per cent drop in power supply due to line resistance, so there will be wastage due to resistance because of the long line to the project. As I have already said, the burning of gas is not entirely clean, but it is cleaner than burning coal. However, if we are serious about the environment, here is a project that will reduce the amount of power-supply generated carbon dioxide emissions.

We will no doubt hear from the minister about the cost advantages of the proposed electricity supply routes. Perhaps the most favoured route is from Kojonup down to Albany, bolstering the electricity supply to Albany and therefore to this project. I have had people from across the region contact me about these issues. If we stack up the various projects, we find that there are some cost disadvantages in the gas pipeline project. However, that is without considering the long-term advantages to be gained from having a long-term vision for the region.

Earlier this year the opposition asked the minister some questions about the project. We asked who was going to fund the project under the present arrangements and we asked who was going to pay the \$200 million for the 300-kilometre powerline. In his response, the minister stated that the cost was only \$175 million, plus or minus 30 per cent. I thought that was a very interesting response.

I have asked some experts to look at this project. Albany's power consumption has a 45-megawatt peak load and a 20-megawatt average load. The wind farm produces a 22-megawatt peak output load but averages a 10-megawatt output load. The wind farm is independent of the Albany demand. It could be argued that the local power station would provide benefit to the power network, including the SWIS.

In 2005-2006, liquefied petroleum gas deliveries to Albany totalled 150 terajoules. LPG is reticulated through pipes to customers but is transported to the town by truck. If natural gas were brought to Albany, the operational cost would decrease by \$1.5 million per annum. Admittedly, that excludes the cost of the pipeline. Capital costs of up to \$10 million would be needed to modify household appliances and gas networks, based on the recent experience of converting 300 homes at The Vines.

Mr A.D. McRae: Member, did you say \$1.5 million in savings?

Dr G.G. JACOBS: Yes, per annum.

Mr A.D. McRae: Minus the operational costs?

Dr G.G. JACOBS: As I have just stated, we are not factoring in the price of the pipeline.

Mr A.D. McRae: The capital or the operational costs?

Dr G.G. JACOBS: We are not factoring in the capital costs associated with building the pipeline.

I will be very honest with the house. The benefit from a natural gas pipeline would not be material, and there are some concerns about how the project would stack up. The two options are the expansion of the power supply to the south west integrated system from a base-load generator, and the Dampier to Bunbury gas pipeline extension, with a 100-megawatt power plant located in Albany and the power back-supplied to the Grange Resources Ltd Southdown project. The SWIS expansion option with the high-voltage powerline is cheaper, but the Dampier to Bunbury gas pipeline extension option could become viable if the government funded part of the pipeline capital cost, say, up to \$80 million; a power supply agreement with Grange were concluded with the appropriate credit undertakings; and the rules governing the wholesale electricity market incentivised distributed power. I will define some of those terms in the time that I have left.

"Incentivising" is an awful word, and not one that I would normally use, but it was included in the advice that I received. Incentivising distributed power means structuring the market rules to favour power plants closer to end users. That is what would happen if the power plant were located in Albany. Currently, power put into, or drawn from, the SWIS at Albany is worth more than power at the reference point, Muja. Powerline losses mean that not all the power put into the line at Muja makes it to Albany. Line losses are a function of line capacity and the load carried by the line. On the current 132-kilovolt line to Albany, line losses are as high as 10 per cent. Essentially, this means that building a power plant at Albany would provide a 10 per cent advantage over one at Muja, all other things being equal. The way the current market rules operate, if a power plant were built at Albany, the power would then flow locally, and if less power were drawn from Muja, the line loss would drop. The 10 per cent advantage is now only two per cent. The new wholesale electricity market is still working through many of those concepts.

The reference to credit undertakings means that the gas company would have to be confident that Grange was a worthwhile partner for a \$200 million commitment, which is the commitment it has given for the high-voltage powerline in any case. The risk in a power plant is lower than that of a pipeline, except that the power plant is deliberately located close to the customer's edge of the power network. Provided there is surety in the project - if it is a goer and is sustainable - there are good credit undertakings, and there are some incentivising distributed power issues in building the power plant closer to where the power is needed, which would happen if gas were provided to a base-load power station in Albany so that power could be generated, the Dampier to Bunbury pipeline option would be viable if the government committed \$80 million. The power supply agreement with Grange could be concluded with the appropriate credit undertakings. The third part is the wholesale electricity market incentivising the distributed power generation, because the power station is located close to where the power is required. I put that as an option with vision for the region. It is important that we think of these things, particularly when there is a large customer that, in partnership with the government, can supply power to not only itself, but also the community, which benefits everybody.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Darling Range) [4.45 pm]: This motion calls on the government to develop power generation in Albany, to decentralise the power generation arrangements that exist at the moment, and in particular to provide a greater range of options to the great southern region. As you would be well aware, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr P.B. Watson), there is already some electricity generation in the Albany area - the wind farm established in 1999 or 2000, with about 24 megawatts of generating capacity. It was a very welcome development, although careful management and community consultation were needed to get approval for the project during the time of the previous government. It was handled carefully and sensitively, and the wind farm in the Albany area is now well accepted, and has become something of a tourist attraction for the area, apart from providing a not insignificant amount of electricity for the south west integrated system. However, in the view of the opposition, it is necessary that an additional option be available for power generation in the area.

A lot of concern is being expressed, and there has been quite a bit of debate about the various options being considered for power supply for the Grange Resources Southdown project. I am not familiar with all of the routes being considered, but I know that one is proposed for the western side of the road between the proposed project and Albany. I received a letter earlier this month, which presumably has also been sent to the Premier, the Minister for Energy and the Leader of the Opposition, from a group known as the Plantagenet line upgrade group, or PLUG. You are nodding, Mr Acting Speaker; you are obviously familiar with that group.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I met with them on Saturday morning, member.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is good to hear. This group is composed of landowners in the area who will be potentially affected by the proposed 220-kilovolt Kojonup-Albany transmission line, which is being considered as part of the requirements for the Grange Resources Southdown project. The residents make the point that they are not opposed to a powerline being constructed, but they are concerned about the process that is being used. I cannot comment from firsthand experience; I am relating the concerns being expressed to the opposition and others. The group is also concerned about the potential high impact of some of the routes being considered. Apparently, a public community meeting was held in Mt Barker on 25 July, attended by 140 or 150 people, which indicates a significant degree of concern in the area. The group makes the point in the letter that, in its view, the consultation process was flawed. A significant number - possibly 20 per cent - of landowners did not initially receive notification of the proposal. Hopefully, that has been overcome and those people who were not informed previously have now been included in the process, as others have been. The local residents are seeking the selection of a route that will have less impact than that which is presently proposed. They say that the route being considered passes through the most densely populated parts of the local area. It is an area of small-scale intensive agriculture on prime agricultural land.

One aspect the Plantagenet line upgrade group is concerned about is the potential for devaluation of their properties. They make the point that many of the residents in the area have their superannuation tied up in the value of their properties. They suggest that a gas-fired power plant be established in the Albany area supplied from a number of alternative possibilities. The most desirable possibility, which I will come back to in a moment, would be by a gas pipeline extended from Bunbury to Albany. They also suggest that gas could be supplied by ship, or that diesel could be used initially, with the option of using gas from the Bremer basin at a later stage. They have also suggested that underground transmission lines might be used, although I imagine that would be an extremely expensive option and possibly very hard to make it economically viable.

They go on to say that, if the only option is to construct a new above-ground powerline, it must have a minimal impact on the local landscape. They make the point that there is a 132-kilovolt line in existence from Kojonup to Albany, carried on wooden posts, which is about 45 years old. It will need replacing at some stage. Obviously, the relevant easements are already in place and it would be more desirable to upgrade that powerline or replace it, given the existing easements, rather than create a whole new easement that would impact on new areas.

Another route suggested is through the Hay Sheepwash state forest; an area I do not know in great detail, although I am familiar with the general area. The residents point out that it would be a shorter route, which would alleviate any potential impact on possibly 150 properties or so. They request that members of Parliament assist by delaying the selection process, revisit the effectiveness of the selection process and consider alternative options for providing power in the area and, in the absence of finding a better route, downgrade the powerline from a 220-kilovolt line to a 132-kilovolt line. Whether that will produce the desired objective may be another matter. I will be interested to hear what the Minister for Energy says in response.

That puts on record the concerns of the Plantagenet line upgrade group about the options that are being considered. I hope the Minister for Energy will give a comprehensive response to those concerns when he makes his comments.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: If the 132-kilovolt line is upgraded, another easement will have to be created for it, which will add to the complication of this process. I suppose we could expect the minister to perhaps comment on that.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is a good point and I hope the minister will respond also to that point. One of the options that was referred to in the letter was to extend the gas pipeline from Bunbury through to Albany. That

was very much the Liberal and National Party coalition's policy for the 2005 state election. If there had been a change of government at that election that pipeline would probably be under construction by now.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The minister might scoff at that, but I will remind members opposite of a little history in relation to the development of gas pipelines in Western Australia. If members have an open mind, they might then realise that it is not such a fanciful suggestion. It is important to remember -

Mr A.D. McRae: The Mt Magnet spur line -

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will come back to that also.

Mr F.M. Logan: Maybe you can dig it up and use it.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Does the member for Cockburn take himself seriously as Minister for Energy in developing Western Australia or does he think it is appropriate to make facile comments like that? If I were in his position, I would want to be taken seriously.

Mr F.M. Logan: Your government paid for it and there is nothing happening there at the moment; it is empty.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: My understanding is that the mine is being redeveloped. In any case, the pipeline is there as part of the state's infrastructure for the future. Western Australia does have very substantial natural gas reserves, partly onshore, but largely offshore in the North West Shelf area, for example, in the Browse Basin area further north and in other areas. We are very fortunate in that respect. Those reserves are largely contributing to the state's booming economy.

Mr A.D. McRae: I support you on that. There has been a lot of excitement in the east about the discovery of three trillion cubic feet of gas reserves in Bass Strait.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is good to hear.

Mr A.D. McRae: That is terrific. But three TCF is very small bickies.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It will last probably three years or so but I guess the member for Riverton's point is right; in Western Australia, when this paper was put together about three years ago, our reserves amounted to 150 TCF and probably more has been located since that time. We are very fortunate in this state. Those reserves benefit not only Western Australia but also the whole of the Australian nation. Coalition governments have recognised the importance of these reserves and, importantly, they have taken key decisions to develop resources for domestic use and to develop liquefied natural gas for export.

Mr A.D. McRae interjected.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I was going to come back to that. The change of government occurred in early 1983. However, I understand that all the groundwork had been done by the previous coalition government, which was in office until early 1983. Sir Charles Court was the Premier until early 1982. Peter Jones was the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce, and a lot of negotiation occurred at that time. The formal signing of the contract may well have occurred after the Labor government came to office early in 1983.

Mr A.D. McRae: I am not discounting the lead-up work that was done; I am saying it is not just Liberal governments that have pursued energy security in Western Australia.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I made the point that a lot of development has occurred when coalition governments have been in office; however, it is the case that there has been bipartisan interest in developing gas reserves in Western Australia. It would be madness not to have a bipartisan approach.

We are very fortunate that there are large amounts of gas available in this state. It is important that, whenever possible, we get greater value out of our gas reserves than we are getting at the moment. It is certainly valuable to the state and to the nation to be exporting LNG as we are at the moment, initially to Japan and then Korea and now in potentially large quantities to China and to other countries. However, from a local point of view, we need to do more if we can to get greater value out of the reserves that are available. Extending the gas pipeline grid further in Western Australia is a very important way of doing that.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: We are very grateful in Esperance to have a gas-fired power station that has the potential to produce 30 megawatts of power interfaced with a wind-driven power station.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: How much gas is being produced at the moment in Esperance?

Dr G.G. Jacobs: There are six five-megawatt gas turbines. They do not all run at once, as we do not need all that power at any one time. There are generally about four running, and that is North West Shelf gas piped all the way from Kalgoorlie to Esperance. That is very viable for us.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Indeed, and I was going to mention the pipeline extension to Esperance, which followed expressions of interest called for in 2000.

I will return to the first pipeline that was established in Western Australia; that is, the Parmelia pipeline, previously known as the WANG pipeline - I presume that stands for Western Australian natural gas. It went from the Dongara gas field area to Perth and was established in 1971. As was mentioned in the exchange a couple of minutes ago, there is the Dampier to Bunbury natural gas pipeline, which was completed in 1984, although the lead-up to the construction of that pipeline occurred over the previous four years or so and it was necessary for a take-or-pay contract to be put in place to enable that project to be undertaken. I recall that the former Premier, Sir Charles Court, was subject to quite a bit of criticism, if not at the time - I suspect there was quite a bit of debate at the time - then certainly in the so-called WA Inc royal commission, or the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters, which was held in 1992. I think one of the terms of reference was to inquire whether any inappropriate conduct or corruption had been involved in that take-or-pay contract. The results of that royal commission clearly showed that nothing of the sort was involved and that the construction of the Dampier to Bunbury pipeline was completely above board. I think everybody now accepts that the development of the pipeline was very much in the state's interests both at the time and since.

Other important projects were put in place when coalition governments were in office. There was the Pilbara gas pipeline from the Burrup Peninsula north east to Port Hedland, which is about 230 kilometres and was completed in 1996; the goldfields gas pipeline that was referred to a moment ago, which is 1 560 kilometres and was completed in 1996; the Busselton lateral pipeline of 16 kilometres, which was completed in 1998; and the mid-west pipeline of 430 kilometres, which was completed in 1999. Government members like to scoff at that pipeline to some extent, but it was constructed to provide gas to not only the Windimurra vanadium mine but also Mt Magnet for power generation. I think I am also right in saying that it is used for power generation at Yalgoo and other places. The member for Roe made reference to the extension of the goldfields gas pipeline south east to Esperance in more recent times. We therefore have a substantial grid of gas pipelines in Western Australia. There has also been the redevelopment at the Telfer goldmine, which is 450 kilometres east of Port Hedland. That has resulted in the construction of a new pipeline to that project, which serves not only the Telfer goldmine but also other mining projects in the area.

However, one area really stands out as an area where gas is not provided at present but where gas could be provided through a pipeline; that is, from Bunbury through to Albany. I am sure that as the member for Albany, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr P.B. Watson), you would not oppose an extension of the gas pipeline from Bunbury to Albany. It would clearly be to the benefit of people in the Albany area. It could be reticulated to people's homes, given that there is already a gas reticulation system in Albany. In addition, a pipeline would make gas available for the further development of industrial opportunities in the area, potentially in the field of timber industry processing, mineral processing and horticulture processing, and gas could also be used in the viticulture industry. The route of the pipeline would most likely be through Bridgetown, Manjimup, Mt Barker and Donnybrook.

Can I request an extension of time, Mr Acting Speaker?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am sorry, it is too late. I would like to give the member an extension of time.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is fine. I will conclude my comments. I think I have made the point that a gas pipeline needs to be extended to Albany, and that should be put in place as soon as possible.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn - Minister for Energy) [5.05 pm]: In response to the motion moved by the member for Roe, I am not too sure about what members opposite are driving at. I cannot work out whether this motion is being driven by a group of people who are opposed to the proposed line routes for the transmission lines to the Grange Resources mine; or whether the proposition in the motion goes to the heart of the possibility of power generation in the south in Albany. I do not know, basically, what the member for Roe's motion is driving at.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: If you had been listening -

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I have been listening to all of the debate.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: With respect, I developed that theme. It is one of vision. It is a vision of covering the needs of the region. It is a way of doing that, rather than merely building a high-voltage powerline for a particular customer without any benefit to the region. It is about thinking outside the square, but it is also about a vision for the power needs of the region into the future. I thought I had explained that.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I listened to the member's debate the first time around, I have read *Hansard* and I have listened to the debate today. I am still not too sure about it. It did seem to me to swing from the second proposition put forward by the member for Roe, which is about the disaggregation of power generation so that power can be generated out of Albany and, therefore, supposedly reinforce the system out of Albany. However, the debate then swung back to transmission line routes, to Grange Resources and to the power demands from Grange Resources. Sure, there could be some overlap between the two, but I still cannot foresee what the motion is driving at, particularly the way in which it is structured.

Let us go back to why I am saying this. First of all, we must bear in mind the whole process of disaggregation of Western Power and the disaggregation legislation that we introduced in 2005. We have to start at that point because the world has moved on. It is a completely different environment from what it was at the time the member for Darling Range referred to when governments stepped in and put in place pipelines and built transmission lines. It is a different world. We have a wholesale energy marketplace now into which anybody can step.

Mr J.H.D. Day: If there was no support, would the Bunbury pipeline have been constructed?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It is a wholesale energy market. Anybody can step into the market and provide power solutions for anybody. Grange Resources has looked at that.

Mr J.H.D. Day: It doesn't mean that it removes government leadership in some cases.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: We will get back in a second to the member for Darling Range's form of state intervention for markets.

Mr J.H.D. Day: They have been very successful.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: There is a series of regulations, which the member for Darling Range appears to forget about, that would prevent that. Given that he is the shadow Minister for Energy, he should know that.

Let us look at the requirement of Grange Resources, as that is the point that the member for Darling Range is driving at. The current anticipated demand from Grange Resources - as the member said, it has rescaled its operations to a staged development - is between 50 megawatts and 75 megawatts. That could be supplied by stand-alone generation at the mine site. My understanding is that Grange Resources has already looked at that, and it does not work out for it. It is not the scale of power generation that would -

Dr G.G. Jacobs: What you are saying is that the situation has changed, and now that it is 50 megawatts instead of 100, Grange is more likely to have a stand-alone plant. If so, why are we going through all these options of high-voltage powerlines to the site?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I will come to that. My understanding is that Grange Resources has looked at providing its own power solution. I am advised that it has looked at providing its own power solution to its own energy needs. That is not its core business, and the scale of the plant does not justify the investment that would be needed to meet its power demand. Therefore, it has gone to the marketplace and sought another solution. The solution that has been put forward by Western Power is to connect Grange Resources to the south west interconnected system. Unlike all the other places that both the member for Roe and his colleague have been talking about, Albany is on the south west interconnected system. It is part of the grid. Esperance is not part of the grid. Mt Magnet is not part of the grid. They are stand-alone power solutions because they are off the grid. Albany is on the grid. It is part of the SWIS.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Kalgoorlie is on the grid.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Yes, Kalgoorlie is also. Therefore, power can be provided to Albany from any source. It can come from Collie; it can come from Kalgoorlie; it can come from Kwinana. It goes into the grid. Therefore, unless there is a good economic reason to put a power plant in Albany, there is certainly no reason for the government to intervene in the marketplace and do that. However, I will come back to other solutions; okay? Nevertheless, that is the reason that Grange Resources has said that it is not economic for it to provide its own energy solutions. However, there is a grid not far away, and that can provide a solution for Grange Resources; that will be a better economic outcome for it.

There are two directions for the powerlines - not one, but two - and they are both being analysed right now by Western Power. There is the 220-kilovolt line from Kojonup to Albany, and there is the 220-kilovolt line from Albany to Wellstead. They are both being looked at, and the engineering analysis of both of them is being undertaken at the moment. Also, the line route analysis and consultation are being undertaken at the moment.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: Minister, where are we at with that?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: As I am advised, depending on the results of a feasibility study by Grange Resources itself -

Dr G.G. Jacobs: Do you mean to say that its options may change?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If the member will just let me finish, he will find out.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: You -

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No, no. I listened to the member in silence. I suggest that he do the same with me. He has asked the questions. He has put forward a motion. If he listens, he will get the answers.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: But I was really surprised that you couldn't get the concept of what I was about.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It is because the member has not explained it very well, and he certainly has not explained the economics of it.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: I spent 40 minutes doing it.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Yes, but it did not make any sense at all to anybody on this side of the house.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: That's not true, and you know it.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If the member listens, he might learn something. Depending on the results of a feasibility study by Grange Resources, the 220-kilovolt line from Albany may initially be sufficient to supply the Grange Resources mine at Wellstead, negating the need for a 220-kilovolt line from Muja to Wellstead through Broomehill.

A proposition is being put forward by the member for Roe that because Grange Resources has come along and has a bit of an energy demand, instead of meeting its needs by building a powerline and directing that powerline in such a way that it will be economically appropriate for the development of the mine, we should look at a completely alternative scenario, which is to build a gas pipeline to Albany - I will use the member for Roe's figure - for \$130 million, and to build a 100-megawatt stand-alone power station in Albany. However, we would then have to build a transmission line back from Albany to Grange Resources. Therefore, the people who are currently making complaints about the line routes will be okay. However, I can guarantee that wherever the new line comes back from Albany up to Grange Resources, another group of people will be saying that they do not want it going through their area.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: They do not want 42.5-metre towers and 130-kilovolt lines either. It is only 90 kilometres down the track.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Regardless of where it is, the scale of the power consumed would determine the size of the transmission line. The member seems to forget that. It would still require a transmission route from Albany back to Grange Resources. That is why I said that I cannot understand what the member for Roe's argument is at all. We have a complete interconnected system, and the solution for this company is to put a transmission line either north of the Stirling Range or south of the Stirling Range. For the company, its investment by way of its capital contribution to that line is cheaper than finding its own solution. Sure, Western Power will have to work out the route, negotiate that with all the landholders, finalise the route and put it through. We are being asked to not think about that but to think about a completely different scenario; that is, to build a \$130 million gas pipeline, to build a 100-megawatt power station and then to put a transmission line back up to Grange Resources, upsetting another group of landholders. That is the alternative. Why? Supposedly, according to the member for Roe, that will reinforce the network in the great southern. That is the sort of economic madness that has resulted in the Liberal Party being in opposition. It is in opposition because of those crazy economic proposals that have been put -

Dr G.G. Jacobs: I am trying to think with a bit of vision.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: My friend, that is not vision; it is hallucination. I am not saying that because it is my view of the economics. I am saying that because it is the opposition's view of the economics. The member himself set out the cost of what would be required to bring power to the mine site.

Let us go back to the point I was making earlier about what we can and cannot do in this environment today. We have had the disaggregation of Western Power. We have had the creation of a wholesale energy market. That has been very successful; it has been extremely successful. There are now in the region of 15 providers of energy into the south west interconnected system from a series of different sources, such as renewable power and fossil fuel power, and there will be more. If a company was willing to take up the proposition that has been put forward by the member for Roe to generate power in Albany - some companies are interested, by the way - that would be entirely up to that company. That would be an economic decision that that company would make. It would have to go through the normal process of registering itself as an energy generator, put forward its proposition as an energy generator, put forward its bid for capacity credits, have those capacity credits endorsed by the Independent Market Operator and then go into the marketplace to either sell its electricity into the market or find a bilateral customer. That is all quite possible, but why would they do it? The town of Albany has a power requirement of approximately 20 megawatts on average and 30 megawatts at peak. We should remember what was being put forward earlier by the member for Roe. He asked for a 100-megawatt gas-fired power station. The power requirements for the town is 20 megawatts on average and 30 megawatts at peak. The peak represents about one per cent of peak demand overall on the south west interconnected system. As it represents only one per cent of the total peak demand on SWIS, we do not find people rushing to invest in power generation in Albany. It does not matter whether it is a peak plant or a base-load plant; the reason people do not invest is that the economics do not stack up.

In terms of generation in Albany, there is the 22-megawatt Albany wind farm. There is a proposed and possible seven-megawatt extension to the Albany wind farm that will take it up to almost 30 megawatts. Discussions have taken place about a proposed biomass power station just north of Albany. There may be one 50-megawatt

power station and one 30-megawatt power station. Again, those discussions are in the early stages, and it all depends on what comes out of those discussions with Beacons.

Mr A.D. McRae interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It is a 50-megawatt power station and a 30-megawatt power station.

Mr A.D. McRae: Not 150?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No, not 150 - not even 100! It may be a 50-megawatt power station and a 30-megawatt power station depending on the outcomes of proposals that have been put up by one particular company.

The economics of taking coal to Albany would simply not stack up. The alternative, of course, as it has been put forward by the member for Roe and highlighted elsewhere is to take a gas pipeline to Albany. We heard the history of gas pipelines in Western Australia. It was eloquently put, but with just a little bit of revision because some of the history was missing - that bit was, "Oh yes, of course; we privatised it." The member forgot to put that bit in. The Liberal government privatised -

Mr A.D. McRae: Flogged off!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Yes, it flogged off the Dampier to Bunbury pipeline. Members opposite did not leave much in the bank afterwards, member for Riverton, despite getting billions from the sale of a public asset. By the time we took over, there was not much left in the bank. What they did with it is anybody's business. They forgot that little bit - "Oh, yes; of course, we privatised it." As a result of privatising it, we have now established an open and accountable wholesale and retail gas market in Western Australia. That being the case, like the wholesale energy market, if someone sees it as viable to put a gas pipeline to Albany and can make money out of it as the gas can be sold to a power generator at the end of the line, and that the power generator can then provide electricity at a viable market price to whoever - Grange Resources or other companies to which the member has referred - I am sure that will occur.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: Would you like to contribute something for community benefit?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No, because the party that the member for Roe belongs to, when in government, privatised the gas pipeline and moved to establish a wholesale and retail energy gas market. It did that for philosophical reasons as it believed it was the best course of action. The marketplace set-up is now governed by national gas regulations involving access codes, the economic viability of pipelines and the regulation of pipelines. We cannot intervene in that way, but we are being asked to do so. That is because members opposite do not understand that the world has moved on. It is not the cowboy 1990s in saying, "Let's just flog things off, and if we want to intervene or subsidise this or that, we can do it because we are the government." The world has moved on. Members opposite established the marketplace.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: I can't believe this.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: There is no point in laughing, member for Roe. This is what his party has done. This is when the chickens come home to roost - philosophically - for that lot opposite.

Mr J.H.D. Day: There are two issues. One is about state development and the other is about how the market operates.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I am glad the member is back because he forgot this bit: members opposite privatised the Dampier to Bunbury pipeline -

Mr J.H.D. Day: So what?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: - and established a wholesale gas market and retail gas market. Nobody has come into the retail gas market, by the way, apart from one provider, which is Alinta. It is not so much of a marketplace. Members opposite established that, and they then signed up. We continue that process because it is undertaken. We continue the process of signing up to the national access codes on gas regulation.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Are you opposed to all that change?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Member for Darling Range, listen. There is regulation over gas pipelines. What did members opposite do? They said, "Forget about that. Don't worry about that. Let's just intervene in the market and get the government some money, and we will spend some more!"

Mr J.H.D. Day: You don't understand; there is an issue of state development and the state's role in that, and there is an issue of how the market operates.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It does not work. The member for Darling Range should listen.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I have been listening to you, but you do not make a lot of sense.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Members opposite privatised the gas pipeline, and then established the wholesale and retail energy markets.

Mr J.H.D. Day: So what? Do you oppose that?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: We signed up to national gas codes and regulations. It does not work through intervening. We cannot intervene, member for Darling Range. Hey, get with the game because it is 2007. I know that members opposite have been out of power for a long time, but they should get with it. That is the reason we cannot do it, member for Roe. That is why we would not do it; that is why we cannot do it. As there is a marketplace, if somebody wants to pick up the proposition put forward by the member for Roe, he can. If the member for Roe thinks it is such a good thing, he should not come in here trying to reinvent history and trying to get us to fix the problems that his government created. He should talk to the Alintas; he should talk to the Synergys. He should talk to the wholesale gas players and convince them that his economics are sustainable. The reason he cannot convince them is because they are not sustainable.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: Tell us about the high-voltage proposal then in this brave new world.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: That is the reason the member cannot convince them. I will continue on the theme raised by the member for Roe. In terms of delivering electricity to Grange Resources, I would also remind members opposite that it is not simply a question of the government intervening and finding energy solutions for private mining companies because we do not do that. We have established a wholesale energy market. If companies want to come to that market and do a bilateral contract with Grange Resources to provide an energy solution for it, it is quite open for those companies to do that. With respect to the building of the transmission lines - the member for Roe should be aware of this point - it does not automatically mean that simply because Grange Resources wants that power, the building of transmission lines is the automatic solution to that company's requirements. The Economic Regulation Authority has to decide whether the transmission line will be subject to the regulatory test under the Electricity Networks Access Code 2004. Before the investment can be authorised, the test requires a review to ascertain whether electricity supply can be accomplished through other more economically efficient means. That is in keeping with the thrust of what the member for Roe was initially talking about; not the craziness about the pipeline and the gas turbines in Albany, but about the supply of power to Grange Resources. Western Power, in putting forward its proposals to the Economic Regulation Authority about the transmission lines, has to have the proposals assessed by the ERA to see if there is another more economic and efficient solution to be found, possibly including a stand-alone energy solution at the mine site itself.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: Tell us about the costs of the high-voltage powerline project to Southdown.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The member has already raised this issue; he raised it in his initial speech. He needs to take note of what I have said to him, because it is important. It goes to the point that the member brought into the chamber, and we have now wasted a lot of time.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: That's good; I'll tell the constituents that.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The member can tell his constituents whatever he likes.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: We need to explore these issues. That's what this place is about. Don't say it's a waste of time.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If the member for Roe had done a bit more research on this subject -

Dr G.G. Jacobs: I've got more research about the costs of this than you've actually provided today!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Exactly! That is the member for Roe's problem. He has done all his research in the wrong area. He is a parliamentarian; if he had started with the act and worked forward, he would have answered this question for himself before he went off and wasted his time on his research. He started at the wrong point in his research.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: We are talking about vision, Minister. We are talking about power provision for the region.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Being a member for Parliament, he should know better.

Mr M.J. Birney: It's actually "member of Parliament".

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Member of Parliament; I thank the member for Kalgoorlie very much indeed. That is the best interjection we have had in this entire debate! I thank the member very much.

Mr M.J. Birney: No problem.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The member for Roe will find that under the Electricity Corporations Act 2005 and the Electricity Networks Access Code 2004, the issues he is raising have to be reviewed by the ERA in any case. It will be determined by the ERA whether a transmission line or a stand-alone power option is the most economically efficient way of delivering power to Grange Resources. Had he done that -

Dr G.G. Jacobs: Okay, so what has been put to them and what are the results of their investigation?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: They have not done it yet. I just said that to the member.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: How long does it take?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The member for Roe talks a lot but does not listen. I have already answered him. Had he done his research, we would have saved a lot of time. Unfortunately, he has not.

The reality is that the test will still be applied; it is required under the act to be applied. At the end of the day the ERA may say that it is an awful lot of money to be poured into a transmission line for a stand-alone customer, and that there is no significant benefit to the surrounding community to which the cost of the transmission line could be spread in order for Western Power to make an economic return. The ERA may well knock it back and suggest that an alternative power source be sought for Grange Resources. I am not sure; it is up to the ERA to undertake that review. Meanwhile, Western Power has a customer, Grange Resources, which has an energy demand, and the energy demand is at this point best served by the delivery of power through a high-voltage transmission line. Two lines are proposed: one north of the Stirling Ranges and one south. The engineering work for those lines is being done at the moment. The routes of those powerlines are being worked out and negotiations and consultation with people affected by the powerline routes are underway.

I am not sure what the outcome will be, but I can tell members that it will not be the proposition put forward by the member for Roe and the member for Darling Range; that is, state government intervention in both the gas and electricity open marketplaces, to deliver a gas pipeline to Albany and build a 100-megawatt power station at Albany, which would unfortunately be a complete white elephant.

MR P.B. WATSON (Albany - Parliamentary Secretary) [5.35 pm]: During the last election campaign the opposition ran on the ticket of the Bunbury-Albany pipeline. It sounds great; we will have a pipeline from Bunbury to Albany. However, we need to examine some of the small things that people are missing. For a start, there is just not the demand in Albany for a gas pipeline. As the minister said before, it uses only 20 megawatts at peak. I sat in on some of the meetings between Grange Resources, Alinta and Western Power. Alinta, after looking at the figures, said that it was not possible. When I hear the member for Roe talking about figures in the region of \$150 million, I think he is way out of the ballpark of what it will cost. It would cost \$20 million for a corridor even before the pipeline could be constructed. The government should investigate the possibility of constructing a corridor for the future. There is not currently the demand for the entire project, but I think we could start off by looking at constructing a corridor. Those sorts of things take one or two years to complete and would be of use in the future.

I was speaking to the member for Collie-Wellington and he said that it is not yet possible to get enough gas from Dampier to Bunbury to service the present requirements, so I do not know how it will be possible to quickly get more gas from Dampier to Bunbury in order to service Albany. These are all things that, when looked at in the big picture, people will say, "We've got to have it." However, we cannot yet get enough gas from Dampier to Bunbury. Population growth is far more substantial in Bunbury than it is in Albany. There is far more growth in the hinterland of Bunbury and Busselton than there is in Albany; I think Albany's growth rate is 2 per cent. There is just not enough demand, either from business or domestic sectors, for gas.

The minister talked about biomass power generation. There is a company in Albany called Beacons Consulting International, which is looking into the potential construction of two 40-megawatt biomass power stations. That would provide 80 megawatts, which is more than enough if Grange Resources wants to increase its capacity in the future. The member for Darling Range mentioned the group PLUG. It is a shame the minister is not in the house -

Ms J.A. Radisich: He is.

Mr P.B. WATSON: The minister is in the house? Beautiful. I am sure he is listening.

Mr J.H.D. Day: He's busy gasbagging over there.

Mr P.B. WATSON: I must pass comment on Western Power's handling of high-tension powerlines. It is proposed to construct them not only from Kojonup to Albany, but also from Albany out to Grange Resources. My staff and I have received a number of complaints about the very poor consultation procedure undertaken by Western Power. The Ravenhill dairy farm is in my electorate and it is a tremendous operation, run by some people I used to know in Denmark. They have a really good business going. One of Western Power's three proposals for powerlines would run a powerline right through the middle of the Ravenhills' property. I do not think that Western Power has been listening to what people are saying. From what I have gleaned from the people who have come to see me, even though Western Power asked different groups to suggest where the powerline should go, when they suggested an idea Western Power went ahead and built it at a different location. That is very disappointing. I have followed up that matter with the Minister for Energy on behalf of not only Ravenhill Dairy, but also PLUG.

As I said before, the cost of the pipeline is a lot more than people think. The member for Roe suggested that it would cost \$150 million. From what I have gathered after listening to Alinta and some of the other proponents, the pipeline would cost over \$350 million, with an additional \$20 million needed to build the corridor.

The member for Darling Range mentioned the Albany wind farm. When the wind farm was first suggested, people marched up the main street of Albany to protest against it because they believed that it would affect fishing and surfing in the area. It is now Albany's biggest tourist attraction. Western Power plans to increase the size of the wind farm. I congratulate the coalition government for building the wind farm in Albany. Currently, a few protesters are making a lot of noise people about the Albany Waterfront project. However, I am sure that after they see the end result, they will change their minds about the project and view it positively.

I congratulate the Minister for Energy for the head works assistance scheme, which has been an issue in regional areas. The Public Accounts Committee has been looking at the contributions of the federal and state governments and the mining industry to infrastructure in Ravensthorpe and Hopetoun. Representatives of BHP Billiton showed us around Ravensthorpe and Hopetoun. There are many problems in those areas. I congratulate Country Labor for going in to bat -

Mr J.H.D. Day interjected.

Mr P.B. WATSON: People are now receiving subsidies that were not originally provided for. The country members of the Labor Party went in to bat. The member for Stirling also put pressure on the government. No-one from the Liberal Party went in to bat. The National and Labor Parties fought hard.

Mr M.J. Birney: Can I interject?

Mr P.B. WATSON: I am sorry, I did not realise that the member for Kalgoorlie was still alive.

Mr M.J. Birney: Did Country Labor go in to bat in the same way it went in to bat against one vote, one value?

Mr P.B. WATSON: I am glad that the member mentioned that. At the moment I can look out of my office window and see people whom I do not represent. Under the new system, if I am still in the job, I will be able to represent those people. If one vote, one value had not been introduced, those people would have to travel to Mt Barker, which is 58 kilometres away, to see their local member. Is that fair?

Mr M.J. Birney: Under the old system, you have a job. Under the new system, there's nothing surer than the fact that you're gone!

Mr P.B. WATSON: Under the new system, the member for Kalgoorlie will have a safe seat. If the member for Kalgoorlie's electorate was a marginal seat, he would not be elected at the next election because he is never in his electorate. He should be very happy about one vote, one value, because it will allow him to have his little house in South Perth and to trot up to Kalgoorlie for the round. I do not want to give too much time to someone who is trying to get publicity because he wants to contest the leadership of the Liberal Party.

The member for Roe's idea is visionary. However, we must consider the facts, the costs and the demands. It is a great idea and, should Albany continue to grow in the next 10 years, I am sure that it is something that the government might consider.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr R.F. Johnson**.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O'Gorman): That concludes private members' business. If there is consent between the government and the opposition, I will leave the chair until the resumption at 7.00 pm.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There is agreement between the government and the opposition. Given that there is no other private members' business between now and 6.00 pm, we are happy for you, Mr Acting Speaker, to leave the chair and to return at 7.00 pm.

Sitting suspended from 5.46 to 7.00 pm

HUMAN REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY AMENDMENT BILL 2007

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MS S.E. WALKER (Nedlands) [7.00 pm]: I was not doing a very good job of trying to express myself on this bill.

Mr J.A. McGinty: I think you've done a remarkably good job.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I am flattered! Has the Minister for Health had a bit to drink over dinner?

I have worked out why I am conflicted on this, and I think I have found a way around it. The minister probably will not like it, and maybe it will not suit me either. The point I was making before private members' business was that we are being asked to sanction the creation of embryos. I was talking at afternoon tea with a colleague, and we sort of worked it out. The reason I am conflicted is that, on the one hand, some people in the community need continuing scientific research and, on the other hand, I feel that no-one is advocating for the embryos that