

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, 8 May 1991

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.30 pm, and read prayers.

## MOTION - COAL FIRED POWER STATION, COLLIE

### *Government Decision Support*

**HON JOHN HALDEN** (South Metropolitan - Parliamentary Secretary) [2.35 pm]: I move -

That -

- (1) All members in this House support the decision of the Government to commission the next 600 megawatt coal fired base load power station in Collie.
- (2) The decision is a graphic illustration of the State Government's commitment to -
  - (a) microeconomic reform;
  - (b) decentralisation in the State industrial base;
  - (c) continued insistence on development attaining the highest environmental standards; and
  - (d) ensuring the prosperity of the Collie area.

Recently, the Government announced that a privately owned, coal fired power station would be constructed at Collie. The decision was arrived at after years of consultation with the community, with various private enterprise organisations, with unions and with others. It has not been an easy decision for the Government to make because, in essence, much of the State's and Collie's futures have depended on the decision. Some people may have had as much difficulty accepting the decision as I have had. It means that a privately owned, coal fired power station will be constructed at Collie. Those who know my political beliefs will know that that decision was difficult for me to accept. However, initially after looking at the facts and realising the importance of the decision, I had to put aside my ideological bents and preferences and accept the importance of the decision. The Government was faced with many problems in making the decision.

Hon Murray Montgomery: A lack of money would have been one of them!

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am glad the member is making this speech for me. One of the principal problems faced by the Government was the lack of loan funds. Even if the Government had wanted to construct a Government operated power station, it would have been difficult because of the constraints that the Federal Government has placed upon the State Government. I have been to Collie on many occasions in the last 12 months to discuss this issue with the people involved and the unions. In those discussions I found that they had the same preference as me. However, at the end of the day, they realised that for the security of the town, for the security of jobs and for the survival of the coalfields, they and I would have to make concessions. They put the position very clearly that it was important that the power station be coal fired and that it be located in Collie.

Many benefits will be gained from the decision. Many jobs will be created both during the construction phase and the operational phase of the plant and many technological changes will occur. Foremost in people's minds has been the thought of whether the power station should be gas or coal fired, bearing in mind that the Harman report suggested it be gas fired because it was a cheaper option. However, the price of coal has dropped substantially because of a commitment by a number of people. The mining companies have been prepared to lower the price of coal and coal workers have been prepared to shed jobs over a number of years. State Energy Commission unions and management have been prepared also to reshape their work schedules and to alter their management operations with the intention of supplying this State with the cheapest possible energy.

It is important that we now look at the microeconomic reforms that this decision holds for the community. There is no doubt that there have been major productivity gains in the extraction of coal. There has also been wage cuts, job reductions, lower coal prices and a restructuring in the management of SECWA. All of these concessions will flow to the State's economy and will result in lower energy prices. It is important to recognise that lower energy prices are not just an end in themselves; they are very important if this State is to become a competitor for downstream processing options. Without lower energy prices, the major multinational companies of this world will look not only to the Eastern States for development because of its cheaper energy, but they will also look overseas where energy prices are lower. If that happens, Western Australia will become nothing more than a quarry. Never before in the history of this State has such an effort been made to reduce the price of energy with that view in mind. It is worth contrasting the efforts made by this Government to reduce the price of energy with those of previous Governments. For example, the previous Governments undertook loan borrowings to such an extent that this State was committed to enormous multimillion dollar contracts. As a result, the cost of each energy unit rose to a very high level.

Hon Barry House: We got a higher price than you got for your PICL plant.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am not so sure, it may be necessary to take another look at that dollar for dollar. Another of the significant advantages of a coal fired power station compared with a gas fired option is the transfer of technology. The coal fired option will result in almost three quarters of the construction of the power station being undertaken in Australia, and almost 40 per cent being undertaken in Western Australia. This will raise the overall level of industrial standards in this State, which will be retained not only in the energy sector of our economy, but will also be transferred into other sectors. The economic activity is depressed and it is of paramount importance for the skills in this sector to remain relevant. As a result of the Government's decision the skilled labour in this State will remain in touch with the skills required in this area throughout the world.

The fact that this will be a privately owned power station will provide those of us who may have been critical of the operations of the State Energy Commission and felt that it has not been efficient, with a yardstick by which to compare one against the other. It is important that we shall be able to review SECWA's operations in competition with the privately owned station, while at the same time making concessions for the significant technological advances to which the new station will have access. It has been said that SECWA must improve its productivity if it is to continue in the field of energy generation. Some people have blamed the high cost of energy on union activity and others have blamed management. An opportunity is presented to compare the two activities and to determine who is at fault; where management needs to be more effective; and where unions must be more multiskilled and innovative in their approach to work practices and the jobs the workers are doing. The overall effect will be an increase in technical, allocative and dynamic efficiency. This is part of the Government's progress and priorities paper released in December 1990. It is the first major step by the Government to implement its commitment to that policy. The second part of my motion refers to decentralisation. The major aims of decentralisation are to ensure that:

resource allocation is efficient in a spacial sense. In other words resources should be directed towards those regions where they will be most productive.

The benefits of economic development are distributed equitably between regions.

The economies of the individual regions are of sufficient size and diversity to support the infrastructure required by them and reduce their susceptibility to changing economic conditions.

In this case we can clearly see that the Government has made decisions that are based upon these principles, and the benefactors of this Government decision will most definitely be the people in the Collie and south west regions. The Government has over many years invested enormous amounts of money in the infrastructure of the Collie region, and this decision means that this capital investment will be effectively utilised and full use will be made of the resources. Those of us who have visited Collie will be aware of significant Government support in the provision of education, health care, housing, water supplies, community services and many other services. If this decision had not been made, many of those

resources would be underutilised. Eventually the population of Collie would have decreased significantly and there would have been a drain on the State's finances for the maintenance of underutilised resources. That will not now be the case. Collie will continue as a viable, self-contained population centre.

If any criticism were to be made about this decision, it could possibly be with regard to environmental issues raised by sectors of the community in the coal versus gas debate. We must be very clear about this issue: Without doubt, whether coal or gas is burnt, both have an effect on the environment. Whether one fuel or the other is used the effects on the environment are manageable. The concerns with regard to coal specifically should be considered. People will be aware that Collie coal is relatively low grade, which means it has an ash content of less than 10 per cent and a low sulphur content between 0.5 and 0.7 per cent. Bearing in mind the concerns that can be created by the construction of a coal fired power station, it was important to consult the community and to seriously consider the environmental impact of making this decision. An environmental review and management program was prepared by SECWA and it was approved by the Environmental Protection Authority. Full public consultation took place.

The environmental concerns about a coal fired power station boil down to three issues: Firstly, fly-ash; secondly, the safe distribution of sulphur oxide; and, thirdly, the management of water resources in the Collie basin. The fly-ash problem has been resolved by an insistence that all fly-ash be collected by the most modern electrostatic precipitators having a specific minimum efficiency of 99.5 per cent, which will be state of the art technology in that field when put into commission later this decade. Extensive atmospheric computer modelling has been carried out in the Collie region to ensure that the new power station, the existing SECWA power station at Muja, and the Worsley alumina refinery can exist in the area proposed, and that they will not have harmful effects on the environment - specifically, increased levels of sulphur dioxide with the potential for the creation of acid rain. The Government has been assured that it will not occur as a result of the construction of this power station. The water to be used for this power station will come from the mine dewatering program and all water from the power station will be treated in accordance with the environmental standards of the Water Authority of Western Australia. Of course, the global effect with regard to greenhouse emissions should be considered in any discussion on environmental impact. On the basis of the modelling and analysis carried out, the new Collie power station will have a minute effect on the emission of carbon dioxide. The owners of the proposed power station have committed themselves to work with the Department of Conservation and Land Management and SECWA in a reafforestation program which will lower the carbon dioxide level in the region, and also have a minor, if not insignificant, effect on reducing the level of carbon dioxide on an international scale resulting in no increase in carbon dioxide emissions worldwide.

The issue of mining and the future use of mining techniques in the region will also have to undergo a strict environmental review and management program, as will and has the power station. During the debate in the community about environmental issues many people have put forward the proposition that new technology, such as pressurised, fluorised, bed combustion and integrated gasification, and combined cycle procedures, ought to be established. The difficulty with these procedures is that they are in the experimental stages. They are extremely expensive, and no-one is yet sure whether they work with any greater efficiency than is currently achievable with modern technology; although the initial experimentation in these areas suggests that there is great hope that these procedures will lower the level of carbon dioxide emissions to the atmosphere.

One can go no further than to look at the benefits of this decision for Collie. Currently the Collie coalfields produce five million tonnes per annum of coal. Four million tonnes of that coal is used in power generation. Without the proposed new coal fired power station, those contracts would run out in the year 2003; and over time the demand for and usage of Collie coal would reduce considerably and eventually the Collie coalfields would not be able to operate and to compete with the other fuel options. The only way that Collie, with its low grade source of fuel, can compete is if large amounts of coal are mined. This decision will allow that mining to continue; without it, that would not have been the case. The contract will guarantee from 1996 that this coalfield will continue in existence for at least another 30 years. This is a guarantee which Collie has never had, and which the Opposition, when in

Government, was never able to give to Collie. In fact, the locals in Collie remember that on a number of occasions the Opposition wanted to move away from coal. No-one in that area can forget the day when the Liberal Government decided it would transfer energy generation from coal to oil; and what a disaster that decision was.

Hon T.G. Butler: They had to change it back.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: That is right. I say that not just to make a cheap political point, which is always a wont of mine -

Hon N.F. Moore: You acknowledge it is.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: - and it is also a reality - but I say it also because one can also draw the same parallels with gas. The opportunity costs concerning gas are far greater than they are for coal. Coal in this State can be used for only one purpose; that is, power generation. Gas, on the other hand, is likely to, and it is speculated it will, be in great demand internationally for a long time to come. Anyone who suggests that Collie coal will be in great demand internationally in the long term is, I suggest, thinking with something other than his head.

Hon Murray Montgomery: So you are really saying there is no gas generation in electricity?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am not saying that at all. Do not be silly. I will make the speech and I will stick to the facts. Of course there is gas, and we will see a continuation of the dual usage of gas and coal; but gas, by virtue of its greater opportunity to provide the State with money and international export dollars, will be used in a far better way, and we will see this resource of coal being used again for its best opportunity. The opportunity for gas sales is obviously far greater than for the sale of Collie coal. We will see also that by being able to compete in terms of the price of gas and coal, we will be able to keep down the price of both. It has been somewhat difficult for me to understand and come to grips with how we have tied the price of gas to the price of petrol internationally; how we have tied the price of coal to the price of petrol; and how we have worked out a complicated financial calculation to achieve that end, when in actual fact the price of coal is not related in any way to the international price of petrol. I have to say - and I think people would have to accept - that was a particularly silly formula to construct, but it has been constructed and it has been instituted into contracts, and the consumers of this State, be they private, business or Government, have paid dearly for those decisions. Those decisions should be altered so that we will have an active competitive arrangement between gas and oil. It should never be forgotten that we cannot go to a gas only option because as a Government we are committed and were committed well over a decade ago to buying significant amounts of gas. We have to honour that obligation. However, we have also to honour the obligation to the people of Collie and of this State to make the most appropriate decision. I believe the Government has made that decision. It has made that decision with an enormous amount of goodwill from the union movement, from the business sector in Collie, and from the people of Collie generally, who have placed above all else the survival of their town and community, beyond the normal sacrifices which people have to make. The people of Collie have been prepared to shed jobs, to look at restructuring this industry, and to have their wages reduced. I do not know of another community which would be prepared to go through the pain which the people of Collie have gone through.

Hon Doug Wenn: The farmers would not do that.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am not prepared to enter that debate; we could go off on all sorts of sidetracks. However, it is an interesting comment.

It would have been easy for the community leaders in Collie, in making those tough decisions, to take the easy road and to say no; and to demand that the Government do certain things that would not result in the achievements which have been achieved. One of the community leaders to whom I would like to refer, who must have been placed in a totally unenviable position, was the Secretary of the Collie Coal Miners Union, Garry Wood. For many months he has struggled with the difficulty of this decision. His union members have been gravely concerned about their future employment and about the future of the town.

Hon Barry House: He did a good job.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: He did indeed, and it ought to be acknowledged that Hon Barry

House said that Garry Wood did a good job. I appreciate that comment, and I am sure he also supports Garry's initiatives. It has been a difficult job for him personally. Many people saw him on occasions as not doing the right thing, and that caused him considerable pain, but at the end of the day the decisions which he was instrumental in making or in having accepted will ensure that Collie will continue for many years as a viable community. The Minister was given a very difficult job in January when he became the Minister responsible for this area, and he pursued an active policy of seeking concessions so that energy costs would be reduced. He was very rigid and hard line in his demands about this issue. He also received criticism from within the Australian Labor Party, but at the end of the day many people came around to his point of view that it was the only viable option which ought to be entertained. The Minister ought to be congratulated by everybody, as this motion suggests, for standing up for that decision.

Finally, members of this House have few opportunities to say that something constructive has happened, and to praise not just our political, industrial or employee colleagues but also an entire community for the sacrifices it has been prepared to make not only for itself but also for this State. I hope people will take up the spirit of what I am suggesting in this motion, and will note the very significant and substantial sacrifices the unions and employers in Collie have made. I hope also that this motion will be supported by the House.

Government members: Hear, hear!

**HON GEORGE CASH** (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [3.00 pm]: I invite members to read the words of this motion very carefully, because it is an attempt by the Government to congratulate itself on its recent decision to place this State's next 600 megawatt base load coal fired power station at Collie. Given the revelations that have been coming out of the Royal Commission in recent days, it is not unreasonable for the Government to want to surround itself with this type of motion in order to give itself a warm feeling.

Hon Mark Nevill: Do you want the deal investigated?

Hon T.G. Butler: Is it a good decision or not?

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am about to address that question. Hon Tom Butler would be aware that the motion comprises a number of elements. One is to congratulate the Government on its recent decision in respect of the power station and in due course I will speak on that. The other elements of the motion include the Government's claim that this decision is a graphic illustration of its commitment to microeconomic reform, decentralisation of the State's industrial base, continued insistence on development attaining the highest environmental standards, and ensuring the prosperity of the Collie area. It is interesting that Hon John Halden was prepared to speak to paragraph (1) of his motion but placed little emphasis on discussing the microeconomic reform which the Government claims it has succeeded in recently.

Hon Tom Butler has asked me whether the decision to locate the power station in Collie was a good one. I think it was the only decision that could be made at this stage. It is to be a coal fired power station and I am pleased that the Government has taken the initiative to see that it is a privately owned and operated power station. That in itself is an important element of the decision to locate the power station in Collie. Had the State decided to finance the operation itself, and then operate the power station itself, I would have suggested that was the wrong decision; but as the Government has decided to move down the road of privatisation that certainly is a good sign and should be supported by all members of this House. I am pleased to see someone of the standing of Hon John Halden, a Parliamentary Secretary of this House and, I understand, one of the leading lights of the broad left faction of the Australian Labor Party, prepared to stand up in this place and publicly support the notion of privatising public utilities in this State.

Hon John Halden: You are going just a little far there, and I will speak for myself about that.

Hon GEORGE CASH: The member cannot have it both ways. He has moved a motion congratulating the Government on what it has done. As I understand the facts, firstly, the Government has agreed to the commissioning of a 600 megawatt base load coal fired power station in Collie; and secondly, it is to be privately owned and operated by the Mitsubishi-Transfield consortium. Have I missed something in stating those two facts?

Hon John Halden: No, you are doing well.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Again I say that I am pleased that someone of the standing of Hon John Halden is prepared to come into this place and praise the Government for its decision to take the privatisation road when it comes to the commissioning of additional public facilities.

Hon John Halden: Before you go too far, we are not privatising the supply of energy, are we?

Hon GEORGE CASH: No, the Government is not. I would suggest that is probably step No 2, because encouraging private companies to own and operate power stations in this State opens the door for the distribution of energy in Western Australia to come under the scrutiny of privatisation, as the member well knows.

Hon Doug Wenn: Is that what you want?

Hon GEORGE CASH: There are elements of benefit to the State in considering that option. All matters must be investigated. In fact, if members read the document quoted by Hon John Halden when he touched briefly on microeconomic reform - that is, "Progress and Priorities: An Overview of the Western Australian Government's Approach to Microeconomic Reform", published in December 1990 - they will see that the Government has made certain commitments to privatisation. I do not know whether Hon Doug Wenn is suggesting that he does not support the publication that was put out by the Government, but I can assure him that, in that document, as part of microeconomic reform the Government has committed itself to privatisation of public utilities.

One of the other important matters which is a step forward in the generation of power in Western Australia is the ability of the unions, and indeed the coal companies, in Collie to get together and talk about reducing the price of coal to make the new power station more viable. Some people in the community believe scope probably existed for a greater increase in productivity; however, the Government has settled on a 15 per cent reduction in the price of coal over the next four years. If that leads in any way to lowering the cost of energy in this State - and it will - that is a good thing. I join Hon John Halden and Hon Barry House in congratulating those union officials in Collie who have worked so hard to convince their members that if there is to be a future in Collie they must work with the coal companies and the Government to make this privately owned and operated power station a success.

We are not talking chicken feed in respect of the cost of this power station; it is currently estimated to cost between \$1.2 billion and \$1.3 billion. That in itself will provide much needed employment in the Collie area in particular and the south west in general, and is clearly important given the current unemployment situation in this State.

Hon Mark Nevill: Which the gas option would never provide.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I suppose Hon Mark Nevill will make his contribution to the debate in due course. What I am saying is that the \$1.2 billion or \$1.3 billion that will be required to build this power station will generate additional employment in that area and is especially important.

It is interesting that not all members of the Labor Party saw the decision to go private on the power station as a positive move. I am reminded of the comments of the member for Morley, Mr Frank Donovan.

Hon John Halden: It shows what a great party we are, to allow internal debate, vigorous as it may be, and to come up with a decision like this.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am glad that is the case in the Labor Party, because I understood Mr Donovan to have said that because he was somewhat restricted in making his comments public it might be necessary for him to leave the Labor Party so that he might better express himself.

Hon Doug Wenn: He has never been restricted from making comments.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Is the member saying that he never considered leaving the Labor Party?

Hon John Halden: You have a propensity to put words in people's mouths.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I do not have to say it; Mr Donovan said it himself. He has threatened to leave the Labor Party because he cannot cop what is coming out of the Royal Commission, and as a good Labor man he cannot cope with the fact that the Labor Party was hijacked by a number of people over numerous years. One of the matters currently concerning him is that the Labor Party has apparently changed its policy on the privatisation of public utilities. He has stated this point publicly, as obviously he is entitled to do. I am pleased that the Labor Government is prepared to adopt privatisation, because for many years it was not prepared to do that.

Hon Mark Nevill: Does every member in your party support your policies 100 per cent? Of course not.

Hon Peter Foss: We all agree on our principles.

Hon Doug Wenn: Hon A.A. Lewis did not.

Hon Mark Nevill: What are yours, Mr Foss?

Hon GEORGE CASH: If Hon Mark Nevill is keen to learn more about the Liberal Party, and if he is thinking of jumping ship and joining the Liberal Party, many people will be happy to talk about the direction, the philosophies and the principles of the party.

Hon Mark Nevill: You could not afford the price!

Hon GEORGE CASH: Given some of the revelations emanating from the Royal Commission in recent times, it appears that the Labor Party is not able to afford the price of some of the alleged actions of some of its former members.

Hon John Halden: We are talking gas, not hot air.

Hon GEORGE CASH: We are indicating support for paragraph (1) of Hon John Halden's motion. Before concluding my comments I intend to move an amendment to insert some words. These words will be inserted in line two, after the words "coal fired". The words to be inserted are "privately owned and operated". Therefore, following the passage of the amendment, paragraph (1) will read -

That all members in this House support the decision of the Government to commission the next 600 megawatt, coal fired, privately owned and operated, base load power station in Collie.

Having discussed the merits of paragraph (1) of Hon John Halden's motion, it is agreed that the additional production of energy in this State is a significant step forward. However, a significant need exists for additional power stations in Western Australia.

Hon John Halden: When?

Hon GEORGE CASH: These should be on the drawing board right now. The member will recall that less than two years ago discussion took place about the possibility of brownouts in Western Australia. If the Government is not prepared to grasp the nettle and introduce new power stations now, we will have the situation, as exists in the north west, of not being able to attract additional industry to this State. The cost of our energy is keeping industry away, and consequently we cannot maximise employment opportunities.

Hon John Halden: If surplus energy capacity is not used, the cost of energy will rise. That will contradict what we are attempting to do; that is, to bring down the price of energy.

Hon GEORGE CASH: If we have excess capacity for a period of time, a cost penalty is involved. However, that cost penalty is soon overcome through the introduction of new industry into the area to consume the additional capacity. Opportunities exist in the north west which could be exploited if the Government could provide energy at a reasonable cost. One does not wait until a port is able to be cost effective before building it; public utilities are built in anticipation of an increase in trade, industry and employment opportunities. It is necessary to cast the net well forward to exploit and create future opportunities.

Part (2) of the motion refers to microeconomic reform. This aspect was not covered to any great degree by Hon John Halden. I have read the document "Progress and Priorities - an overview of the Western Australian Government's approach to microeconomic reform". Members would be aware that the Government has claimed to have made progress in certain areas of microeconomic reform. It has been claimed that during the 1980s the Public Service

was made more efficient and Westrail was transformed from a heavily subsidised loss making instrumentality into an efficient, profitable organisation. Hon Fred McKenzie would be pleased to know that I believe the Government has made progress in making Westrail more efficient. The document also claims that the output from the State Energy Commission per employee has more than doubled. I cannot agree or disagree with that statement because I do not have the facts before me to justify that. However, if that organisation has doubled its output in the 1980s, great opportunity exists in the 1990s to double that efficiency level again.

However, the claims about reforms in the industrial relations area are very questionable. For some time the Government has only just managed to keep the lid on the industrial relations pot by pandering -

Hon John Halden: For half a decade. That is more than "for some time".

Hon GEORGE CASH: One could acknowledge that the lid has been kept on the industrial relations pot, but given the problems which are now emerging from the Trades and Labor Council, and given that many of the TLC affiliates are not impressed by this Government, within a short time we will see changes in the Government's industrial relations position.

The document claims that the Government has achieved many wonderful things during the 1980s, and, indeed, during the early part of the 1990s. It is hard to reconcile all the self-congratulatory statements which appear in the document with the fact that *The West Australian* of Tuesday of this week contained an article headed "CES data shows jobless up 50 pc"; it stated -

The number of unemployed West Australians jumped by almost 50 per cent over the past year, according to previously unpublished figures released by the Commonwealth Employment Service.

I go on to quote from that article -

According to the CES data, there were 114,886 people unemployed, or 13.8 per cent of the labour force, in WA at the end of March.

It is said by some that the CES figures are not accurate and that we should in fact rely on the Australian Bureau of Statistics' figures. The article continues -

A spokesman for WA's Education, Employment and Training Minister, Kay Hallahan, yesterday dismissed the CES data as unreliable and said the Government hoped the next ABS figures would paint a brighter picture.

I am sure they will paint a brighter picture, but it is said by many that the ABS figures are not as accurate as the Commonwealth Employment Service figures. As much as the Minister would like to believe -

Hon John Halden: You must make your discussion, which is very interesting, relevant to the motion before the House.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am more than happy to make it relevant because in his motion Hon John Halden talks about the achievements of the Government on microeconomic reform. I have spent more time during my comments on his motion talking about microeconomic reform than he did during his discussion. More than that, I have said that although it is competent for the Government to issue publications of self-praise on microeconomic reform -

Hon Mark Nevill: Which document are you talking about?

Hon GEORGE CASH: I hoped Hon Mark Nevill would have read it. It is titled "Progress and Priorities" and was published in December 1990.

Hon Mark Nevill: I may have read it, but I do not recall the document.

Hon GEORGE CASH: There is a good chance he has not read it and that is why he cannot recall it. All comments about microeconomic reform go down the drain when reading yesterday morning's *The West Australian* relating to the current unemployment figures in Western Australia. I refer to paragraph (2)(b) of Hon John Halden's motion concerning decentralisation of the State industrial base. I do not know why Hon John Halden bothered to include that because the fact that another coal fired power station is to be sited in Collie is



not exactly an indication of decentralising the area from which we generate power for Western Australia. It has always been generated in the Collie area.

Hon John Halden: Is Kwinana a bit of an exception? There is also Pinjar and the north west grid. Are they exceptions?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Whatever Hon John Halden says, he should not talk about generating electricity at Pinjar. What has the Government done for the north west grid in recent years? What additional public utility energy has been introduced into that grid in recent years? None at all because it is privately operated and he knows it.

Hon John Halden: You ought to be pleased about that.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Whatever Hon John Halden does in this place, in any discussion he must watch his attempts to convince this House he knows something about energy products and energy distribution in this State. I would argue with him that the decision to site the new coal fired base load power station at Collie is not a graphic illustration of the Government's commitment to decentralisation in the State industrial base. If Hon John Halden had said he was pleased to announce that the Government intended another power station should be based perhaps north of Geraldton, or indeed further north in the north west of the State, I would say we were beginning to decentralise and make some progress in providing low cost energy. That has not happened and he knows it. He has attempted to give himself a warm feeling by putting words on paper - he hoped that no-one would look into the words used in the motion - and have a motion passed in this House congratulating the Government on the good things it has done, knowing himself that the words are not able to be fitted to the facts. Paragraph (2)(c) of the motion claims that the decision to site the new power station in Collie is a fine example of the State Government's commitment to continued insistence on development attaining the highest environmental standards. He has given us some indication of how he intends to support that part of his motion by referring to the Environmental Protection Authority decision and to the other environmental controls being placed over the project.

Hon John Halden: They are impressive; let's be fair.

Hon GEORGE CASH: As far as continued insistence on development attaining the highest environmental standards is concerned, I again suggest that all he has to do is walk outside and cast his eye on the Swan River. That is something immediately before him; it is visual; he can look at it and even touch it. After having looked at the river he should read yesterday's paper. The issue is current news; I am not asking him to go to a library and research anything in detail. I am not asking him to refer to last week or the week before when other illustrations of environmental problems appeared in the newspaper.

Hon John Halden: What does that have to do with a privately owned power station?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Hon John Halden has suggested that the Government has a good record in attaining the highest environmental standards. I am saying that in yesterday's paper, even the Minister for Water Resources, Ernie Bridge, was prepared to admit that it could take up to 80 years to clean up the Swan River. If that is the control of which the Government is proud, I worry about this Government's attitude. Do members believe that it is only in the past week or month that the Government has worked out that the Swan River is dying because of the pollution being poured into it? A report published about three years ago warned the Government of this possible occurrence. The mere fact that we have woken up to it now is rather stretching a long bow.

I have indicated that I intend to move that paragraph (1) be amended to include certain words. In view of the fact that Hon John Halden has not attempted to sustain any argument about why paragraph (2) should be agreed to, I intend to move to delete it because he did not show that the decision is a graphic illustration of the State Government's commitment to the matters listed in paragraph (2). Given my comments, the House would be remiss if it were to pass his motion. I have clearly shown that the Government does not deserve praise on the items listed in paragraph (2) and they should be deleted.

#### *Amendment to Motion*

Hon GEORGE CASH: I move -

- (1) In line 2 to insert after the words "coal fired" the words "privately owned and operated".

(2) To delete all the words contained in paragraph (2).

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let me enlighten members on what we are doing. We are not in Committee; therefore the member has only one shot at the situation. In other words, his amendment is the whole of that amendment.

[Resolved, that motions be continued.]

HON JOHN HALDEN (South Metropolitan - Parliamentary Secretary) [3.31 pm]: Hon George Cash has seen an opportunity to broaden this debate beyond the realms of realistic imagination. The motion I moved refers to the Government's decision to commission a 600 megawatt coal fired power station at Collie, and Hon George Cash has moved an amendment which will ensure that it is privately owned. Paragraph (2) of my motion states that -

The decision is a graphic illustration of the State Government's commitment to -

- (a) microeconomic reform;
- (b) decentralisation in the State industrial base;
- (c) continued insistence on development attaining the highest environmental standards; and
- (d) ensuring the prosperity of the Collie area.

The Leader of the Opposition meandered around unemployment Statewide. The Government's decision will obviously have a significant and beneficial impact on the unemployment rate.

Hon George Cash: It was right to talk about unemployment and unemployment levels.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Leader of the Opposition meandered around that subject and around the pollution of the Swan River, which had nothing to do with the Collie decision.

Hon George Cash: It had something to do with the environment. Who prepared this motion?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I wrote it.

Hon George Cash: Did you read it?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Of course I read it.

Hon George Cash: Did you understand it?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Leader of the Opposition may have to do that with his backbench, but I do not have to do it with mine.

It is unfair of the Leader of the Opposition to move an amendment when he knows full well that the motion deals with all the issues he raises. The indication via the television over the last few days is that the public of this State have accepted the Government's decision. The Opposition appears to want to trivialise this matter to make a cheap political point. Most people in the community would accept my motion.

Hon Murray Montgomery: I think the amendment tidies it up and makes it concise.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: It is not concise enough for my liking. It is not a question of deleting part of the motion; it is a question that the State Government has attempted to adopt a certain spirit in regard to its decision. The amendment trivialises that, particularly with the deletion of paragraph (2) of the motion. It is unfortunate that the Opposition has taken this opportunity to behave in this way and my motion highlights the case at point.

The Leader of the Opposition tried to trivialise the argument about microeconomic reform, which is covered in the Government's decision. This decision is the most significant step towards microeconomic reform in this State's history.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members to cease their audible conversations, because the member now is not replying to the debate; he is speaking to the amendment proposed by Hon George Cash. I ask him to remember that he is speaking either in favour of or against it. He has not told the House which way he is voting.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I will tell you in a moment, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: It does not matter to me. Does the member understand that he is speaking to the amendment that Hon George Cash moved?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Yes, I do indeed. I will make it clear for the record: I intend to oppose the amendment and the comments I have made so far would indicate that.

It is true that there were a number of alternatives before the Government and it could have concentrated on energy creation at Kwinana. It could have taken the gas option, which would have meant that there would have been plants to the north of Perth only and they would have been operated from Perth with a small labour force. It is clear that decentralisation will take place by positioning the coal fired power station at Collie, where the coal resource is available. The environmental aspects have been dealt with and I will not go through them again.

Without doubt the Government has ensured the prosperity of the Collie region and no-one would argue about that. To accept this amendment would be to weaken the statement this House should make. The decision which has been made is a step in the right direction and it is a decision which should be made by a Government of any political persuasion. I hope the House will oppose the amendment.

HON DOUG WENN (South West) [3.37 pm]: I oppose the amendment. I am disappointed that Hon George Cash had the opportunity to speak on the motion and then created a situation in which other members would be prevented from debating it. I spoke with Hon John Halden prior to his introducing this motion and I agree with it in its entirety. I accept that part of the amendment moved by Hon George Cash to insert the words "privately owned" because that was the Government's intention; it is part and parcel of its decision. For Hon George Cash to create a situation which prevents members from speaking about the Government's reasons for making the decision is unacceptable.

If the Leader of the Opposition believes that microeconomic reform is not important to Western Australia, I do not understand in which direction he is heading. He continually refers to a paper put out by the Government and I was under the impression that he agreed with it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will put the member's mind at rest. He can speak about the virtues of paragraph (2) of the motion in his endeavour to convince the House to retain it. He is not precluded from speaking about the virtues of paragraph (2) - indeed, this is an opportunity to do exactly that.

Hon DOUG WENN: I accept what you are saying Mr President, but if paragraph (2) is deleted that right will be taken from us. I understand what you are saying and I am giving my reasons why the amendment should be opposed. The Government has always advocated decentralisation. The Opposition has stated that it will create satellite cities around Perth; in a basic way, that is decentralisation. I will come back to that later.

Paragraph (2)(c) of the motion deals with environmental standards and I am firmly of the opinion that the State Government has imposed heavy environmental standards in Western Australia. It is looking at what happened in the past. The pollution of the Swan River to which Hon George Cash referred has not occurred because of what happened today but because of what happened many years ago.

As someone has pointed out, it will take many years to clean up the Swan River, but the process has started, and so it should have. I would be the first to agree that we have left commencement of this project late, but we can start working on it now. Pollution of the Swan River should never have happened in the first place. However, the environmental issues of yesterday are entirely different from those of today and we are reacting to the matter immediately. I cannot believe that Hon George Cash would want this removed. It is not just the Collie area that is involved but also the flow on to the whole south west. It will benefit the whole of Western Australia, not just Collie and the south west. I cannot understand why the Leader of the Opposition cannot see that. Over the past couple of months much discussion has taken place between many people about this matter. I spoke briefly last Wednesday on this matter because I intended to speak on it in more depth today. I am happy that Hon John Halden moved this motion so that we may debate the issue. It surprises me that Hon George Cash wants to eliminate it, as he has sought to do.

The people of Collie have put themselves on the block to secure their future. I was in Collie all weekend where there was a magic party on Saturday night that the people threw together in three days. The community came together supplying huge amounts of food and an equal quantity of drink for nothing. I estimate that on Saturday night between 2 000 and 2 500 people from the town mingled to celebrate the achievement that they had worked so hard for. What made it more surprising was that so many people were out on a wet and cold night. However, the people turned out because they believe in the project. There are critics of the project in the area and others who, because of their environmental beliefs say that a coal fired power station is dangerous to the atmosphere. That will happen wherever one is built. I will return to that matter in a moment because it is important that we consider the environmental impact on the area and what may happen if we do not take control immediately.

Hon George Cash made a big thing of the build-own-operate powerhouse situation. I get the feeling that some members opposite believe that this is a brand new initiative for Western Australia. As Hon Tom Helm can tell members, there have been build-own-operate powerhouses in the north for many years which sell power to the SEC grid that is used by people in the north west. I cannot believe that an attempt was made to impose the stigma that because we are the Labor Party we are coming out with a brand new innovation; that is incorrect as this idea has existed for many years. The Government decided last week it would offer the contract to design and develop the new powerhouse to the Mitsubishi Transfield Collie Power Station Joint Venture company.

I turn to the environmental side. I have had discussions with a person from one of the four major companies. He approached me in Collie saying that this project will involve the strictest environmental rules he knows of. His company owns coal fired power stations in America and Canada where it does not have to meet anywhere near the stringent rules laid down by the Western Australian Government. This microeconomic reform is one in which we believe. Surely members on the other side believe in that also. It is the way we are going today. This project offers a great opportunity for any Government to take the lead in this area. We see in this project an opportunity for decentralisation through the construction and operation of this new power station.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm*

Hon DOUG WENN: If nothing else has emerged from this debate over the last couple of months about the establishment of a base load power station, whether it should be gas or coal, it is that we will have to pay for it. Someone used commonsense to work out a questionnaire and basically answer why Collie coal should be chosen rather than gas. The second question was whether we could avoid the need for a new generating plant by energy conservation and utilisation of improved technology. That is something we will have to look at very seriously, and it is something which I believe this Government will take on board over the next six or seven years.

It is also important that we all conserve energy. There is no doubt about that. Many pages have been written on how we can do that. We can put in these new lights which cost about \$30-odd but which last much longer than the normal household globe. At a branch meeting recently a motion was put forward that Homeswest should include this system of lighting in its new homes rather than the system presently used. The result would be a conservation of energy. Home heating and so forth is also involved.

The real problem comes down to town planning. We have only to look at St George's Terrace to see the magnitude of the problem created in these glass houses of huge dimensions. They have all this glass on them and then a couple of million dollars worth of shade over the top. One must wonder about the intentions of the designers.

Hon Murray Montgomery: One must wonder about how it got there and who let it get there.

Hon DOUG WENN: That is exactly what I am referring to. We have to tell our planners and designers that before sending their plans to the shires they must look very carefully at the environmental impact of their buildings. They must look particularly at ways of saving energy, because it is disgraceful how it is wasted now. I was asked the other day what the Government was doing about it and why it was not educating people. The Government is doing that at all times. Huge amounts of paper work are available with information which people can utilise to try to save energy in their homes. It is all very well giving people pieces

of paper, and it does not matter how many science programs are put on television, the average Joe Blow of today will follow the advice for a little while and then drift back to his old habits. I have two grown-up daughters and, for some reason, wherever they go they must have a light on, even in the middle of the day. They have a habit as they are walking past a door of turning on the light. I am told it is a sign that the amount in one's pocket is getting down when one runs behind turning lights off. It is amazing how many people are doing that. I said to my eldest the other day, "One day you will have a house and you will be paying the bills and you will be running behind your kids turning the lights off."

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: What did she reply?

Hon DOUG WENN: Like most kids, "Eh!" That is what they say as they leave the house to get into the car to go down to the shop, which is 50 metres away, and use 10 litres of fuel in the process. They do not have a mind to commit themselves to conserving energy. They believe in the environment, they believe that we have to do these things, but when it comes to doing them personally they seem to go along without thinking what they are doing.

Hon Murray Montgomery: If we conserved enough energy we would not need a new power station; that is the direction you are taking.

Hon DOUG WENN: That is right; that is exactly what I am saying.

Hon Murray Montgomery: So Collie does not need another power station.

Hon DOUG WENN: It does today because at this stage people are not educated enough to stop doing the things that we have been doing for years, such as building those huge buildings in the Terrace and installing air conditioners which cost thousands of dollars to run to cool themselves in summer and, by reversing the cycle, to warm themselves in winter. Why do they not design these buildings to take advantage of the natural environment, or better still, why do we not put on a jumper when we are cold? That would be the easiest answer. In the short term, and certainly in the decades leading up to the year 2000, there is no real prospect of reducing our present use of electricity. The United States utilities that have offered to pay for conservation programs, for example, find that amounts offered to them by the bidders are not large - five to 30 megawatts. Such a reduction brought about by conservation would accommodate about three months' growth in Western Australia. However, clearly that would not be enough. One of my pet topics is the environment. My mind always seems to turn to that issue, and we should all take the opportunity to circulate such information.

Hon George Cash: As we should be speaking to my amendment, will you be addressing at any time the words "privately owned and operated"?

Hon DOUG WENN: At the opening of my speech, I did that. I support that part of the motion, because that is what the Government has done -

Hon George Cash: And what about privatisation?

Hon DOUG WENN: Within reason. I would support the powerhouse but not the privatisation of the grid.

Hon George Cash: It is important that these matters be placed on the record.

Hon DOUG WENN: I support the words which Hon George Cash has inserted solely because they fit in with the message in the motion.

Hon George Cash: I am pleased to have the member's support. I hope that we will see him vote in support of the amendment.

Hon DOUG WENN: I support part of the amendment but oppose the rest of it. The Leader of the Opposition was given an opportunity to present the amendment in two sections. Instead, he addressed them as one matter. Therefore, unfortunately, we will oppose the whole of the amendment, even though I support one part of it.

Hon George Cash: Has anyone ever suggested that you tend to have two bob each way?

Hon DOUG WENN: Not really.

Hon P.G. Pandal: We would like to suggest it now.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let us get on with it.

Hon DOUG WENN: I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition seeks my support. However, in reality, he has blown his opportunity. He has lost my support in total when he could have had my partial support, and he would at least have been part of the way towards his aim - although the passage of the amendment is a foregone conclusion with the way the Opposition plays the numbers game.

The question I was addressing was, will power station stack emissions force us to use gas for the next power station? The answer is a definite no. No doubt, in the past, the burning of Australian coal produced dust which went into the atmosphere. However, I give credit to an ex-member of the Liberal Party, John Sibson, who prior to an election took the bull by the horns and asked the then Government to put precipitators on the Bunbury powerhouse, a move that ran to a cost of \$3 million. Dust emissions from that power station, as a result of burning Collie coal, decreased dramatically. The people of Bunbury were very happy with the work done by John Sibson. I would not be surprised if that did not win the election for him at that time. I have no qualms about giving credit to a man who saw a problem and confronted it. Nowadays, with the new technology being used, the dust is collected by electronic static precipitators. The problem now, of course, is the disposal of the dust caught. In time, the State Energy Commission in Bunbury will be able to develop the dumping areas into park lands for general public use.

A booklet I have points out Western Australian sources of Greenhouse emissions. Emissions from land clearing run to 10 per cent; fossil fuel burning is 47 per cent - of which petroleum is 21 per cent; gas 14 per cent; and coal about 12 per cent. The source of that information is a discussion paper prepared by the Western Australia Greenhouse Coordination Council. It shows that coal and gas have relatively the same level of contribution to greenhouse emissions in Western Australia. I used to argue along the lines that we would have problems with greenhouse emissions, but after reading this information and talking to scientists, as well as reading papers in this place, I am now aware that the argument was not entirely correct. My research has convinced me that, environmentally, the base load coal fired powerhouse is a viable proposition.

Other aspects should be considered. If we build a new powerhouse with the latest technology available we will be leaning towards relaxing the greenhouse emissions into the atmosphere. We will do away with the Bunbury powerhouse in 1995-96 - as the Bunbury powerhouse does not have high technology to catch those emissions. In time the Kwinana powerhouse will also be taken off coal; again the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> will be eliminated. So, the reality of building one powerhouse with high technology is that we will reduce the dangers of gas emissions. Many books have been written on the topic. We cannot do without publications by the Environmental Protection Authority, and companies must submit papers to the EPA. I was approached by one company which could not believe how strict are the rules of the EPA. The company runs coal fired powerhouses in other countries, where the rules are nowhere near as strict.

Some time ago I purchased a book entitled "Greenhouse - Planning for climate change". We should consider one strong environmental passage in the book, from a paper presented by Mr I. Lowe, which reads -

A recent pilot study of attitudes to energy supply and use options shows a much more complex structure than the traditionally-assumed dichotomy between technocrats and environmentalists (Stainton Rogers *et al.*, 1986). This should be no surprise, since most environmentalists enjoy some of the comforts of our contemporary life-style and most technocrats have some concern for the natural world. A coherent approach to changing the present pattern of energy use in a fundamental way should be based on a more thorough understanding of the complex social role of energy and the consequently complex mixture of attitudes among the population.

Basically, that means that we are all environmentalists but we like the relaxation and the comforts offered by power energy.

The understanding at the Environmental Protection Authority is that whoever gets the contract to construct the new powerhouse will be committed to the planting of a huge number of trees around the buffer zone of the property, called Coolangatta, purchased by the Government some years ago to assist with emission control. Environmentally, even using coal, we have made the correct decision. We must ensure not only as members of Parliament

but also as members of the general public that the environmental instructions are adhered to. In no way should we drift away from those instructions.

Subparagraph 2(d) of the motion refers to ensuring the prosperity of the Collie area. No doubt, over the last few months, members who have visited Collie have noticed a depressed attitude among the general public. It has not been an easy fight for them, and much discussion has occurred over sleepless nights for many people. I have many people to thank for their efforts in Collie. The final crunch was that, if we had not come to the realisation of where we were going, within 12 years Collie would have been on the outer. If we had decided upon gas, it would have been there forever and a day. I still believe that gas would be much more profitable to the State, by exporting it and using it in as many industries as possible. However, the decision for a coal fired power station has meant that Collie has picked up already since the announcement was made. I have had a number of high ranking business people telephone me in Collie to see what the feeling is and to ask whether they could come down. Indeed next Thursday a number of businessmen are coming to Collie to look at its potential. A real estate agent in Collie who has had a block of land on the market for the past six months had not been able to get anyone to look at it, yet two days after the announcement on the power station he had eight inquiries. The people of Collie are now looking positively to the future. So they should, because the town has just been given a 40 year life; that is when those contracts will be coming up again for consideration.

At the outset I said that that decision had not pleased everyone, but Collie now has a long term future, not only for the current work force, but also for their children. That has created problems with services, because already there has been an influx of people looking for work in Collie. When the power station is operational the work force will run from 700 to over 1 000 workers, and if one adds to that the employment that will be created in the service industries such as shops, food supplies, theatres, the Government will need to upgrade services such as hospitals and education facilities.

Garry Woods led the union charge on this issue. He was not alone, but at the meeting held at the Collie oval he put all the points to the unions involved in the coal industry. Not everyone was happy, but they broke away into their own union groups to discuss the situation and when they came back and voted to go with the commitment given by the coal industry I saw the strain lift off Garry Woods. He had to stand before them and explain about the losses in the short term and the gains in the long term. I congratulate the many other people within the unions who were involved. I also congratulate Rosanne Pimm from the Collie Shire Council. She stood strongly behind what was happening. She was willing to go anywhere, at any time, to discuss the situation and to put the council's point of view. If anyone needed a little moral support, Rosanne was able to provide that support. All in all, although I have named those two people, everyone put in a huge amount of work. Politicians were involved: Julian Grill and Norm Marlborough were able to coordinate the efforts of various groups. Companies were able to speak to the unions, and I was surprised to learn that the companies were not aware of what was happening because they did not have the communication that they should have had. If one wants to see the reality of a lack of communication one has only to look at Telecom. The relationship between management and staff is nil, or akin to hatred, but that is something I will mention at a later time. All the people of Collie and all others involved must be thanked for their efforts.

Hon E.J. Charlton: What about the local member? How did she perform?

Hon DOUG WENN: Badly, but I will not go into that.

Hon Barry House: Be charitable.

Hon DOUG WENN: I will, by not talking about her. Hon Bill Stretch in his Address-in-Reply speech said that all members of Parliament must be thanked for their efforts. Those members also include Hon Barry House, Hon Murray Montgomery and Hon Bill Stretch. As local members of Parliament we did our best, but we are not running around saying that we were on all the committees and that we did everything. I am saying that we did this collectively, not as individuals.

Hon Barry House: Then you should add Dr Turnbull.

Hon DOUG WENN: I will, if the member wants to put it collectively. I will not go into that any deeper. As I said to Hon George Cash, I accept that the power station could be privately

owned, but I cannot accept the rest of his amendment because it reflects on the people of Collie and surrounding areas. I am opposed to the amendment in its entirety, although I support Hon John Halden's original motion.

**HON E.J. CHARLTON** (Agricultural) [4.28 pm]: I support the amendment, and I seek your advice, Mr President, on the procedure for an additional amendment that I wish to move. Should I move my amendment now or at the end of my comments?

**The PRESIDENT:** You have not spoken to the main question and therefore when this amendment is dealt with you will be able to speak to the original question. You cannot move your amendment now; you must do that when this one is disposed of.

**Hon John Halden:** But don't speak twice.

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON:** I will be brief and acknowledge the amendment moved by Hon George Cash. The main reason that the House should agree to his amendment is that it acknowledges that the coal station should be privately owned. While I acknowledge that the Government made the right decision we cannot entertain the situation where somewhere down the track it may change its mind. On 2 May an article in *The West Australian* stated -

Mr Meecham warned that the union movement had not given up its fight to prevent private ownership of utilities such as power stations.

He said unions would mount future campaigns for public ownership of the new station, which will be built and operated by Transfield-Mitsubishi.

The unions will press the Government to purchase the station or, at worst, lease the utility so it can be operated by the public sector.

It is important that while acknowledging the Government's decision and the fact that it took a long time we must also acknowledge that the players involved did not have an easy decision to make. We cannot, after the Government has made the decision, finish up with the unions saying that they intend to take over.

**Hon John Halden:** The contract would not allow that.

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON:** Contracts drawn up in the past have been changed, but I am pleased to hear Hon John Halden reiterate that that will not occur. I take it from his interjection that the Government would in no way entertain any part of the contract being written so as to give some commitment to the union movement or to Mr Meecham.

**Hon John Halden:** Mitsubishi-Transfield would not want that either. It is an enormous commitment on their part.

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON:** We do not want to see that happen; it would be in total contrast to the whole arrangement that has been negotiated and entered into. The second part of the amendment is concerned with deleting paragraph (2) of the motion. While it is fair to congratulate the Government on the decision it has made, it is drawing a long bow to combine that with the Government's commitment to microeconomic reform. We cannot say that the decision for the power station to come on stream in five or six years' time is a graphic illustration of the State Government's commitment to microeconomic reform. The same can be said about paragraph (2)(b) of the motion, which deals with the Government's commitment to decentralisation in the State industrial base and also about paragraph (2)(c) of the motion, which deals with the Government's commitment to continued insistence on development attaining the highest environmental standards. The first part of the motion embraces that. I agree that the decision to build a power station in Collie will ensure the prosperity of that area, but more needs to be done to completely ensure the future of Collie than simply making a decision to establish a privately owned power station there.

**Hon John Halden:** Talk to the people in Collie about that. They would think it was the greatest decision ever.

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON:** Absolutely. Not to make that decision would have been the death knell for Collie but there is more to ensuring the prosperity of Collie than making this decision. To pass paragraph (2) of the motion would be to acknowledge that the decision for a power station to be built in Collie will ensure the future of Collie forever. I support the amendment.



**HON MURRAY MONTGOMERY** (South West) [4.35 pm]: I support the amendment to the motion and at the same time support the decision to build a privately owned and operated power station in Collie. However, one has to examine the motion and see what it is really trying to say. Hon Doug Wenn said that had we had the opportunity to educate the community we may not have had to build this power station. That is interesting because various groups in the State have been saying exactly that. The promise to build a power station was made during the last election campaign by Hon Peter Dowding. He promised the people of Collie that a power station would be built there. It has taken two years for that decision to be made and during that two years a side issue was thrown up concerning whether we should build a gas fired power station. The Government had already promised that it would build a power station in Collie; it was part of its election campaign. The Government has given the people of Collie -

Hon Tom Helm: Another Government promise that we kept.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: It has taken a long time to make that decision.

Hon Tom Helm: You are so amazed with our decision.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: The Government has taken a long time to work out how it was to make that decision.

Hon John Halden: It was an appropriate decision.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: The Government took so long to make that decision because it could not figure out a way to build the power station. The Government could not borrow the money because it had put the money elsewhere.

Hon P.G. Pandal: You are getting to the nub of the question.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: The Government had to ask private enterprise to build the power station so the State would have the energy it required for its future needs.

Hon Tom Helm: So it did not have to pay for gas that it did not want.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: The Government could have bought gas at a cheap price.

Hon Tom Helm: We are still paying for it.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: The Government could have sold the gas overseas for three times the amount it bought it for.

Hon John Halden: Where is the contract for that? We can all say things like that, but there is no one buying gas.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: Is there not? The Government could sell the gas overseas.

Hon John Halden: Who would buy it?

Hon T.G. Butler: Does your amendment not say that?

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: I do not have an amendment.

Hon T.G. Butler: The amendment you are supporting.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: I have not moved my amendment yet.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon J.M. Brown): Order! It is difficult to follow the member's speech with so many members giving him advice on what to say. I know Hon Murray Montgomery is quite capable of making his own speech so I will ask members not to interject and to allow him to proceed.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: The people of Collie owe their existence to coal and to the generation of power in this State. It is interesting to note that the people of Collie are very pleased with the Government's decision. However, the second part of the motion moved by Hon John Halden refers to microeconomic reform and a graphic illustration of the State Government's commitment to that reform. The best place for microeconomic reform to start, in an area of great relevance to this country, is on the waterfront. That certainly has nothing to do with anything that has happened in Collie.

The building of the new power station at Collie has nothing to do with cheap power and the way this Government has treated the Collie miners and mining companies, because they are

two different issues. In one case the miners and coal mines will supply SECWA with coal, and in the other case a privately owned and operated power station will be supplied with coal by the mining companies - I assume they are still privately owned and operated - and will supply electricity. Therefore, the cheap power supposedly to be generated by SECWA is another issue altogether. Two issues are involved: The first is the private consortium building a new power station and supplying power to the SECWA grid, and the other is the Government's trying to make sure that SECWA has the vehicle by which it can get cheaper coal to provide cheap power into its own grid. I am sure that question of microeconomic reform has been taken on by the Government to try to tie the two together. That is where people become confused on the question of microeconomic reform. They are tying one with the other, but the cheap power would be provided in any case.

Hon E.J. Charlton: In five years.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: I thank Hon Eric Charlton for indicating that it will take five years. The motion states that the Government has made this decision also to decentralise the State's industrial base. The only way that can happen is for industry to establish in the south west or in other parts of the State outside the metropolitan area; decentralisation of industry will not follow from the building of a new power station in Collie. If industry is relocated in the Collie area, that is fine and it is a step forward in removing industry, together with some of its pollution problems, from the metropolitan area. However, relocating industries in the south west of this State will move some of the pollution to that area. Perhaps industrial parks should be scattered around the State, rather than industry being concentrated in one small area, in order to minimise the pollution in any one area.

The subject of environmental standards has been well aired in the speeches made during this debate. I see no reason for this issue being included in the motion, other than that power generation at Collie will obviously increase the prosperity of Collie. However, it will be necessary for somebody elsewhere in the State to flick a switch to initiate that prosperity. It cannot happen by building a power station; somebody elsewhere in the State must use the energy produced in that power station. Industry is needed to initiate that prosperity and industry needs cheap power. Therefore, we should look at areas other than those covered by this motion, because the motion does not go to the heart of the problem. Cheap power must be supplied through the generation process and perhaps by SECWA delivering that cheap power. We have already achieved the first part and we must make sure that SECWA provides cheap power to consumers.

As Hon Doug Wenn said, many people have played a part in the decision to build a power station in Collie. Many have been mentioned by name, and I refer now to the executive of the mining union, Garry Woods. We met him after he returned from a trip to the Eastern States. He landed in Perth at midnight and was in Collie in the early hours of the next morning. He met union members and others in the morning and we met him in the afternoon. Although he was tired, he was prepared to meet with the mining people and the unions who were trying to get the best deal possible for the establishment of the power station. With those few words, I indicate my support for the amendment to the motion.

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan) [4.48 pm]: The essential word to be examined in the words proposed to be deleted is "commitment". An excellent illustration of the difference between "being involved" and "being committed" can be found in the excellent breakfast dish of bacon and eggs; in the making of a dish of bacon and eggs, the hen is involved but the pig is committed.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Not always willingly.

Hon PETER FOSS: The point raised by Hon Derrick Tomlinson that it is not always a willing commitment is also a very important point. I agree that this is an excellent development; it is one of the better things the Government has done. In fact, it is one of the few things I can recall that the Government can stand up and celebrate. It probably happened by accident but, nonetheless, it is done and it is a good thing. We should all be happy that the Government has at long last done something for which we can congratulate it. To the extent that there has been any microeconomic reform, it has been carried out with great reluctance, as Hon Murray Montgomery pointed out to us. Had the Government had the money, it would have been dictated to by the unions and would have built the power station itself. We all know the reason the Government does not have the money is that it has spent

hundreds of millions of dollars on its mates, which has been of absolutely no benefit to this State. The only benefit which has come out of this whole sorry business is that the Government has been forced to use private industry to build and operate this power station.

Hon Graham Edwards: Tell that to the people who had their money in Rothwells. You would have seen them go broke.

Hon PETER FOSS: The money the Government spent on those people was trifling. What about the \$350 million the Government gave to Mr Connell?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon J.M. Brown): Order! If members want to have a shouting match, this is not the place. I ask the member on his feet to modify his tone so that we can conduct this debate in a sensible manner.

Hon PETER FOSS: One of the few benefits which has come out of the Rothwells and WA Inc saga is that the Government has been forced reluctantly into doing something which I believe is good and will assist the process of microeconomic reform. We should be grateful for those things which have come from the ill wind which has blown through Western Australia. Part of the reason the Government does not have any money to spend on a new power station is the \$400 million which it paid for the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd project. That takes us to some extent to the supposed commitment of the Government to decentralisation in the State industrial base. The Government planned to establish the PICL plant in Perth; so much for decentralisation and so much for a commitment! One of the reasons that it was so silly to build the PICL plant in Perth is that there is not enough gas in Perth. However, due to the foresight of a Liberal Government the Western Australian people committed themselves to purchasing gas and to developing the North West Shelf. That gas is now being consumed at such a rate that we are no longer able to supply all the people in the south west who wish to be supplied. It is unfortunate that the Labor Government forgets to mention this when it talks about the fact that in the early days when this gas came on stream there were not enough people to purchase all the gas. It is usually the case that we do not suddenly find overnight large numbers of people -

Hon Tom Helm interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: Is the member saying my facts are wrong? That is very good. I suggest to Hon Tom Helm and Hon Tom Butler that they work out whether the State Energy Commission is presently able to supply gas to all the people in the south west who would like to have it, because the current capacity of the north west pipeline is such that more people want gas than the SEC is able to supply. I tell members that because I happen to know that is a fact.

Hon Tom Helm: That reflects the success of a Labor Government.

Hon PETER FOSS: No. Some time ago the member was telling me I was wrong. He is now telling me that it reflects the success of a Labor Government. The member knows I am right because I would not be saying it if I were not right.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! This is the second time in about five minutes that I have had to get on my feet because of the loud comments of members on this subject. I ask the member to ignore any interjections - I will handle them quite capably - and to direct his remarks to me and to the motion.

Hon PETER FOSS: I think it is clear to the House that I am correct in saying that due to the foresight of a Liberal Government, a considerable amount of gas has been made available to industry in Western Australia, and that capacity has been absorbed. In fact, it has been more than absorbed because people are wishing to use gas but are not able to do so. However, despite the fact that the Government knew there was a shortage of gas, it proposed to set up in Perth, in the major industrial area of this State, a petrochemical plant. If that is a commitment to decentralisation in this State, it is a very strange sort of commitment. The Government made that decision about the PICL project despite the fact that at the same time a Liberal Opposition - showing the usual foresight that a Liberal Opposition and a Liberal Government is capable of showing - suggested that the appropriate place for the PICL project, if we were to engage in such a project, would be the north west because there is a lot of gas there which could be used. There is also salt which could be used, although it is not quite as close as Mr Dallas Dempster's source of supply, which is probably the reason the petrochemical project was to be in Perth, because Mr Dempster was going to get a bit out of

it. Leaving that aside, the sensible place to locate the project would have been the north west. However, that suggestion was not taken up by this Government, despite its so-called commitment to decentralisation, because in fact there is no such commitment. If anything has happened in terms of decentralisation, it has been by sheer coincidence and force of circumstance, where this Government has been dragged reluctantly, kicking and screaming, into the arena.

Hon Murray Montgomery made another important point that notwithstanding that Hon Peter Dowding gave a commitment to establish a coal fired power station at Collie, that commitment appears to have been forgotten for two years while the Government has been trying to find some way of getting around its honouring that commitment. However, the Government has again been forced, kicking and struggling, to the realisation that it has left its decision making so late that it really has no alternative. This decision should have been made not just two years ago when the commitment was made by Hon Peter Dowding but at least four to five years ago. The problem with this Government is that it is so uncommitted to anything other than its own survival that it is unable to make any useful decisions unless it is put in a position of having no choice but to do so.

Hon John Halden: Why didn't you think of it four or five years ago?

Hon PETER FOSS: I will not go into that. I suggest that if the member is genuinely interested, he read a paper prepared by Richard Court, a person who appears to have knowledge, experience and ideas in this area which far exceed those of anybody in the Government. Were members to read his ideas I am sure they would find them extremely illuminating and very good for their education.

We need to understand that this Government has no commitment whatsoever to microeconomic reform. One of the best examples of that has been this Government's attitude to one of the leaders of microeconomic reform not just in Western Australia but also in Australia; I refer to Robe River Iron Associates. The idea of microeconomic reform would not even be a talking point had it not been for the excellent action taken by that company. Prior to the action of Robe River in the north west and the enormous reforms and improvements in efficiency and productivity made by that company, not even lip service was paid to the idea of microeconomic reform. Had that company not taken the flak which it took, and had it not shown the sheer determination to demonstrate to the people of Australia what microeconomic reform can achieve, we would not be talking about microeconomic reform on a national basis. We hear people say that it is good to see things change; there were terrible abuses and industrial practices; but that was not the right way to go about it. The fact remains that had this company not taken the action which it did, other people would not have benefited from its actions and we would not even have microeconomic reform on the agenda in Australia.

Hon Bob Thomas: Why are coal prices cheaper now than they were when you were in power?

Hon J.M. Berinson: The member is not usually lost for words like that.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am not lost for words.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon PETER FOSS: Robe River Iron Associates has been under continual attack by this Government for the actions it has taken. Hon David Parker, who was the Minister in charge of mining matters at the time these changes took place, continually undermined and attacked the Robe River company publicly when he should have been supporting microeconomic reform; and to this day the Government still tends to cut Robe River dead.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is 5.00 pm and therefore I must interrupt the debate for the purpose of taking questions without notice. For the benefit of honourable members I advise that I take my time from the clock at the far end of the Chamber, as I cannot see the one above me.

[Questions without notice taken.]

Hon PETER FOSS: Not only was the Government, at the time that Robe River introduced its reforms into the workplace, very antagonistic to the efforts of Robe, but also to this day it still has not recognised the fact that it owes Robe a tremendous amount for its efforts and

contributions to the microeconomic reform of Western Australia. Had it not been for the changes implemented by Robe, other companies in the north west would not have been able to make the changes they have made.

I believe the Government cannot talk about a commitment to anything when its total involvement has been by happenstance rather than by following any principle. It is clear that the principles of the Australian Labor Party are totally contrary to the very things it seeks to espouse in paragraph (2) of the motion. That is why we have to delete paragraph (2). It is sheer hypocrisy to claim that the benefits which genuinely flow from this decision - we accept there are genuine benefits from the decision - result from a commitment by this Government. If the Government were to say that the ALP will change its platform so that it, like the Liberal Party, is committed to free enterprise and that the Government should not be involved in matters that can be handled by private enterprise, I would agree that that is a form of commitment. However, when its platform says quite the opposite and it has done this over the complaints and objections of unions, one can hardly call it commitment. Therefore, I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

---

**Ayes (15)**

Hon J.N. Caldwell	Hon P.H. Lockyer	Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon George Cash	Hon Murray Montgomery	Hon D.J. Wordsworth
Hon E.J. Charlton	Hon N.F. Moore	Hon Margaret McAleer
Hon Max Evans	Hon Muriel Patterson	(Teller)
Hon Peter Foss	Hon P.G. Pandal	
Hon Barry House	Hon R.G. Pike	

**Noes (14)**

Hon J.M. Berinson	Hon John Halden	Hon Sam Piantadosi
Hon J.M. Brown	Hon Kay Hallahan	Hon Bob Thomas
Hon T.G. Butler	Hon B.L. Jones	Hon Doug Wenn
Hon Cheryl Davenport	Hon Garry Kelly	Hon Fred McKenzie
Hon Graham Edwards	Hon Mark Nevill	(Teller)

**Pairs**

Hon W.N. Stretch	Hon Tom Stephens
Hon Reg Davies	Hon Tom Helm

Amendment thus passed.

*Motion, as Amended*

**HON E.J. CHARLTON** (Agricultural) [5.37 pm]: The motion as amended defines the role of the Government which should be adhered to in the implementation of the new power station at Collie. However, I think there is a need to further endorse what has taken place and to ensure that other aspects are adhered to.

*Amendment to Motion, as Amended*

**HON E.J. CHARLTON:** I move -

To insert after paragraph (1), the following -

This House recommends that the Government continues to provide energy efficiently by undertaking in conjunction with SECWA, a thorough review of the commission's operation and undertakings with the intent that power is supplied Statewide at a rate that renders downstream processing, wherever located, a feasible proposition.

It is essential, as was adequately pointed out by Hon Murray Montgomery, to ensure that ongoing benefits from a privately owned and operated coal fired power station benefit everybody. It is one thing to build a new power station; it is another to ensure that the benefits do not occur in five years' time but come forward now. The mining unions and the companies have made a variety of decisions with the State Energy Commission to ensure that there is a more efficient power source. While that has happened we have a situation in which

the State Energy Commission of Western Australia needs to put its house in order. It is absolutely critical for the Government to embark, with the same sort of tenacity, on a program which will ensure that SECWA achieves that end. In the discussions which we were privileged to have, and which we appreciated, with representatives from SECWA about a power source from a coal fired power station, it was outlined that SECWA had to obtain coal at a price which would enable the authority to produce power at a competitive rate. The National Party supports that and everyone agrees with it and the Government has taken steps to ensure that takes place.

SECWA will have to fine tune its operations so that power can be generated and distributed through the system in an efficient and cost effective way that will benefit the State. Some people will react by saying it will mean that some personnel will lose their employment at a time when unemployment is increasing. They will ask how we could entertain such an idea. It is common knowledge that SECWA took on a number of employees who were previously employed in other Government departments. This applied mainly to personnel from Westrail who were employed in country areas. Westrail was told that it had to smarten up its operations; that may have occurred in country areas, but it has not been the case in the metropolitan area and the cost that is being incurred is passed on through the system. We have to be big enough to acknowledge that we have a problem. No-one is saying that to clean up the waterfront or SECWA people should be sacked and thrown on the scrap heap. If the Government is dinkum it will smarten up the operations of SECWA so that energy can be generated in the most efficient, effective and economical way. If it means that personnel have to be put off, that is the way it has to be. The important thing to remember is that if the action I propose is taken it will enable new businesses to start up. I ask Hon Sam Piantadosi whether he would like to comment.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Garry Kelly): Order! He will not comment from the position he now occupies.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: My proposal will enable new initiatives to be taken and new industries to come on stream.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: I am happy to make a comment; it is not a problem.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I can hear the member. I reiterate that if the operations of SECWA are put in order it will allow new industry to get off the ground and people can be retrained in new skills.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Sack them - throw them out onto the streets!

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Now that Hon Sam Piantadosi is sitting in a position where he feels he is able -

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! He will still be out of order, but not as much.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: - to make valid comment, he is trying to sidetrack me from the most important point; that is, if we clean up SECWA to make it more efficient, cheaper power will be available. Everyone acknowledges that Western Australia is in a ludicrous situation with power generation and distribution costs. Those costs make it impossible for new industrial development to get off the ground and for any decentralisation, which was referred to in the original motion, to take place. We need to look at it from a broader perspective than we have done in the past. When we consider changes to the status quo the immediate reaction is what we heard from Hon Sam Piantadosi; that is, what do we do with the employees? Do we put them on the scrap heap? We must ensure that power generation is carried out in an efficient, businesslike manner and this should apply to existing power facilities as well as to the new power station at Collie for which the Government is being congratulated for implementing. Both the Government and SECWA must make a commitment to ensure that takes place and they should not continue to have a comfortable feeling about putting the screws on the coal companies and unions at Collie. They cannot relax because they believe the system is now under control. The Government must put a heavy hand on SECWA to smarten up its operations and to carry out the reforms I have proposed. As the operations of the authority improve it will be productive for the State and the work force.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Do you think we could guarantee a minimum price for power?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I would like to see a massive change in the Government's approach to new industry.

Hon Mark Nevill: A revolution?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Yes, that is the word. Let us have a revolution.

If the Government were dinkum about decentralisation and attracting new industry into Western Australia it could advertise that there will not be an increase in power costs or other services for two or five years. The Government could take a number of initiatives and, after all, that is the role of Government. It should be involved in ensuring that the services it provides are made available in all areas of the State. I will cite a few examples of industries which are about to get off the ground. The Moora paper and pulp mill, a \$100 million investment, is on the drawing board and Westrail is saying that if it is to be involved in transporting 100 000 tonnes per annum of the company's product from that mill to Geraldton it will have to spend \$6 million on infrastructure. Westrail has said that it is unable to do that and that is where the Government should consider the overall situation and perhaps make moves to construct a siding for use by Westrail. Arrangements for adequate power supply will be made with SECWA. The proposed industry is only small, but it will create 269 jobs. That is the type of industry we want as a result of a shake up in this State. If a shake up does not occur we will continue to have the situation which prevailed prior to the Government's making its decision about the coal fired power station.

I have a couple of newspaper articles which illustrate why this action should be taken by the Government. *The West Australian* of 2 May states -

On the other side of the equation, SECWA unions have offered specific work changes and committed themselves in writing to improving power station productivity by at least 15 per cent in the next four years.

Later, Dr Lawrence is reported as saying -

The concessions made by the coal companies, miners and SECWA unions will result in real reductions in power charges for both householders and industry from July 1.

If the Premier is dinkum about that then I ask Hon John Halden or any other Government member to say whether that will happen when he responds in this debate. The only way to ensure that happens is to make SECWA put into effect these absolutely crucial and critical changes. Out in Mukinbudin or any other small country town the small businesses using freezer-type installations are paying 18.4¢ a unit for their power - an absolutely astronomical fee which jeopardises the viability of those businesses. If we are dinkum about decentralisation we must get things balanced and decide whether we need these people out there. We should stop this nonsense of saying that things must be cost effective, that it costs X dollars to put power through rural Western Australia and therefore we must get a certain amount in return even if a body is currently running at a loss. If we acknowledge that SECWA is running at a loss we must balance that against the fact that the Shire of Mukinbudin brought in \$41 million gross to Western Australia last year. Therefore, one cannot just look at SECWA, Westrail or the Main Roads Department in isolation, saying that it costs this much therefore we must get this much back. It is time we had some fresh thinking on what has been happening in this State for a long time.

The important point of this further amendment is that we must not stop now. It is absolutely crucial that the Government ensure, by adopting a strong and forceful attitude, that these things happen and that it does not allow procrastination. If it does this it will ensure that SECWA gets its house in order and refines its operation so that it gets its power charges down for the benefit of the State. In doing that it will ensure that downstream processing takes place. Right now we have the Kwinanas of this State set up around the cities of Australia. Their position has no bearing on the raw materials and primary industry that this State produces so well. We have many opportunities to have a future in downstream processing of our mining and agricultural products. If members were to speak to people associated with River House, which is involved with a paper pulp mill, they would find out what can be done. It would open members' eyes and lift their expectations. All we have to do is make a few decisions like this one which are no skin off anybody's nose and the benefits of which will compound across the board. The few people, as important as they are, who will suffer loss of employment as a result will have their unemployment offset by the extra opportunities provided indirectly to them and to many other people because of the new opportunities that will arise.

**HON P.G. PENDAL** (South Metropolitan) [5.55 pm]: I am in favour of the amendment to the extent Hon Eric Charlton has talked about the Government and the State Energy Commission of Western Australia seeking more energy efficiency. It is an interesting observation, coming on top of what Hon Eric Charlton said, that if one looks at matters rationally SECWA cannot possibly be committed to efficiency to a maximum degree because it has a vested interest in selling more and more power rather than producing less or having its current load used more efficiently. The reason that is significant is that it produces a dilemma for an organisation in charge of producing power which at the same time is charged with the responsibility for ensuring that energy is used efficiently.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is why we split the policy from the SEC.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I was about to say that we should go one step further. I believe there is a case to be made for removing from SECWA its role in promoting the use of energy in a wiser and more efficient way. For example, in the past the Solar Energy Research Institute was more independent of mainstream SECWA than most bodies are today. I will give an example of what one might achieve by separating the role of energy efficiency from SECWA. It relates to the use of new light bulbs coming onto the market. Members will have heard stories that some light bulbs use substantially less power while producing the same amount of light. They also last a lot longer.

Hon Mark Nevill: I am sure that the State Energy Policy and Planning Bureau performs that role as well, although I may be wrong.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It may do so, but we do not see the effect of that. If it is true that what is called the "compact fluorescent bulb" uses 18 watts while most globes in homes use 75 watts while producing the same amount of light, then the effect of using the compact bulbs must be one of reducing the energy bill of every consumer in Western Australia. I am told that these globes last for seven times as long as ordinary globes. By inference that must reduce the draw they make on the State's energy system. If all of those things are true, which they are because they have been proved in the United States, it begs the question, why are we not using them?

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Members will be aware that the amendment moved by Hon Eric Charlton touches on the question of providing energy efficiently in Western Australia, and the Government and SECWA have a role in that. However, energy conservation functions run contrary to the stated purpose of SECWA in the first place. SECWA exists in order to produce energy. It exists as well in order to sell that energy. It has a vested interest in selling as much energy as it can to the electricity consumers of Western Australia. That militates against an energy conservation.

During the dinner break I was able to ascertain those statistics from the United States of America which bolster the argument I was advancing whereby SECWA could already demonstrate its commitment to energy conservation by the use of compact fluorescent bulbs. The fact that it is not supports my argument that SECWA has no vested interest in the conservation of energy. I quote from page 180 of a publication called "The State of the World" written by Lester R. Brown, whom I met in Washington last November. In this article, under the subheading of "Picturing a Sustainable Society", he states -

Forty years from now, Thomas Edison's revolutionary incandescent light bulbs may be found only in museums - replaced by a variety of new lighting systems, including halogen and sodium lights.

This is the most important part of the quote -

The most important new light source may be compact fluorescent bulbs that, for example, use 18 watts rather than 75 to produce the same amount of light. The new bulbs, already available today, not only reduce consumers' electricity bills, they last over seven times as long.

I ask members to ponder on those figures for a minute. It is actually possible, according to this publication, to use in our homes a new sort of bulb which uses 18 watts rather than the 75 which most of us use, or in some cases 100. From the 18 watts one obtains the same amount of light in one's home. At the end of the day the electricity bill will be something



like 25 per cent of the current amount. As well as that we have the bonus that the bulbs last seven times as long. They cost a fair bit more, but it would be interesting to run a model through a computer in order to ascertain the following things. If we were to give every consumer of electricity in Western Australia a free set of compact fluorescent bulbs, we may well be up for many millions of dollars, but according to this research it may so reduce the community's reliance on the State Energy Commission's network that any decision to build a new power station after the next one at Collie may be obviated. In other words the investment of a few million dollars up front may well save Western Australia hundreds of millions of dollars.

That is the impact of an energy conservation policy being encouraged in a society instead of our current position, which is one where the State Energy Commission has a vested interest in our using more and more energy out of its own grid. To that extent Hon Eric Charlton's amendment deserves the attention of the House. Given that this is a motion sponsored by the Government, I request the Leader of the House to give us some information from the State Energy Commission in due course on whether a model of that kind could not be run through a computer. It has been acknowledged tonight by Hon Peter Foss that the cost of the next base load power station at Collie will be considerable, and could run to hundreds of millions of dollars. It will be so costly that the private sector is being asked to provide it. To that extent, the Opposition enthusiastically supports the Government's motion.

Hon Mark Nevill: Mr Foss was saying that the decision should have been made five years ago. You are saying that the decision should have been made later.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: No I am not. Hon Peter Foss is right that the decision made last week ought to have been made somewhere between three and five years ago. I am saying that the decision has now been made for the next base load power station at Collie, but we now should be in the planning mode for the next one, because we are not only way behind the eight ball in the provision of the current proposal but also we will be further behind the eight ball in future if, for example, this State is to produce energy costs in any way comparable to the rest of Australia. That is the reason that the Opposition has committed itself to a reduction in a four year period in the energy costs to the consumer in the order of 40 per cent.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Were you in favour of swapping from coal to oil a few years ago?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Firstly, I was not in the House then.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: I am asking for your opinion.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: My electorate has a fair bit to say about that because it has big ramifications for not only the people at Kwinana, where one of the power stations will be affected, but also for many people outside my electorate. However, that is not my point.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: That is not the answer to my question. The member talks about efficiency, but he should respond to my question.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will come to that question in a few moments -

Hon T.G. Butler: You won't.

Hon Mark Nevill: He never does.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: I think that the member is in favour of wind power.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon J.M. Brown): Order!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That was a device taught to me by a Labor politician a long time ago.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is your only saving grace.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: He was one of the few reputable Labor politicians in the State. My point is that the Government owes it to the House, and the State Energy Commission owes it to the House, to give us some idea whether we need to go to another base load power station beyond that which has been announced by the Government in recent days, and which has been given the support - although one would not know it from the comments of other members - of the members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party. It is a ludicrous position for us to be mindlessly going down the path of a new power station after the next Collie one, if the trials coming out of the United States are accurate; if it is true that a person can produce in his own home -

Hon Mark Nevill: It is the same as saying that we don't need one now.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: We do need one now. I do not know how many times I need to say that. We need the base load power station which was announced last week. We might not need the one after that.

Hon Bob Thomas: The Geraldton one or the Port Hedland one?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will be interested to hear the member's contribution in a few moments. Suffice it to say that the amendment is a sensible one. It asks the Government to concentrate not just on a Capital Works Program - which it cannot afford anyway. That is the reason the Government has invited the private sector to be involved; it is not because the Government believes that the private sector is more efficient or more capable of providing that, which it is; the private sector has been invited to finance the new base load coal fired power station at Collie because the Government cannot afford to build it.

The Government has squandered so much money, and that is having an effect on the eastern seaboard where the Prime Minister is under such pressure tonight. That is a matter which the House should be addressing; it is a matter which the mover of the motion, Hon John Halden, ought to address. The Government should give some information about the energy conservation program which I learnt about in the United States. It is something which may well save the consumers of energy in this State many millions of dollars in the form of power bills. I support the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

*Motion, as Further Amended*

**HON BARRY HOUSE** (South West) [7.46 pm]: I will add some comments to the debate from a south west perspective. I welcome the announcement of the base load coal fired power station to be built at Collie. It was a sensible decision under the circumstances, and should be welcomed, although I have a couple of reservations. The announcement is three years too late; it should have been made a few years ago, because the State is fast running out of capacity for industries to locate, particularly down stream processing industries, which have already been mentioned.

Hon Bob Thomas: What about gas turbines?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The member represents the same area as I do. He may make his comments afterwards. We still face the possibility of brownouts in the next year or two until the base load power station is up and running. The Government's procrastination in coming to a decision has led to the ruin of several businesses in the Bunbury area, such as an engineering works which closed down prior to Christmas last year. I hope that the business reopens and that it shares in the economic upturn that we will see as a result of this decision. Much of that pain involved could have been avoided.

I congratulate the coal companies, and the miners who made concessions in order to make this coal fired power station a feasible proposition. The companies agreed to reduced tonnages, and the unions agreed to a cut in the work force and in wages, and generally to increase efficiency. That was done in the interests of the town of Collie and to ensure the future of the south west. They have recognised the reality of the situation. Hon Tom Butler is not present at the moment, but after his speech last night I am sure he will agree that this represents a form of enterprise bargaining - or what I understand it to be; that is, where two bodies in the workplace get together and negotiate their future. If they had been committed to a centralised decision making process we would not have seen the concessions made.

As stated by other speakers, a great deal of work still needs to be done. The final negotiations are not complete, and much ground has to be made up by the SECWA unions. The featherbedding of work practices at the Muja and Kwinana power stations is well known. That simply must be addressed for the future.

I support the Government's decision to go with the coal option and not gas. Like most members, I have been privy to briefings on advances in power generation technology and I am very satisfied that coal power generation can meet all the environmental requirements. Also, I am pleased that the energy proposal includes the planting of some 40 million trees. The coal fired power station has been opposed consistently by extreme environmentalists. The Mayor of Bunbury, Dr Manea, was reported in the *Leschenault Reporter* as stating that if

the environmentalists were fair dinkum about their topic, they would campaign about the emissions from cars in the Perth metropolitan area.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You are wearing the right colours, Mr House.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: These emissions have a far more significant impact on the greenhouse effect than the emissions resulting from the power station project. The privately-owned power station will produce much needed competition to reduce power costs and to encourage the future development of the south west region. It runs against the grain of Labor Party policy to privatise such a facility, and it is certainly more in line with Liberal Party philosophy. It was proposed by the Liberal Party that a new coal fired power station would result in a 40 per cent reduction in power costs, yet I understand that this power station will deliver a reduction of only 25 per cent. However, I welcome the change in direction by the Labor Party.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: We welcome your change to become a greenie. You could give some pointers to Mr Pandal.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: This decision is likely to cause some problems in the Labor Party, and I leave it to its members to sort that out. They are not capable of doing so, but it is their problem, not ours. It is ironic that the motion was moved today by Hon John Halden, a convener of the left faction of the Australian Labor Party.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Get it right.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Is the member the convener? The Halden and McGinty team, from the left faction, was involved in the Cabinet reshuffle this year.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: I am worried about your green argument because you may not be up to date with those facts either.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I thought the left faction in the Labor Party was the protector of public utilities. Like Hon George Cash, I welcome the approval of the Labor left for this proposal. However, the real reason that this power station is privately owned should not be forgotten; that is, that the Government does not have the money to pay for it.

The new power station will encourage the south west to get back on the economic rails. It will provide an important boost for the south west, and it is estimated that 25 per cent of the economic activity in Bunbury is as a result of input from Collie. Also, about 30 per cent of the Collie work force commutes from Australind, Eaton and Bunbury. Therefore, a significant amount of the region's wealth is created in Collie and this is drawn to the major regional centre in Bunbury. Until recently this area had been insulated from the economic downturn, but it started to feel the pinch prior to Christmas last year. This decision will boost confidence and provide incentive for industry, building and engineering industries in particular, to move to the area.

The other night I mentioned some unemployment statistics which were issued by the Bunbury office of the Department of Social Security. From March 1990 to March 1991 a 56 per cent increase occurred in the number of people unemployed in the area. I hope that this decision will help the plight of those people. When considering these figures one must take into account the disguised situations such as the many people who have been cut back from full time to part time employment, and the many year 11 and 12 students who have stayed at school because they have no career options.

I was puzzled by a couple of aspects of the Government's announcement about this power station project: Firstly, I was puzzled by its timing. In many respects the announcement should have been made a couple of years ago - however, it is better late than never. Secondly, the Premier came to Bunbury and made an announcement about the Bunbury Regional Hospital. That also was a welcome announcement as it is something we have been seeking for a long time. These two announcements came from a Government in midterm, and this indicates that maybe it is losing touch. This would not have happened in the Burke or Dowding days, when such an announcement would have been made before an election and involved glossy brochures, plenty of fanfare, a band and dancing girls.

Hon Doug Wenn: If we had done that, you would have complained bitterly.

Hon P.G. Pandal: It would have involved new satchels.

Hon Mark Nevill: What would please you by way of an announcement?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I have already said that I supported the announcement.

Hon P.G. Pandal: An announcement to go to an election straight away to face the judgment of the people.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: That is right; I hope this decision heralds an early State election.

Hon Doug Wenn: Don't hold your breath, Mr House.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: We are particularly interested in taking on the seats of Mitchell and Bunbury.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Far too many conversations are taking place in the Chamber.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The announcement of the coal fired power station at Collie should have created a great deal of electoral comfort for the Minister for South-West, David Smith; it should have helped to restore his dwindling electoral stocks. However, I will relate to the House the way he heralded the good news in the south west. In last Tuesday's *South West Times*, on the day prior to the announcement, a front page article headed "Coal bid remote: Smith" read as follows -

Failure by coal companies and some SECWA unions to meet cost-cutting targets will see the State Government choose the gas power option, according to South West Minister David Smith.

Hon P.G. Pandal: A well informed Minister!

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The article continued -

On the eve of the Government's decision on another coal-fired power station, Mr Smith said he was concerned the effort to secure the facility was falling apart.

A little further on the article read -

A rally was held in Perth by supporters of the coal option, and the Government is expected to make a decision today.

That was last Tuesday. It continued -

Mr Smith said offers by both Western Collieries Ltd and Griffin Coal Mining Company fell short of Government targets.

"It has just been impossible to get a reasonable proposal out of a couple of the unions," he said.

Mr Smith criticised the rally.

"Instead of demonstrating, everyone concerned would have been better off staying at the negotiating table," he said.

"The rally won't have a bearing on the decision.

"The conditions have already been set, and have been known to the companies and unions since the end of December.

"Quite simply, if the conditions are not met, there will not be a coal-powered station."

Hon Mark Nevill: What is wrong with that?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: That was on Tuesday and the announcement came on Wednesday. I will relate to members the lead article in the *South West Times* on 2 May. The headline is "Green light for coal-fired power project". The article states -

Following an 11 to five Cabinet vote in favour of the station, Mr Smith claimed his recent comments that gas power would be chosen over coal unless targets were reached, was a ploy to keep the heat on coal companies and unions.

"We were never bluffing on the targets," he said.

That is a very interesting comment coming from a Minister of the Crown. Overnight he has done a complete back flip on the issue.

Hon Mark Nevill: Why?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Or he was remarkably ill informed on Tuesday, because on the Wednesday he was supposedly supporting the coal fired option.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is nonsense. He put pressure on and he got the concessions.

Hon George Cash: Don't be stupid.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: After reading his comments, and given that the Cabinet vote was 11 to five, I wonder whether Hon David Smith actually supported the motion in Cabinet.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is grubby politics.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: If he did not support the motion, the people of the south west must be thankful that he got rolled. At the very least, by those comments, which are starkly in contrast, he has played the people of Collie and the south west as fools and that will not be appreciated by those people.

Hon Mark Nevill: You are a petty fool.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: It clearly illustrates the contemptuous attitude he has developed since he became a Minister.

Hon George Cash: We will never be sure whether what he is saying is a ploy or a fact. It will always be subject to question.

Hon J.M. Brown: Now, now, Mr Cash.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: His constituents are asking whether they can take him seriously.

Hon Mark Nevill: If they had not delivered those concessions in the last 24 hours there would not have been a coal fired power station. What is inconsistent with that?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: That sounds like a lot of rubbish.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have asked members on three occasions now to cease their audible conversations. As I have said on many occasions, members do not have to like what is said in this place, but they do have to listen. If members do not want to listen, they do not have to stay in here.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I applaud the decision to locate the coal fired power station at Collie. I applaud the decision to make it a privately owned and operated power station. It will provide a significant boost for the south west, and I congratulate people involved with the Collie Coal Industry Council. They have done a very good job over the last six months.

Hon J.M. Brown: Particularly Tom Jones.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Yes, I was about to mention Tom Jones, who was deputy chairman of that industry council. Other people were involved in a big way, such as Rosanne Pimm; the Collie Shire President, Gary Wood; David Crawford; Mike Lowry, and others as well. The two members who have their offices located in Collie are Dr Hilda Turnbull, the member for Collie, and Hon Doug Wenn, and both made strong representations to the Government and deserve plaudits. I commend the amended motion to the House.

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.

## LEGAL CONTRIBUTION TRUST AMENDMENT BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Attorney General), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Attorney General) [8.08 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to clarify the meaning of the words "lowest balance in his trust account" in section 11 of the Legal Contribution Trust Act 1967. The Legal Contribution Trust Act requires legal practitioners to deposit 65 per cent of the lowest balance of their trust account occurring during the current or preceding financial year with the trust. Section 11(1) of the Act, which relates to the initial depositing of funds, requires that a practitioner

shall deposit "to the credit of the trust an amount being not less than the prescribed percentage of the lowest balance in his trust account". Section 11(2) relates to the ongoing need for a practitioner to maintain a deposit in the trust. It again refers to the "lowest balance in his trust account".

The trustees of the trust are concerned about the existence of doubt as to the proper interpretation of the phrase "lowest balance of his trust account". The present interpretation generally adopted is that the lowest unreconciled balance is to apply. In other words, no credit is to be given to cheques already written but not presented. While the present practice appears to rely on a correct interpretation of the phrase, in the interests of clarity and certainty an amendment to put the matter beyond doubt is desirable. The Bill simply clarifies the meaning of the relevant phrase in accordance with the generally accepted interpretation.

In addition to that amendment, the Bill contains the standard accountability provisions approved by Cabinet in January 1990 regarding powers held by the Minister to issue directions to the trust with respect to its performance and ministerial access to information.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Derrick Tomlinson.

### **SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Attorney General), and read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**HON J.M. BERINSON** (North Metropolitan - Attorney General) [8.10 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

For some time, there have been conflicting legal opinions about the date from which newly elected members of the Legislative Council are entitled to remuneration. This Bill seeks to clarify the position by providing that payment can be made to newly elected members of the Council only upon the commencement of their constitutional term of office; that is, from 22 May. No doubt, many newly elected members commence assisting their constituents as from the date of their election. However, as they cannot sit or vote in the Council prior to 22 May, they cannot constitutionally be regarded as members. Payment prior to 22 May therefore appears unjustified. In particular, the amendment precludes the possibility of two people being paid in relation to one office where a retiring member of the Council has not been returned at a general election but remains a member and is paid accordingly until 22 May. It is in line with the practice of the Commonwealth Parliament where senators are paid only from the July in which they take up their seats. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Derrick Tomlinson.

### **COMPANIES (CO-OPERATIVE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Attorney General), and read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**HON J.M. BERINSON** (North Metropolitan - Attorney General) [8.12 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for an amendment to section 174 of the Companies (Co-operative) Act to increase the percentage of shares which may be repurchased from members from five per cent to 10 per cent of paid up capital. This amendment brings the buy back capacity of cooperative companies into line with the buy back provisions of the Companies (Western Australia) Code and the corporations law. Cooperative societies presently registered under the Co-operative Provident Societies Act wish to convert to cooperative companies. Once the buy back provisions have been increased, the societies will convert to cooperative companies and come within the Companies (Co-operative) Act.

The conversion is in the interests of the public as the Companies (Co-operative) Act provides a more complete regulatory regime for cooperatives. The Co-operative and Provident Societies Act has limited regulatory and providential requirements and societies are largely left to their own devices. The cooperative societies consider the change in the buy back provisions to be vital to them because they need to create a market for shares of members who leave the industry and similarly there needs to be a source of shares for people who wish to become members. The amendment is supported by the Co-operative Federation of Western Australia. Once the conversions have been effected, the Co-operative and Provident Societies Act may be repealed. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Max Evans.

## **MOTION - ROTTNEST ISLAND AUTHORITY AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 1990**

### *Disallowance*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of debate from 7 May.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Fred McKenzie.

## **ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - TENTH DAY**

### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 7 May.

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral) [8.15 pm]: I support the motion moved by Hon Jim Brown for the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech as delivered to this House on the opening day of Parliament. I support also the way the Governor is carrying out his duties. He has the widespread support of the Western Australian community for the way he has taken on the role of Governor and for the way he represents the people of Western Australia in that capacity.

I commence my speech by referring to a couple of matters raised by Hon Tom Butler in his speech in the Address-in-Reply debate last night. He said quite rightly that, as I was interjecting on him, I should make my own speech. I therefore take this opportunity tonight to respond in a substantive way rather than by interjection to some of the matters he raised. I am pleased that there are still people like Hon Tom Butler in the labour movement. I thought they might have become redundant with the new four on the floor entrepreneurial style of Mr Burke and his successors. To hear his speech about the labour movement in 1891, and the ballad that he read to the House, indicates that the old labour movement is alive and well even if it is a bit out of date - like 100 years. My wife's great-grandfather was William Guthrie Spence, who was a leader of the shearers' union. My parents-in-law made a presentation to the labour movement of William Guthrie Spence's tea set and the original copy of the book he wrote. My in-laws, therefore, have a strong association with the Labor Party going back to the 1890s. The way in which the Labor Party received those gifts and the way they treated my parents-in-law when they presented it with those gifts was a credit to it. It handled them in a sensitive and positive way and I commend it for that. My in-laws were impressed and touched by the way they were treated on that occasion.

In the light of my situation, it is interesting that I have been accused of being opposed to unions or that I do not like them; I think that was the term used by Hon Tom Butler last night. I am not opposed to unionism; I think it is probably necessary. However, it is out of date. Hon Tom Butler's remarks last night emphasised that the union movement is anachronistic in modern society. In a sense, it is old hat and out of step with the needs of a modern society because it imposes great restrictions and a very inflexible system on the labour market in Australia. At this time in the world economy, it is absolutely vital for countries such as Australia to have a considerable degree of flexibility in the way it operates. We must get rid of centralised, monolithic decision making processes which make it very difficult for the labour market in Australia to respond to the demands of the world economy. However, even Labor Governments at both the State and Federal level have realised that that is the way of the world at present and they are seeking, in their own small way, to address the problems in the Australian economy.

Hon Mark Nevill: Don't you think management has failed probably more than union members over the years?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am not being critical of unions without taking into account that they are part of the economic system. I am equally happy to criticise the employers when it is necessary. However, we must realise that the Australian economy is in desperate need of some hard decision making which means the removal of some of the entrenched positions that people have in the economy at present. One of those entrenched positions is that of the union movement.

Hon Garry Kelly: Do you see no role for unions at all?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I think there was a significant role for unions in the past and there will probably be one in the future. However, there is no role at this time. The way in which the union movement has sought to look after the interests of workers is working in reverse. The centralised constraints that it imposes on the economy do not allow the economy to respond or be flexible to be a part of the world system. If every other country had a union system like ours and their economies were as slow to respond to demands as is ours, my argument would be different. Maybe I could accept that that is fair and reasonable.

Australia is competing in world markets where unions have become irrelevant. It has an incredible inability to turn the ship around quickly to respond to the way in which the marketplace is moving. Anyone who does not think that the world's economies are changing rapidly has his head buried in the sand because they are changing dramatically each day. If Australia wants to be part of the world economy it must have the ability to be flexible and to change direction quickly. Regrettably, the union movement is one of the constraints on that flexibility - it is old hat and anachronistic. I acknowledge that people like Bill Kelty understand this and are trying to change the union movement so that it will fit in with modern circumstances, but it is like a juggernaut trying to be shifted off course. People involved with the union movement know that is the problem they face.

Hon Garry Kelly: You must accept that individual workers do not have much clout.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Obviously I have more regard for individual workers than does Hon Garry Kelly. I suggested last night that Hon Tom Butler was misrepresenting the Liberal Party position. The Liberal Party is not suggesting that the wage fixing system should be terminated and that every single employee should negotiate his own contract; it is suggesting that if workers want to stay in that system they can, but if they want to get out of it and negotiate their own contract they should be able to do so. The Liberal Party wants the system to have the flexibility which the economy needs. The worker will decide whether he wants to be part of a union system or whether he wants to be employed under a contract system. The contract system has actually been implemented, under this Government, at Robe River. Last night, by way of interjection, I mentioned what was happening at Robe River and perhaps I exaggerated some of the figures.

Hon T.G. Butler: By \$100 000.

Hon N.F. MOORE: No, by about \$10 000. Members will be aware that at Robe River problems arose because there were two drivers per train. The company decided that there would be one driver only for each train because it was of the view that one of the drivers slept while the train travelled to Pannawonica and back and it was not necessary for him to be on the train. The company put to the drivers the option to be part of a contract system and, as a result, some train drivers at Robe River have a \$130 000 a year contract.

Hon Tom Helm: The trains did not have two drivers. They had one driver and an observer.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The member should not be pedantic. Two people were in the cabin - the driver and the observer. What happened was that the observer shut his eyes and did not know what was going on. I have actually been inside an engine and it is very comfortable. I do know what took place and anyone involved with Robe River who can justify the rorts that went on in that company is trying to have us on. Hon Tom Helm knows what took place as well as I do, and was probably part of it. A driver at Robe River now has the option of working for wages, as he did previously, and being part of the company's employment structure whereby he is provided with a house at company rent, has cheap electricity, and is eligible for workers' compensation and sick leave; or he can take out a contract. Under a contract he receives \$130 000 per annum, but he is responsible for everything he requires. About half the train drivers have taken up the option of a contract.



Hon Tom Helm: They are still entitled to workers' compensation.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That is good. In some cases the drivers who have taken the option of a contract have formed a partnership with their wives and operate as a company, and their taxation is organised around that. As I said, the proposition was put to the workers at Robe River and some accepted the contract system and others did not. That illustrates exactly what the Liberal Party is arguing: If a person wants to opt out of the centralised wage fixing system he should be entitled to do so. It is the same argument that I put forward last night: If a person does not want to be a member of a student guild, he should not have to be.

Hon Tom Helm: Why is it so good if only half took up that option?

Hon N.F. MOORE: If people are presented with two options some of them will take up one option and the others will take up the other option. It depends on their circumstances. Some people would rather have the company look after their housing, electricity and water while others are prepared to take a risk and go for the bigger money, hoping that at the end of the day they will finish up in front. That is human nature, which is something the union movement fails to acknowledge and that is the reason it is out of touch with reality. Everyone is not the same and people have different aspirations. Some people are prepared to work harder than others, and why should someone who does not work as hard as someone else receive the same money? It will not be accepted that people are the same and should receive the same wages regardless of what they contribute in the workplace. The situation in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe has demonstrated that economies based on that anti-human nature proposition will not survive. People will not stand for it over a period of time and that is the reason the union movement in Australia represents only half the workers. It does not provide for their everyday needs and Robe River is a classic example of that.

For the edification of Hon Tom Butler, the Liberal Party is proposing a system whereby a person can make his own decision to remain in the wage fixing system. For some crazy reason Hon Tom Butler cannot accept that some people do not want to be bound by the constraints of unionism and that they want to improve their circumstances even at the expense of their colleagues. That is what human nature is all about. If people want to do their own thing, work as hard as they like and be rewarded for it, they should be allowed to do it. If people want to stay in a union, it is their business and I will not argue with that.

Hon T.G. Butler: You would have to agree that between 1981 and 1983 the Liberal Government destroyed the industrial relations system. Your policy advocates the same thing again.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Liberal Party has said that there should not be a totally controlled system of industrial relations in Australia, controlled by one organisation which makes the rules for everybody. The Opposition believes that bargaining at the shop floor level should be acceptable and that workers and their companies can do a deal outside the constraints of the Federal arbitration system. Only two weeks ago the Prime Minister said that he did not like the decision of the Industrial Relations Commission in respect of the waterside workers, and said that the Federal Government would do something else. If employees do not like what the umpire says, they also can change the rules. The Opposition is arguing that if a person does not like the centralised wage fixing system he should go somewhere else, and that is what the Prime Minister argued in respect of the waterside workers.

Hon Tom Helm: Are you advocating what is happening in New Zealand?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am speaking in response to the comments of Hon Tom Butler and I am trying to explain to him and to the House what the Liberal Party advocates. I have no doubt that the troglodytes of the union movement will continue to argue for compulsion and that everyone has to be tied down by the enormous constraints of the union movement, by centralised control, so that no-one can have a thought of his own. Members opposite will continue to argue in favour of that system because they are in control of the union movement and they call the shots. We never see union officials going on strike or going without when they take their workers out.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: It shows how much you know.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The union officials always finish up with money in their pockets and they fly to the Pilbara in first class comfort to organise the unions to go on strike over ridiculous things. That is the only reason they have a vested interest in maintaining the old

system. It is a matter of hanging on to power. They are bleating now because they are losing their power. Workers across Australia have said on countless occasions -

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You would not know what a worker looked like.

Hon N.F. MOORE: What a pathetic interjection. The member should lift his game. If he wants to interject he should say something which is not inane. Hon Sam Piantadosi is one of the troglodytes who has his head buried in the sand. He cannot understand that the world has changed since he was down the sewers complaining about the dirty water in them. The world is changing. Perhaps it is time Hon Sam Piantadosi started to look around to see what is going on. It is time he talked to workers who are no longer members of unions, to the workers at Robe River who have taken on contracts, and to the 10 per cent of workers in Australia who have no jobs because of the Government's policies which Hon Tom Butler tried to defend last night. He should talk to the 30 per cent of young people in this State and the 50 per cent of young people in Melbourne who have no jobs about the Government's policies and the effect of the dreadful dead hand of unionism on the economy.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You are a sick man, Mr Moore.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

Hon N.F. MOORE: I object to that remark. I am not sick, and I think that sort of interjection is unparliamentary. I ask that it be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Muriel Patterson): Hon Sam Piantadosi?

Hon SAM PIANTADOSI: I am not medically qualified to determine whether Mr Moore is sick, so I do not know whether I am in a position to withdraw the remark. Were I qualified and able to make a determination, I would do so. However, to help you out, Madam Deputy President, I will withdraw the remark.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon N.F. MOORE: Those sorts of withdrawals should be unconditional, although I will not take the matter any further.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You should get your facts right in the first place.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon Sam Piantadosi is a classic example of the reason this country has such desperate problems. People like him, who live in the past, who cannot understand it is a changing world, who would have the economy strangled by the dead hand of unionism, are causing one of the most significant problems facing this community. This economy desperately needs the microeconomic reform that we were told today the Government is doing something about. I cannot find one thing of any consequence that has been done, by either the Federal Government or the State Government, in respect of microeconomic reform. They cannot do anything in this area because the unions will not allow them to. The unions realise that as soon as any decent microeconomic reform takes place in Australia, it will cut away their power, and workers will be able to get away from the shackles and make their own decisions. We must do something about the waterfront. We have read a great deal in the Press in recent times about the waterfront, and about the wharfie who works 28 hours a week and earns \$110 000 a year. We know about the problems in the transport system in Australia, where it costs a fortune to ship goods around the country or overseas. We have heard about work practices ad nauseam, especially in the north of the State. Thank goodness for companies such as Robe River Iron Associates which have tried to get rid of some of the nonsense going on in the work practices inflicted upon businesses in this country.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Hon Norman Moore should address the Chair, and no more interjections will be made for the remainder of his speech.

Hon N.F. MOORE: We need to reform the taxation system to introduce some incentive, and to privatise a number of Government enterprises. Those are the sorts of microeconomic reforms desperately needed in this country, but which the Lawrence and Hawke Governments are incapable of delivering because, in the main, their union colleagues will not allow them to do so. There is a desperate need for a change of Government at a Federal and State level so that a party able to deliver the goods is in power. Without that change, we shall continue to go backwards. Compared with Asian nations, such as Singapore, we are

going backwards with regard to our economy. Anybody who went to Singapore in the 1970s and saw the poverty and the way people lived at that time - as I did - and compared that with the standard of living in that country today, would recognise what a country with no resources but with a bit of enterprise can do. That country should be compared with Australia which has plenty of resources but no enterprise, and is going backwards.

Hon Tom Helm: Don't people say that Singapore has lost its character?

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is all very well for tourists to talk about the wonderful character of Singapore but that is not much comfort to the people who were living in poverty. I am sure that a person who was living in the gutter would rather have a decent house and less character! I thought members opposite supported the workers.

Let us consider what the Federal and State Governments have delivered. The Federal Government has delivered record unemployment; 10 per cent of the population in Australia is unemployed. That is from a Government which claims to look after workers. In addition, 30 per cent of young people are unemployed. It is an absolutely disgraceful situation. When the unemployment figures were approaching that level in 1982, during the time of a Liberal Government, members of the Labor Party were quite rightly screaming their heads off about the dreadful Government which had allowed unemployment to reach that level. It is most hypocritical of them not to acknowledge that the present Federal Labor Government has made a mess of the situation, and the Western Australian Government is not doing much better either. The number of bankruptcies is at a record high level and we are in the midst of the worst recession since the Depression of the 1930s.

Hon Tom Helm: Who brought in the wage freeze in 1982-83?

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Federal Liberal Government. It made an attempt in very trying circumstances - members opposite can ignore the drought in the Eastern States and other circumstances confronting it at the time - to do something about the crazy situation. I acknowledge that the Fraser Government messed things up. Members opposite, as union officials, claim to represent the workers but their Government has presided over record unemployment and bankruptcy levels and the worst recession since the 1930s. Who are members opposite representing, if that is happening to the people they claim to represent? Hon Tom Butler suggested last night that the Liberal Party could do no better. That is nonsense; the Liberal Party has the policies, the ideas and the people.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Where are the policies?

Hon N.F. MOORE: It would do members opposite the world of good if they listened to John Hewson some time. They should sit down, close their ears to other things, and listen to John Hewson; they - like everyone else who listens to him - would be convinced that there is a future for Australia, even when looking at the gloom facing us at present. What has the Western Australian Government done? It has been responsible for gross mismanagement of our economy. We have the second worst unemployment figures in this nation, in a State with the greatest amount of resources. We have a betrayal of the Labor Party by its leaders. Leaders of the Labor Party have sucked money from the system into their own pockets, satchels and paper bags.

### *Points of Order*

Hon J.M. BERINSON: That is an entirely baseless allegation; it is grossly improper and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I will not withdraw because I have made a statement that I believe money has been taken from the Labor Party by its leaders.

Hon J.M. Berinson: By whom?

Hon N.F. MOORE: By its leaders, and they have used it for their own purposes.

Hon J.M. Berinson: That is another gross abuse of the privilege of this House.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I assert that, Madam Deputy President, and I am not the only one who asserts it.

Hon SAM PIANTADOSI: Hon Norman Moore took offence earlier at a comment I made and asked that it be withdrawn. He has now been requested to withdraw a remark. He

pointed to a number of members as being leaders in the trade union movement in the Labor Party. He has pointed a finger at us. The Attorney General asked that he withdraw the remark and so do I.

Hon GEORGE CASH: On the same point of order, members in this House may not like what Hon Norman Moore says, but he certainly did not reflect on any member of this Parliament and his comments are not unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Muriel Patterson): I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

*Sitting suspended from 8.40 to 8.45 pm*

*Deputy Chairman's Ruling*

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Muriel Patterson): I will not request that Hon Norman Moore withdraw his statement because it is a debatable matter and out in the public arena. He did refer to "leaders of the Labor Party" and not "leaders of Parliament".

*Debate Resumed*

Hon N.F. MOORE: I was saying that I believe there has been a gross betrayal of the Labor Party by its leaders. That has been available for everyone to see in articles appearing on the front page of *The West Australian* for the past few weeks. The most disappointed and aggrieved people in Western Australia nowadays are the rank and file members of the Labor Party. I have seen them in my electorate going out on stinking hot election days to hand out how-to-vote cards all day. I have seen these people drive from Kalgoorlie to Meekatharra to hand out how-to-vote cards because they could not get anybody in Meekatharra to do the job. These loyal, hardworking Labor Party people have had to read every day in *The West Australian* about their former leader taking money through an account of his own, money that did not go to the Labor Party where they believe it should have gone. They have also seen examples of people getting commissions for raising funds and heard extraordinary stories about money in briefcases and the like. They are the people who have a reason to be really annoyed and angry about what has been happening in the Labor Party over the past 10 years. I have drawn this matter to the attention of the House because I believe fervently that we have to get rid of this Federal Government because of what it is doing to the economy - and I have already talked about that - and we have to get rid of this State Government because of what it is and what it stands for; that is, something un-Australian, in my view.

I wonder what all the other Cabinet Ministers, some of whom are still in the Ministry, had to do with what has gone on in Western Australia for the past eight years. I wonder what the former State President of the Labor Party knew about what was going on. Did he know about the leader's account? Did he know where all that money was coming from? More importantly, did he know where the money was going? If he did not know these things, is it not an absolute disgrace and an indictment of the parliamentary leader that he was collecting \$3.5 million for the Labor Party to spend himself yet the President of the Labor Party did not know about it?

Hon Graham Edwards: If you spent time in your electorate you would have something to talk about.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That was a stupid statement by a person who knows nothing about what he is talking about.

Hon Graham Edwards: You didn't even have the decency to front up at Kalgoorlie the other day.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Norman Moore will address his remarks to the Chair and not become involved in interchanges. I ask members not to interject. They may not like what is being said, but Hon Norman Moore has the right to be heard.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I did not hear the Minister's interjection clearly, but I think he said I was invited to the opening of the Kalgoorlie police complex last Friday and did not turn up.

Hon Graham Edwards: Were you there?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I was invited, but I might add only after the intervention of the local police who wanted to know why no Liberal members were invited.

Hon Graham Edwards: What a lot of rubbish.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That is a fact. They asked me to come and see them so that they could ask me which Liberal in the district would be attending.

Hon Graham Edwards: Why didn't you go?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I will come to that in a moment. I was asked why only Labor members were invited to the opening and I replied that that was typical of this Government, which ignores the presence of Liberal members and refuses on many occasions to invite them to functions such as that one.

Hon Graham Edwards: That is rubbish in line with your other comments! That is a reflection on the whole Police Force.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I said that I would very much like to go to that function and would appreciate an invitation, which arrived subsequently. The Federal Leader of the Liberal Party, Dr Hewson, came to Western Australia that week and I attended a function in Karratha with him.

Hon Graham Edwards: I am not surprised you regret his coming here.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I asked the Minister to refrain from interjecting.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I attended a function in Karratha on Thursday, 2 May, the day before the opening of the Kalgoorlie police complex, at which Dr Hewson spoke to 200 or 300 people, and as I was the organiser of that function I felt I should be there. Regrettably the airline flight schedules did not enable me to get back to Kalgoorlie in time to attend the opening of the police complex, which I would have liked to have done. I went to Kalgoorlie on the Saturday for another purpose, and for the Minister for Police to suggest that I did not go because I did not want to is absolute nonsense. I am very anxious to go to functions in Kalgoorlie because there has been a massive swing in Kalgoorlie away from the Labor Party. The people have had a bellyful of the Labor Party and are looking for the alternative Government. I happen to represent 70 per cent of Western Australia and that makes it a bit difficult for me to go to Kalgoorlie every day, but the people know that we are there. The member for Eyre and the member for Kalgoorlie know darn well that their seats are under threat as they never expected them to be in the past.

I wonder what Hon Tom Butler knew about what was going on and about what has been brought to our notice in the newspaper over recent weeks; and if he did not know anything about it the people in the Labor Party - the rank and file I have talked about - have every reason to want to know what he was doing when he was president. He told us last night what he thought he did. Maybe we will find out eventually what he actually did do.

Hon T.G. Butler: What did I tell you last night?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Last night the member gave us a long history of his leadership of the Western Australian branch of the Labor Party. He did not mention whether he knew anything about Brian Burke's leader's account or any of the things that are now coming out in the Labor Party about Terry Burke getting a commission for raising funds for the Labor Party.

Hon T.G. Butler: Why should I tell you anything? You are like Mr Pandal; you are a never was. Why should I waste my time telling a never was anything?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I would have thought that somebody who was President of the Western Australian branch of the Labor Party for 10 years was less than a never was because he allowed to happen in the Labor Party something for which I believe the rank and file will forever condemn both him and his parliamentary colleagues. This has been the worst chapter in the history of the Labor Party, and it is a pity that it is happening in its 100th year.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Why not come out with me in my electorate? I extend that invitation to you.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I have a large enough electorate to look after as it is without my looking after the member's electorate for him.

Hon T.G. Butler: How would you see the Liberal Party protecting those people who will have individual contracts forced on them by employers and who will be instructed not to join a union?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I suspect they will get a job in a union dominated industry where they can choose to remain in the system. The labour market will decide what people do - and it is about time it does - instead of having the system which members oppose support where no market forces are applied to what happens in the labour market.

Hon T.G. Butler: You will not answer the question.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am saying that if a person wants to remain in a union controlled or regulated industry, and that is where his job is to be, as far as I am concerned he can stay there. If he does not want to go into a contract system, he will not have to do that. However, I believe the vast majority of workers will opt to go to a system where they can negotiate their own conditions because they know damn well that if they offer productivity in return for better conditions and wages, the employers will go for them like a rocket. Employers want employees who are prepared to work their butt off, but they will pay them accordingly. The molly coddling and the feather bedding which has been going on for years must go if the economy is to be turned around.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: What union official upset you along the track?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I used to be a union official. I spent 10 years as the local branch president of the State School Teachers Union. I attended all its annual conferences, and just like the member I used to argue that teachers should get better conditions, and I used to work very hard to improve the conditions of teachers.

Hon T.G. Butler: Do you now argue that teachers should not have better conditions?

Hon N.F. MOORE: No. I thought the conditions in those days were pretty bad. Fortunately we were pretty successful in securing better conditions for them.

I now want to change the subject slightly and talk about another matter which is of concern to me; that is, the call by Hon Ian Taylor, the Deputy Premier, and Monty House, the deputy leader of the National Party, for us to take action against United States bases in Australia. Before I talk about that I acknowledge and accept that many farmers in Western Australia are suffering severely for a range of reasons. I do not dispute that at all. In fact, I have considerable sympathy for the people in Morawa. Many of the farmers who are now causing a lot of trouble around the place are people whom I know well because I spent some time living there. I acknowledge their frustration, but I do not accept that they should demand that we take retribution against the United States by way of some action against the United States bases in Australia.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Do you support dumping by the Americans?

Hon N.F. MOORE: No, I do not. The problem, as the member quite rightly points out, is caused by the trade policies of the United States and by the European Economic Community, but taking action against American bases will not do anything to stop that. The body which should be working to do something about the problems with United States policies and the European Economic Community is the Federal Government, through its trade department. The Federal Government should be putting pressure on the United States - as it is, regrettably not very successfully - to do something about its policies; and it in turn will put pressure on the EEC to do something about its policies. I do not hold a lot of hope for the EEC changing its policies. Farmers in the United Kingdom and France have a standard of living which is based upon artificial prices for their products, and they are not about to change that. The French farmers make trade unionists in Australia look like wimps; when they want to take on their Government, they really take it on.

Hon Tom Helm: You said the EEC had no unions.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I did not say that.

Hon Tom Helm: Read *Hansard*.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I said that European farmers make our unionists look like wimps.

Hon Tom Helm: Do the farmers not have a union?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I do not know what they call themselves, but when they get organised they have been able to maintain a very artificial price situation.

Hon Tom Helm: Before you speak you should do your research.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Madam Deputy President, I will have to continue to ignore the gentleman from Manchester, or wherever he comes from. I suggest that when he goes to the Cotswolds of England he will see farmers who are grossly inefficient but who work from dawn to dusk to produce lambs which they cannot sell. The member would know darn well that those people are a political force and they will not give up what they have got now. The bottom line of what I am saying is that there is no way that farmers in that part of the world will give in to some Australian Minister who says, "You are causing us some trouble." They will just ignore us. Australia is quite irrelevant to what they are about. To suggest that we should in some way or another attack United States bases in Australia to try to achieve our ends is absolute nonsense. It would be like cutting off our nose to spite our face. The United States bases in Australia contribute, first, to our defence - and that is pretty important as far as I am concerned - and, secondly, they provide significant employment and income to Australia. The town of Exmouth is virtually dependent upon the North West Cape base, just as the town of Morawa is dependent upon the wheat industry. It is not fair, and it is unacceptable in my view, for people to say we have to get rid of that base, and therefore take away jobs, in order to provide jobs for somebody else.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: And vice versa.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Quite right. I am saying, let us fight the problem which affects the wheat industry without saying the way to do that is to take away the job of someone who works for the United States base in Exmouth. We must also do something about those reforms to the Australian economy that I have already talked about. A classic example which the member should take on board was provided by Tim Fisher, the Federal Leader of the National Party, when he said that in Australia it costs \$60 a tonne to get wheat from the farm gate to the ship, and in the United States it costs \$12 a tonne. It costs \$48 a tonne more in Australia to get wheat from the farm gate to the ship. If we cannot do something about that \$48 we are not really trying.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: That is the subsidy that is paid by the American Government.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is not the subsidy. That is the actual cost of transporting wheat from one point to the next. If we can do something about that \$48 we will take away the significant difference between what farmers are paid and what they need to get paid in order to be economically viable. It is also a pity that the Federal colleagues of members opposite have decided, for blatant political reasons, to "Australianise" - as they call it - the United States base at North West Cape without any concept of what it will mean. Before the last Federal election, in order to satisfy the peace element in the Eastern States, Prime Minister Hawke announced that North West Cape would be Australianised; in other words, the United States would be kicked out and we would take it over and operate it ourselves.

Hon Garry Kelly: It is obsolete.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is not obsolete at all. Mr Hawke did not say at the time who would pay to run it. That base costs \$30 million a year to run. Is he saying the taxpayer will pay \$30 million to run a base that the United States wants? If the United States wanted to close the base down that would be a different argument, but the United States has not indicated it wants to leave that base. In fact, it is appalled at what has happened; it was not consulted when the decision was made and it still has a need for the base. So blatant politicking took place in respect of the base at North West Cape; then we have misguided farmers saying it should be knocked down or that they should descend upon it like the peaceniks of years gone by, in order to put pressure on the United States Government. That base provides employment for Australians and wealth for places like Exmouth. I believe the Americans should stay there for as long as they want to, and we should support their presence.

Mining in national parks is another issue which has aroused some passions in Australia in recent times. I am becoming increasingly frustrated - as, I am sure, is Hon Mark Nevill - as the green movement seeks to muddy the waters about mining in national parks. Most national parks in Western Australia were determined by somebody drawing a line on a map to roughly enclose an area of some significance; and usually, if no natural boundaries were in place, the boundaries were just drawn along a line of latitude or longitude. In some other areas, such as the Hamersley Range National Park, the boundaries were boundaries of pastoral properties which were determined by some pastoralists years ago and which bear very little relevance to the actual area to be conserved. A classic example is the Rudall River

National Park, which is just some lines drawn on a map to enclose the general Rudall River system. Nobody actually went there and decided that one part of the area was worth preserving and another part was not and so drew the line in a particular way. This has caused a great degree of difficulty for mining companies which want to operate in those areas, and again the classic example is the Rudall River National Park, where the Kintyre uranium deposit is 700 metres inside the park boundary. When I went to look at it recently, I thought that the country outside the national park was more attractive and more worthy of preservation than the land upon which the deposit is located.

Hon Garry Kelly: Who was the Government when that boundary was drawn?

Hon N.F. MOORE: We were the Government, but at that time there was not the attitude that anything inside a national park is good and everything outside it is no good. The boundaries were drawn there to preserve an ecosystem, but at that time there was not the hard and fast rule about mining in national parks that the Labor Party and the green movement are now seeking to impose.

Hon Mark Nevill: Rudall River has no features to make it a national park. It should be a nature reserve.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon Mark Nevill can argue about that if he likes. I will not be pedantic about what it is called, but it does preserve an inland river system which flows into an inland lake.

Hon Tom Helm: It should not be mined.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is interesting that the member should say that. I happen to think that the Kintyre uranium deposit is in a part of the national park that is not worth preserving, but there are some areas outside the national park which should be preserved; so we have the silly situation of these arbitrary lines determining what can and cannot happen. The same applies with the Hamersley Range National Park - the area where the Marandoo iron ore project is situated is one of the least attractive parts of that national park. I know that park quite well, and there are some parts of it which must be preserved forever. For example, it would be an absolute tragedy if Dales Gorge were to be mined; but Marandoo, which sits on a fairly flat piece of land, is eminently mineable and I do not believe for a moment that that project will in any way offend against what is to be protected by the Hamersley Range National Park.

The Government has decided to excise areas from national parks to enable mining to take place. I would rather we did not do it that way, because arbitrary lines will again be determining the excisions. I believe we should allow mining to take place in national parks provided that the mining will not damage the environment in a way that is unacceptable. We should work out a series of guidelines which will allow mining to take place in a national park under strictly controlled conditions. It is not beyond the wit of man to allow a mining operation to take place in a national park provided it is not in an area which must be preserved. In this way we can have the best of both worlds - we can have the general area protected by the national park controls and at the same time benefit from the export earnings which come from those mines.

Hon Tom Helm: What about the people who live there?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Is Hon Tom Helm talking about Rudall River? The people who live there are portable people - they move from place to place. Some people in the south are called the feral people, but these are called the portable people.

Hon Tom Helm: Are they on wheels?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Yes; as the member knows, they are usually in Toyota Landcruisers paid for by the Federal Government through a variety of grants, and they move from sacred site to sacred site and from one mining deposit to the next. Just as the sun comes up and goes down, so they move from place to place. If one goes into the desert parts of the country east of Newman one will find places that have been settled - where buildings and stores have been erected and water supplies provided by windmills - completely deserted. Nobody has been there for months, but as soon as someone from a mining company goes out there to do something the portable people turn up and it becomes part of their cultural area and traditional land. Until somebody is prepared to make a hard and fast decision about this



problem we will have the situation, as we have at present in some areas in the north of Western Australia, where some mining operations will not be undertaken because they are being deliberately obstructed by Aboriginal groups - not so much by the Aboriginal people themselves as by the people who advise them, namely the Aboriginal Legal Service and other sundry persons who work in the Aboriginal industry and are in there for their own benefit and nobody else's.

While I am talking about uranium I want to mention in passing the absurdity of the Labor Party's two mines uranium policy. It was once a three mines policy but one is not working any more so it has become a two mines policy. The fact that the Labor Party is prepared to allow those mines to operate for political reasons, and then argues that somehow or other we should not have uranium or nuclear power, is extreme hypocrisy. What it also does is to stop the Kintyre deposit from being developed. Kintyre is a fairly small deposit which can be developed almost immediately; all the work has been done and the markets have been found. The company wants to go ahead and mine it, and it could do so with a minimum of disruption to the national park and the Aboriginal people, because the Aboriginal people there have agreed to the mining of Kintyre.

Hon Tom Helm: What?

Hon N.F. MOORE: They have agreed to mining at Kintyre.

Hon Tom Helm: How many of them have agreed to it?

Hon N.F. MOORE: The people who allegedly speak for that area.

Hon Tom Helm: The Strelley people?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Yes.

Hon Tom Helm: How long have the Strelley people been there? Tell the House.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I will put it as simply as I can for the benefit of certain members who need it to be explained simply. There are laws in this country - too stringent, in my view - which require certain approvals from Aboriginal interests before one can mine in certain parts of Western Australia. The company at Kintyre, CRA, has gone through all the processes and has been given approval, through the processes set down by this Government, to allow mining at Kintyre. What is stopping mining is the absurd ALP policy, the two mines policy. The Government is preventing the mining of a deposit which is worth tens of millions of dollars to the Australian economy at a time when we desperately need some exports to do something about our economy.

Another issue which is very significant to my electorate is the provision of sealed roads. It seems to have been a characteristic of State and Federal Governments for the last 10 years not to go in for building bitumen roads in the bush. I cannot think of very many bitumen roads which have been built in the last 10 years. Some have been finished, but no new projects, no new initiatives or proactive decisions have been made in respect of bitumen roads which might lead to a whole range of benefits being obtained by people living in the outback parts of Western Australia. If we had bitumen roads in the bush, we would increase our tourism potential, reduce road transport costs and improve the social life of people living in the bush. They could travel from one town to the next on a bitumen road instead of having to travel on very rough roads. The costs to motorists would be reduced because tyres do not blow on bitumen roads as opposed to dirt tracks. I have been pressing in my electorate to get this Government to do something about the need for bitumen roads, particularly in the Pilbara. I have asked a number of questions of the Minister for Transport only to get answers like, "We have no plans for the provision of bitumen roads other than what is being done at the present moment." That is not acceptable. It is time the Government at least had a plan. I asked question 299 on 5 June 1990 -

What are the Government's priorities for road sealing in the Pilbara region following the completion of the Paraburdoo access road and what is the proposed timetable for the commencement of each priority section?

The answer from the Minister for Transport was -

The Government has a commitment to provide a sealed road between the Great Northern Highway and Shay Gap. This project will be jointly funded by the Government and Goldsworthy Mining Company.

The answer goes on to talk about funding. As a result I asked another question, question 343 -

I refer the Minister to the answer to Question 299 and ask -

- (1) Does the answer mean that apart from the Shay Gap road, the Government has no plans to seal any other roads in the Pilbara?
- (2) If not, what other roads will be sealed; what is their order of priority and when is work expected to commence on each road?

The answer came back -

There are no other firm proposals for road sealing in the Pilbara region at this time. However, the situation is reviewed on an annual basis.

That is a pathetic answer to a very serious need in many of the outback parts of Western Australia. I would have thought that the Government would have at least worked out a priority arrangement to decide which roads it would do, even if it does not have the money to do them now. Obviously, from that answer, the Government has no such plans.

I have presented a petition to this House from residents of the Paraburdoo-Tom Price-Newman area with something like 2 300 signatures it. The petition seeks a bitumen road linking Tom Price and Paraburdoo with Newman. The decision by Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd to develop the Marandoo project about 40 kilometres from Tom Price has meant that that road could become a reality in the near future if the Government were prepared to make a decision. Hamersley Iron will build a sealed road from Tom Price to the Marandoo project. It will be only 80 kilometres from the Marandoo site to link up with the new Newman-Port Hedland Road near Mungina Gorge. I hope that the Government will start thinking about that road. I hope that at the next election the Liberal Party will give a commitment to seal that road. The road would open up the tremendous tourist potential in the south Hamersley Range. The gorges of the Hamersley Range are superb tourist attractions, and easy access to them would undoubtedly increase their potential. It would also mean that the residents of the Tom Price-Paraburdoo area would be able to travel to and from Newman and vice versa for sporting and other cultural interaction. That would be a very important road, and it should be being planned now.

I would like to see a number of other roads sealed, although I am not suggesting that can be done overnight. What I am arguing is that plans should be put in place now to decide where those roads will go and where the best location for them is so that when the money becomes available we will not have to wait around for the imponderable number of surveys which need to be done to determine where a road should go. Some examples of that are the Exmouth-Giralia-Barrisdale road, which would enable people to go from Exmouth across to the Pilbara without having to back track 150 kilometres. We should also be looking at a road from Laverton to Ayres Rock to link up Western Australia with the Northern Territory. That would provide enormous potential for Western Australians to go through the central part of Western Australia and Australia to Queensland, and it would allow Queensland tourists to come into Western Australia. That road should be considered as a long term national priority.

The Goldfields area has been asking for some time for a road to link Kalgoorlie with the Pilbara. We could seal the road from Leinster through to Wiluna and on to the Great Northern Highway near Ned's Creek Station. That would provide a direct link between Kalgoorlie and the Pilbara, enabling Kalgoorlie mining houses to have direct road access into the Pilbara mining area. There should also be a road from the north eastern goldfields linking up Geraldton. The Leinster to Mt Magnet road should be sealed as another priority to provide access from the wealth producing parts of the State to the ports. These are obviously long term propositions, but what I am arguing is, bearing in mind the amount we pay in road tax and how much money from fuel tax goes into roads, it is time to consider hard and fast planning in respect of those several roads I have mentioned. When I tell people in Tom Price, for example, that it will cost about \$25 million to seal the road from Marandoo to Mungina Gorge so that they can get to Newman, and that the Government is putting aside \$50 million every year to pay WA Inc debts, they are not amused.

I conclude with a couple of observations about the State Government of Western Australia and what it ought to do. It is my view that the State Government has become stale, inactive, and is probably corrupt.

Several members interjected.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

The PRESIDENT: Order! I was about to tell the member that he cannot use that language. I ask him to withdraw it.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I understand that I am not permitted to call a person corrupt, but am I also not permitted to call the Government corrupt?

The PRESIDENT: That is right.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I withdraw unconditionally, but I have no doubt that the Royal Commission will tell us one of these days whether what we think about things is true or not.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no rule about what people think, but there is a rule about what they say in this place.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon N.F. MOORE: I acknowledge that. I am saying that one of these days what we think will be either confirmed or otherwise. The Government has lost its way. It has forgotten what it is in office for. It has become a lame duck. It has been paralysed by the revelations of the Royal Commission. It cannot govern. It is unable to give the leadership the State needs at this time. The Australian economy and the State economy are in desperate straits, and we have a lame duck Government in Western Australia which is unable to govern or provide the leadership we need. What it should do is resign and put us out of our misery.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: I would like to put you out of your misery.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It should put the people of Western Australia out of their misery and allow a Liberal-National Party Government to do something for Western Australia which is desperately needed, and that is provide some sort of positive economic leadership and provide a new direction for the people of Western Australia. They are sick and tired of the way the Government is performing. The Government is not performing; it is providing nothing for the people of Western Australia and they are waiting with baited breath for the next election so that they can toss out this Government. John Hewson has said that it will take the five to 10 years to turn around the Australian economy, and that is probably a modest assessment of the problem. I suggest that this Government and the Federal Government should get out quickly so that people can get in and as quickly as possible start the work which will take five to 10 years. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Garry Kelly.

**VIDEO TAPES CLASSIFICATION AND CONTROL AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 15 November 1990.

HON E.J. CHARLTON (Agricultural) [9.20 pm]: Over recent years, much debate has taken place in this Parliament regarding the substance of this legislation. Many people have been actively involved in attempting to provide a resolution in the best interests of the State. I cannot begin to describe the contempt I feel for the video tape businesses which are run from Canberra. It is incredible that at the centre of Australia's parliamentary activities and government that the Australian Capital Territory can allow such businesses to run in an uninhibited way. These activities can only be described as the most immoral and degrading of businesses.

A host of community services people around Australia are working to overcome the problems faced by families. We have all witnessed recently the consequences of the actions of a young person who has been charged with a very serious crime. Indeed, we see continuously what happens to young people from broken homes, or those who face other distressing situations. I have discovered, after talking to a number of people who deal with some of these unfortunate young people in our society, that many young people have been subjected to all sorts of immoral videos and material. These businesses seem to run unchecked and, indeed, seem to be encouraged. Some people make a lot of money from these businesses, to the great expense of not only young people but also our society as a whole.

It is absolutely essential to take some action to overcome this horrendous situation which affects many people in this nation. I trust that we will make some decisions on this legislation which will improve the lot of many people in Australia, and certainly in this State.

**HON PETER FOSS** (East Metropolitan) [9.27 pm]: I expressed interest in this legislation when I spoke in the Address-in-Reply debate. This is an area that classically illustrates the reason for having a Federal system of Government in Australia; however, one of the things that the State Governments are better able to do than Federal Governments is to accurately reflect and respond to community standards. There is a constant wish to have an orderly and centralised way of doing things, as if there were something uniquely good about having the same standard throughout Australia, as if somehow a standard which we all have is better than a standard which we choose for ourselves. I do not agree with that. I am reminded of Colonel Cathcart in "Catch 22" who used to insist that his pilots make sure they had a neat bomb pattern when bombing - not because it caused greater destruction on the ground but because it looked better in the aerial photographs. This insistence on having uniform standards throughout Australia is similarly an insistence related to the appearance of the result rather than to its usefulness in achieving the purpose for which it was established.

A Government member: You cannot generalise.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am not seeking to generalise. I can see some greater grounds, for instance, for our driving on the same side of the road. I would not for one moment say that it would be sensible for each State to decide on which side of the road people should drive. However, the member seems to understand my point that mere uniformity for uniformity's sake is not a good idea, particularly when we are dealing with community values. Who is better at determining community values than the community itself? State Governments are far more responsive to the extreme concerns now being voiced in the community regarding the quality of the material being peddled on television, in video shops and in the cinemas. The community is continually expressing those serious concerns, yet we seem to be going backwards and instead of imposing tighter standards to reflect this community view, the standards seem to be looser. As I mentioned in my contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate, the recent changes to the film classification guidelines indicate this slackening of standards. The announcement by the ministerial meeting was expected to reveal stricter classifications; however, this actually led to a "lesser" - to use the same words - standard of classification. Hon Reg Davies indicated in his speech on this Bill, prior to my speech on the subject, that the new words in the classification guidelines, except with the two lower classifications, resulted in an acceptance of more horrifying and upsetting material than was previously the case. Notwithstanding the fact that the classification guidelines seem to be going in the opposite direction, it is interesting to note that the Ministers had expressed the community view of tighter standards. This stresses my point that the States are more responsive to the community view than the Commonwealth.

The move to centralisation and unification is driven by the convenience of film and video distributors, and those who show these films. I can fully understand that if a person is programming television on a national basis - everything seems to be contracted on a national basis these days - it would be extremely inconvenient if a film had a different classification in, say, Western Australia than New South Wales. Therefore the argument is immediately made: Let us get rid of the inconvenience. However, the inconvenience is in place to ensure that we have a proper standard of classification in our community. It is not a sound argument that a community setting its own standards is an inconvenience to somebody operating on a national basis - that is not a sufficient reason for preventing the States from setting standards. As a general rule I am very much in favour of commercial convenience by which Governments should not stand in the way of proper commercial transactions through unnecessary bureaucratic inconvenience; however, this should not extend to prevent the Government from exercising its proper responsibility in setting film censorship standards. That is not a justification for an abdication of our responsibilities to the community of ensuring that a strict standard is maintained with the quality of material shown, particularly to young people.

I have responded to position paper No 47 of the Australian Law Reform Commission. I indicated that if we must have universal standards in Australia, the best way to approach this would be to take into account each aspect of classification; these would include violence, sex, language and the portrayal of children in each of these matters. A separate assessment

should take place on each of these aspects by the film censors. Also, people like to know certain things about a film before they see it. For instance, an adult wanting to see a film with an M classification would not know whether it was classified that way because of explicit sexual scenes, which may not disturb that person, or because of extremely violent scenes, which could disturb that person greatly. Therefore, people are not forewarned before they go to see the film. It is important that each of those aspects be separately assessed, and this could be done on a graded scale. Each of the aspects to which I refer are contained in the classification guidelines, and if each of those were separately assessed - which is not done presently - each aspect could be given a standing on the scale. The film could be then be given an overall grading. Once that was done, the individual States could indicate how a combination of those aspects led to that grading. Therefore, it would be possible to have a universal assessment and the States would still be in a position to say that they do not approve, say, of the explicit violence shown in a particular film.

It is extraordinary that the M classification applies on the basis that children over the age of 15 can see the film. As I mentioned in a previous speech, I saw *Dances with Wolves* which had an M classification. I was horrified by its continuing gratuitous violence, and I could not stay and watch the film. I cannot see how this film can be shown in the community without drawing comment.

Hon Garry Kelly: I could show you a number of reviews, none of which mentions that aspect. They are obviously desensitised.

Hon PETER FOSS: Most of the reviews I had seen emphasised the idyllic lifestyle of the Indians.

Hon Cheryl Davenport interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am pleased that another member agrees with me.

Hon Mark Nevill: You have successfully turned me off seeing it.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am glad that I have turned the member off, if violence is not the member's cup of tea. Hon Garry Kelly has put his finger on this very serious issue. People with any sensitivity who see such films will find them to be extremely violent - however, some people are not affected by the violence, and that was the case with those who did not mention it in their reviews. If it is bad, one should say so. I found it extremely violent, although I do not see many violent films.

Hon Garry Kelly: The reviewers are desensitised to screen violence.

Hon PETER FOSS: That is exactly right, and that is the concern. The community standard as to what constitutes an acceptable public performance is changing - we are being desensitised. As I mentioned in the Address-in-Reply debate, a most important point is that younger persons are less concerned about the violence than the older generations. The younger generations have been exposed to violence from childhood and they have ceased to recognise the graphic realism in a film as violence. What sickens me and causes me to stand up and leave a theatre seems to be pretty standard fare for a child of 15.

Hon Graham Edwards: They are desensitised by the television coverage of violence in its natural form, such as violent soccer riots. I do not know whether Hon Peter Foss saw those riots on the television news.

Hon PETER FOSS: Hon Graham Edwards has again made a valid point; it is not only the dramatic representation of violence, but also the graphic dwelling on violence by the news departments. It almost becomes a good thing to put something in the news because it is violent.

Hon Garry Kelly: The stations are supposed to adhere to a code of practice in the presentation of their news.

Hon PETER FOSS: Yes, and I think members were circulated with a copy of that code the other day through the post.

Hon Mark Nevill: The worst example I have seen on the television is that advertisement for the New South Wales-Queensland State of Origin rugby match.

Hon E.J. Charlton: That is healthy competition.

Hon PETER FOSS: I have not seen that. The other problem we have is that the people who

are now judging these things are also being desensitised to the violence. I would not like to be a censor and have to sit and watch these things, because after a while one would become desensitised. The standards are dropping partly because of that.

Hon E.J. Charlton: It makes me laugh when the videos display a warning which says that some scenes might prove to be offensive, and it turns out 10 times worse than one could imagine.

Hon Graham Edwards: They only put that on to attract more attention.

Hon Max Evans: To hold the audience.

Hon Graham Edwards: During the ratings period.

Hon PETER FOSS: We do have serious concerns. Most members in the Chamber have some view and concerns on this point, and that is an indication that there is a community concern. We have the interests of the community at heart, but for some reason it appears to be outside our ability as legislators in the State of Western Australia to reflect that concern in the way our films and videos are being displayed to the public. The reason is that we have gone too far in seeking to achieve uniformity without ensuring that, as a State Parliament, and more importantly as a State Government, we can take action to ensure that the standards that our community expects of these videos and other forms of visual representation meet those community standards. The Opposition supports this legislation with some amendments that will be proposed by Hon Reg Davies. It is our attitude that if any further step is to be taken, as proposed by the Australian Law Reform Commission, towards a greater uniformity of classification, as a pilot for the future we should be seeking to arrive at a system which will enable us to take back into the control of this State and our community a little more of the classification of these films so that we are not at the mercy of a system which is dictated to by the producers, distributors and presenters of these films as opposed to the people in the community whose interest it is proposed to serve.

HON KAY HALLAHAN (East Metropolitan - Minister for The Arts) [9.44 pm]: I am pleased that there is agreement to support the Bill. The Opposition does have on the Notice Paper a number of amendments and there has been some discussion about them. There is a genuine concern that we should have the most effective piece of legislation possible, and we will proceed with further discussions during the Committee stage. However, in response to some of the comments that have been made, I want to reassure members on the content of the Bill.

The Bill gives us an opportunity to have input into censorship even though it is delegated to the Commonwealth Censor. Any request from a State Minister responsible for censorship for the review of a classification would be automatically referred to the Censorship Board by the Attorney General. That is very important from our point of view, and members will possibly be aware that the amendments that we will consider tonight are being introduced nationally, and that the agreement to cooperate in such an action has come from meetings of State Ministers with the Commonwealth Minister. So despite Hon Peter Foss' concerns that local input may be lost, the legislation we are considering tonight is a result of the concerns by the State Ministers coming together in that Standing Committee. I make that point first and foremost because that will be a matter of concern and interest to members.

The Bill provides for clearer and more informative markings, advertising and consumer advice for all future video releases. That is very necessary because some of the indications on videos have not been clear to people, certainly not to adults in their role as parents. This will help overcome those difficulties where markings have not been of a suitable size or clarity. We must keep in mind that this is an enormous industry. Having nationally agreed to have across-Australia legislation, the Commonwealth has passed its legislation, two States have passed similar legislation and other States, like us, are in the process of bringing in the legislation. There is a widespread concern across our nation about the standards and the exposure of people to certain material on video tapes. People should be in a position to make judgments about what they want to see, and what material should be classified in such a way that it may not be possible for the community to have access to it at all.

I have two other brief points to make. The requirement to publish classification decisions in the *Commonwealth Gazette* will be removed because it has been costly and quite slow. It can take up to eight weeks for that process and we have a number of concerns about that; one

in particular has been that prosecutions have sometimes foundered because of confusions in the courts about the date on which the classification came into effect. We are doing away with an area of confusion and therefore, it is hoped, an area by which people who transgress the law can escape conviction. Members would generally applaud that.

I remind members of a small amendment which was initiated by Western Australia. Members will be pleased to hear that the six month limitation on proceedings involving child pornography will be lifted by this legislation. Prosecutions involving child abuse videotapes could be brought at any time and would not be subject to that Statute of limitations. I commend the Bill to the House. I am pleased with the indications of support for it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon Garry Kelly) in the Chair; Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for The Arts) in charge of the Bill.

**Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.**

**Clause 6: Sections 12, 13 and 14 repealed and sections 12 and 13 substituted -**

Hon REG DAVIES: Which other States have passed legislation along these lines?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The proposals implemented in this Bill have been introduced into all State and Territory Parliaments. They are now law in Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory and I understand they are in the parliamentary programs of the other States.

Hon REG DAVIES: It is important that the public are made aware as soon as possible of decisions made by the censor. I intended moving an amendment to this clause to have the decision take effect from the day it is made public in the databank. That would ensure that the databank information was updated regularly and would allow the public to know at the same time. As it is some time since we last discussed this Bill, I have had time to discuss it with other people and investigate it and have found that it will initially take up to five days for information to be placed on the databank. Eventually it will be put in on a daily basis. Because the police are concerned about evidence in court, should there be a need for the censor's decision to go to court, the court generally uses the Chief Commonwealth Censor's certificate to determine the day on which a decision is given. Therefore, because of evidentiary grounds, I will not persist with my amendment. However, I insist that the public be well informed on all of these matters at all times.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 7: Section 15 amended -**

Hon REG DAVIES: I have had several months to investigate and further discuss this matter with a variety of people and will not proceed with my amendment. Initially I wanted public interest groups included in the consultative process. My amendment related to those people we entrust with public morality such as our ministers of religion, our schoolteachers and so on. I have examined the ramifications of this amendment and I now believe that the proposal could have allowed minority groups, perhaps with some ulterior motive, to deliberately tie up the system for some time. As was said earlier, this is a big business and it could cost the video industry many thousands of dollars as well as causing it great inconvenience. I am still firmly of the belief that the public's point of view should always be taken into consideration and the Minister has the responsibility to ensure that that occurs. The deletion of the public interest organisations carries with it a prescription for the Minister to act at all times for the good and on behalf of the public interest.

Community leaders should be appointed to the censorship board. They should be people with academic qualifications predominantly - the so-called experts. However, individuals should still have a right to express their opinions. Each case is considered sympathetically and on its merits by the censors. Objections have been considered fairly seriously and are addressed in a sensitive manner. I hope that will continue. The censors are attempting to maintain the general wellbeing of our community to the best of their ability. Hon Peter Foss earlier this evening referred to the desensitisation of people who look at pornographic violent videos and movies. I suppose the people most at risk from that happening to them would be

the censors. Therefore there should be a fairly rapid turnover of those serving on that board so that they do not become desensitised or unwittingly lower our community standards. Our community standards have been gradually lowered over the years, albeit softly, softly, without our knowing it and that should not continue. The board should comprise a good mix of community people, not only academics. There is a place for bricklayers and so on on the panel.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: I am not sure whether Hon Reg Davies was speaking to clause 7 or to clause 6, but what he said made a lot of sense.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Garry Kelly): Clause 6 deals with a similar subject, but we are debating clause 7.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: I am very interested in this clause because it deals with the classification of videos. Members will recall that when the original legislation was before the Parliament I was adamant that symbols should be displayed on the bottom of videos to indicate the level of violence. It has been left to the control board to determine the method of classification of videos. I ask the Minister what form the classification symbols will take because some States have already enacted legislation. We should be given an indication of where the symbols to indicate the level of violence will be placed on the videos and what form they will take.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I have a publication in my hand which sets out the classification guidelines and membership. The symbols are outlined in it and I will make it available to the member at the conclusion of the debate.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: Will numbers or letters be used?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The different classifications are R, X, G, PG and M.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: That is the same as the existing classifications.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Agreement on this matter was reached in 1988. Considerable discussion was held with the industry and by early 1990 an agreement on the required markings had been reached between the industry and the Standing Committee of Ministers. There is no legislative requirement, but since 1990 the industry has been complying with a voluntary code. If one of its members decided to break that code there would be no legislative sanction. The industry is somewhat sensitive, as are most industries, to community attitudes and standards and it went along with the voluntary code. However, we need to enshrine that code in legislation and that is what we are doing now. The markings on the videos are larger than is required by law.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: Is the Minister saying that the description on the bottom of the video which indicates the level of violence is defined by a letter? Is there a numbering system which gauges the level of violence of that video?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The Government is about to take part in a national public awareness campaign so everyone knows what is meant by the various classifications. People are not clear about the classifications and they do have some unpleasant surprises. The Government is not including an education program in the legislation, but the campaign will commence very soon around Australia; Western Australia has cooperated and will contribute to its cost. As a result, there will be increased public awareness.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 8: Sections 15A, 15B, 15C, 15D, 15E and 15F inserted -**

Hon REG DAVIES: Mr Deputy Chairman, I thought that the previous clause to which I spoke was clause 6. I do have an amendment on the Notice Paper to clause 6 and I guess I will have to move to recommit the Bill at the end of the Committee stage.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Garry Kelly): Order! The member said he would not proceed with the listed amendments to clause 6 so I put the question that the clause stand as printed.

Hon REG DAVIES: Mr Deputy Chairman, I thought you were talking about the first two lines of the amendment on the Notice Paper.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I indicate to the Committee that Hon Reg Davies and I have had



considerable discussion on this Bill. We understand one another's position and we could happily lead the Committee through the process whereby Hon Reg Davies has agreed to withdraw a number of his amendments. He indicated to me that he would withdraw part of his proposed amendments to clause 6. I indicate to the Committee that there will be no difficulty about disagreement. The Government would prefer not to have any amendments and I have been in touch with the Federal authorities and the Chief Censor's office to ascertain the practical application of the proposed amendments. We do not want to detract from the effectiveness of the Bill. The amendments Hon Reg Davies will move will not be detrimental to the legislation. It would be useful to the Committee if he would indicate which amendments he intends to proceed with.

**The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is no problem in achieving what both the Minister and the member seek. At the conclusion of the Committee stage the Bill can be recommitted to allow the member to move his amendment to clause 6. If the member recalls, I asked him whether he wished to proceed with his amendment and he said he did not. He sought an explanation from the Minister and in the course of his remarks he said he would not continue with his amendment. Perhaps the member would indicate which amendments to clause 8 he proposes to proceed with.

**Hon REG DAVIES:** I thank the Deputy Chairman for his consideration. This is the third Bill I have handled on behalf of the Opposition and the previous two were very simple. I move -

Page 5, line 19 - To add after the word "effect" the words ", provided however that upon such a review the censor may not decide to apply a less restrictive classification".

The reason for this amendment is to achieve an ongoing commitment to the tightening up of amendments, and it is intended to reflect the wishes of the Ministers at the Darwin conference that the censors should tighten up the classification of videos. It will also have the effect that censors must get it right first time. To some people that may appear a little harsh, but it should result in consistent standards, so that parents can have ongoing trust in the determinations of the censors. It will ensure that our standards are not lowered. In the past decade we have observed the lowering of our standards, which has been gradual and caught us by surprise. We can take this opportunity to amend the legislation to reflect the wishes of the Ministers at the Darwin conference.

**Hon KAY HALLAHAN:** The Government is not in favour of this amendment. I have tried to negotiate with the member but have been unable to persuade him to change his mind. The uniformity of classifications would not apply in Western Australia if censors were unable to downgrade a classification on review. Hon Reg Davies is proposing that a censor may review a classification but he can only make the classification more restrictive. It is a strange review process that allows amendments to be made in only one direction. It is not objective, nor is it the way reviews should be conducted. I have some concerns about the amendment but, because of the benefit to be gained from the enactment of this legislation, on behalf of the Government, I reluctantly agree to the amendment in view of the other agreements that have been reached which will allow an effective Bill to be passed in Western Australia. It is not a desirable amendment, nor does it comply with the general standard of reviews. However, my staff have contacted the Chief Censor for the Commonwealth Government who has said that although it is a most unusual review clause, it will not make the legislation unworkable. In view of the urgency of passing uniform legislation, he has indicated that he can live with this amendment to the Western Australian Bill.

**Hon REG DAVIES:** The classification may be reviewed if it is offensive to the public. Our first responsibility is to the public of Western Australia and, although we have some concern about, we are not responsible for, what happens in the ACT. We are aware of what happened in the past in that State and we do not want it to occur in Western Australia. If any video is considered offensive to the public in this State, the classification should be reconsidered with a view to raising it. If classifications were lowered, I believe that would once again lower community standards. If a video was considered offensive in the first place, the lowering of its classification would represent a lowering of standards. The Liberal Party does not want that to happen in Western Australia. I am aware that there will be cries from the board and from some people that we are taking away the independence of the review board by directing

it to move classifications in only one direction, but we want to avoid the undermining of community standards.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: I congratulate Reg Davies for proposing this amendment and the Government for agreeing to it. I regard it as a safeguard. It may not ever be used but it will be in place to prevent the review board from classifying videos in a way that is not desirable. The standards of society must continually be raised, and downgrading the classification of a video has the effect of lowering our community standards. That should not be tolerated in any way.

**Amendment put and passed.**

Hon REG DAVIES: I move -

Page 5, line 28 - To add after the word "Gazette" the following -

(iii) in the major daily newspapers in all States and Territories

I seek leave to alter the amendment by adding after the word "Gazette" the following -

(iii) in a daily newspaper circulating throughout the State

**Leave granted.**

Hon REG DAVIES: I have moved my amendment because the public should not be excluded from any information regarding any review by the censor. It is a way of keeping the public of Western Australia informed.

**Amendment, as altered, put and passed.**

**Clause, as amended, put and passed.**

**Clauses 9 and 10 put and passed.**

**Clause 11: Section 23A inserted -**

Hon REG DAVIES: I move -

Page 11, line 10 - To add after the word "markings" the words -

and the minimum size and position for markings

**Amendment put and passed.**

**Clause, as amended, put and passed.**

**Clause 12 put and passed.**

**Clause 13: Section 46A inserted -**

Hon REG DAVIES: There has been much debate relating to discussion paper 47, entitled "Censorship Procedure", released recently by the Australian Law Reform Commission. This paper causes me some concern because discussion papers containing draft guidelines are often used as a basis for legislation. My greatest concern relates to child pornography. Our legislation addresses the problems of child abuse or child pornography, but if one reads some of the recommendations in this discussion paper one becomes concerned that we are getting Federal legislation. I would not be happy to see some of these recommendations included in the Bill at a later date. I do not believe there is any justification for child pornography, which should not be allowed or even contemplated as some people's children are being used in child pornography.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Garry Kelly): I do not wish to restrain the member in this debate, but when dealing with clauses of the Bill he is restricted to the content of the clause under discussion. At present he is referring to a discussion paper which presumably does not come within the purview of the clause presently being discussed.

Hon REG DAVIES: My concern is that one day it may. We are discussing child abuse. As this discussion paper will be part of Federal law administered by the Commonwealth Government, and as the discussion paper talks about censorship procedures, I believe they are closely related. I want on the public record the fact that, although our Bill states specifically we will not entertain child pornography, if the recommendations in this document came into being we might find that the Act changes and child pornography and even bestiality could appear in legislation at a later stage. I will be happy to speak about this matter at the third reading stage, if that is what you prefer, Mr Deputy Chairman.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I indicated previously that this clause was initiated by Western Australia.

Hon Reg Davies: The Minister is to be congratulated on it.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I thank the member. At present there is a six month limitation on prosecutions being sought in relation to video tapes involving child abuse. However, under this clause any offence will be able to be prosecuted at any time and no Statute of limitations will apply. I think everyone will be happy to know that will be the case. It will certainly suit Hon Reg Davies, given his comments tonight. I consider the amendments the Government has agreed to tonight to be mainly words, as the legislation was adequate as it stood. However, in the interests of the people of Western Australia and believing that we need this sort of legislation to safeguard the community, the sooner we have it the better and that was the motivation behind the Government's agreement to the amendments that have been moved. I say in the spirit of conciliation which has been evident in respect of this Bill that Hon Reg Davies has made a very sensible response to the information which the Government has been able to make available to him. I am sure he will have no regrets about the decisions he has made, and the Government similarly does not believe that the Bill will in any way be lessened in its effectiveness by our acceptance of the amendments moved by the Opposition.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported, with amendments.

*Recommittal*

On motion by Hon Reg Davies, resolved -

That the Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of clause 6.

*Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon Garry Kelly) in the Chair, Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for The Arts) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 6: Sections 12, 13 and 14 repealed and sections 12 and 13 substituted -

Hon REG DAVIES: I move -

Page 3, line 30 - To delete the words "the relevant decision" and substitute the following -

written notice of the relevant decision pursuant to subsection (1)

This amendment is in line with section 75 of the Interpretation Act 1984 which details the correct procedure to be adopted when the written law authorises or requires a document to be served by post. This amendment will allow those people who have appealed to the censor to actually get the ruling of the censor by post - because the Bill states that the censor will provide a written report - and to be satisfied that the ruling has been sent, and will assist those people who may wish to challenge the ruling later and can prove that they did not in fact receive that correspondence.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I indicate that a number of members have raised a question about the status of the Federal discussion paper. I reassure members that it is a discussion paper only and it will not impact in any way on this Bill.

Bill again reported, with a further amendment.

**CHILDREN'S COURT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA AMENDMENT BILL (No 2)**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 26 March.

HON DERRICK TOMLINSON (East Metropolitan) [10.38 pm]: In his second reading speech the Attorney General stated that -

For the most part, this Bill does not involve a new policy departure. Its main purpose is to deal with a number of technical deficiencies which have emerged in the practical operation of the legislation.

The Opposition considers that to be a fair representation of the Bill. In the main it is reasonable to characterise the Bill as comprising five sets of initiatives, four of which are not contentious in that they do not involve changes in policy but rather clarify matters which, in the Attorney General's words, are technical deficiencies which have emerged in the practical operation of the legislation. It is my understanding that these technical deficiencies were identified by the judge of the Children's Court. It is on his initiative that these matters are addressed in this Bill. Four sets of matters are not contentious and the Liberal Party does not intend to oppose them. The first set, mainly in clauses 7 to 9 of the Bill, clarify matters of procedure and authority relating to the president, the judges and the magistrate. Included in those matters is the appointment of part time magistrates. The second set of amendments elaborates the provisions of existing section 19 relating to jurisdiction, powers and procedures when criminal charges against children are heard in other courts. The Bill proposes the insertion of new sections 19A to 19F to elaborate the provisions of section 19. The third set of initiatives in clause 18 clarifies the provisions for appeal against decisions of members or magistrates of the court, and brings the procedures for appeal in the Children's Court into line with those in the Supreme Court. The fourth set of initiatives establishes standing of police, local government authorities and other public authorities to prosecute in the Children's Court. In each of those there is a clarification, elaboration and an establishment of the standing. The Attorney General describes these amendments as changes to deal with technical deficiencies.

I compliment the draftpersons of these amendments. They are a considerable improvement on the matters contained in the original Bill; they are clear and simple to understand, and they are couched in language very accessible to a lay person. They are very accessible to me as a lay person, and it is a compliment to the draftperson that the Bill is presented in this form. Having said that, I am mindful that, in the next decade, tomes of learned discourses will be published with interpretations of what those very simple things mean. However, that is what the courts are all about, and regardless of what I anticipate will happen in the next decade, I sincerely compliment the draftpersons for the clarity of the amendments.

Those four parts of the Bill are, I suggest, in no way contentious, but one part of the Bill is contentious. It is contentious because it is riddled with moral, ethical and legal dilemmas. Sections 35 and 36 of the Act impose restrictions upon the publication of proceedings of the court. Eliminating the extraneous words, section 35 says, in essence, that a person shall not publish a report of any proceedings in a court containing any particulars or other matter likely to lead to the identification of a child who is concerned in those proceedings. The essence of section 36 is that in the case of proceedings in any court in which a person is alleged to have committed an offence under chapters 22, 31A or 32 of the Criminal Code, a person shall not publish or cause to be published a report of those proceedings containing any particulars or other matters likely to lead to the identification of a child against whom or in respect of whom an offence has been or is alleged to have been committed. Those prohibitions are very clear.

For the benefit of honourable members, chapters 22, 31A and 32 of the Criminal Code deal with offences against morality, with sexual assaults, and with offences against liberty respectively. So important is the prohibition on the publication of matter which will identify the person before the court either as the person charged, as a material witness, or as a child against whom some act has been perpetrated and is therefore the subject of the court proceedings, that amendments are proposed to sections 35 and 36. The Government proposes in clause 15 to introduce severe penalties for contravention. Presently, in spite of the prohibitions being very clear, the Act provides no penalties. The proposed amendments introduce a penalty after summary conviction of a fine of \$10 000, imprisonment for 12 months, or punishment by the Supreme Court as for contempt. A similar penalty is provided in section 36.

That indication of the severity of those punishments reflects the importance with which the Government and the public of Western Australia regard the protection of the identity of children before the Children's Court. But clause 17 introduces a departure. Under clause 17, a proposed new section 36A will provide that by application to the Supreme Court the

Attorney General or the Commissioner of Police may be permitted to publish matters which are prohibited under sections 35 and 36. The Minister's justification for that significant departure in his second reading speech is as follows -

Members will be aware of recent cases of publication of the names of juveniles who have escaped from custody. There is widespread support for the view that, where the escapee poses a serious threat to public safety, it should be possible to publish his identity and description.

I agree with the Attorney General's assessment that there is widespread support for that view, but I observe that the justification which the Attorney General has proposed focuses on and speaks about only juveniles who have escaped from custody. Proposed section 36A has a much wider application. It simply says, in part -

(1) The Supreme Court may, after considering the public interest and the interests of the child, by order allow the publication, broadcast or disclosure of any matter prohibited by section 35(1), (3) or 36 . . .

In other words, it does not seek to confine the power of the Supreme Court to allow the publication of matters prohibited under sections 35 and 36 to those individuals who have escaped from custody; it is a general provision. There is no restriction. No circumstances are specified in which the court may make such an order.

We come now to what is the essential dilemma of this proposed amendment to the Children's Court of Western Australia Act (No 2), and it is a dilemma represented in a tension between the public interest and the interests of the child. I find it rather interesting that that very dilemma is addressed in proposed section 36A, which says that the Supreme Court may by order allow the publication of those matters - but the operative qualifier is "after considering the public interest and the interests of the child". This gets to the very heart, not only of the moral, ethical and legal dilemmas, but also of the public debate which has ensued in the past 18 months following three instances of the disclosure of the names of juveniles. One of the interesting aspects of the interests of the child is that those interests are protected by a public interest: It is a public interest to protect the interests of the individual. That public interest is indicated in the attitude that courts have adopted to the sentencing of juveniles, and I will refer to a couple of decisions which make quite clear the attitude of the courts - the protection of the interests of the child by the judiciary. In the case of Walker - No 115 of 1988; 20 October 1988 - the Court of Criminal Appeal dismissed an appeal against sentence by the Crown against a probation order and a community service order in respect of an armed robbery by an offender aged 17. In his judgment on that appeal the Chief Justice said -

In the case of a young person, it has long been recognised that the courts will, wherever possible, impose a sentence which has rehabilitation or reformation rather than deterrence as its main element.

The Chief Justice then went on to say -

Many years ago, the Chief Justice of Tasmania, Sir Stanley Burbury, in *Lahey v Sanderson* [1959] Tas S R 17 at p.21 stated:

'The courts have recognised that imprisonment is likely to expose a youth to corrupting influences and to confirm him in criminal ways thus defeating the very purpose of the punishment imposed. There has accordingly been a universal acceptance by the courts in England, Australia and elsewhere, of the view that in the case of a youthful offender his reformation is always an important consideration and in the ordinary run of crime the dominant consideration in determining the appropriate punishment to be imposed. . . .'

So to protect the interests of the individual - that is, to protect the interests of the child - the convention followed by the courts in imposing sentences is to lean towards a sentence which has emphasis upon reformation, the desire always being to redeem a young person from a life of crime, not to deter the young person from future crime by imposing a severe punishment or a punishment which would be the equivalent punishment for an adult convicted of such an offence, but rather to look for an opportunity to reform that individual. That was reiterated, again in the Court of Criminal Appeal, in sentencing a young offender, in Yorkshire - CCA Library No 7169, 2 May 1988. Yorkshire had pleaded guilty to a series of sexual assaults of a gross character on a woman.

Hon J.M. Berinson: On a number of women, I think, I believe that was the case where the judge said he thought those charges were among the worst that he had ever dealt with.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Once again the Attorney General demonstrates his superior knowledge on these matters, and I always defer to his superior knowledge. However, I will quote what Mr Justice Wallace and Mr Justice Smith had to say because it illustrates this point of the public protection of the individual interest. They said -

There has been universal acceptance by the courts in England, Australia and elsewhere, that there is an essential difference between children and adults when they come before a court exercising criminal jurisdiction. In particular, it has been accepted by the courts that the reformation of the offender is always an important if not the dominant consideration and that any sentence should be tailored with a greater emphasis on the future welfare of the offender.

Given the Attorney's previous interpolation of information that the judges regarded the offence as one of the worst that had been brought to their attention -

Hon J.M. Berinson: I think I was referring to the trial judge's comment.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: - the appeal judges reiterated the principle that in the case of a child the reformation of the offender should be the dominant consideration. That principle of protecting the child offender by imposing sentences which emphasise reformation - redemption rather than deterrence - is taken one step further in sections 35 and 36 of the Children's Court of Western Australia Act (No 2), which prohibit the identification of the offenders or the persons before the court. The assumption and the extension of that argument is that if the identity of an offender, a material witness or a child who has been offended against is published, that child is indelibly branded as a criminal at a youthful age.

[Pursuant to Standing Orders, debate adjourned.]

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [11.00 pm]: I move -  
That the House do now adjourn.

#### *Adjournment Debate - Fruit Prices - The West Australian Report Cessation*

HON SAM PIANTADOSI (North Metropolitan) [11.01 pm]: I wish to clarify some matters raised yesterday by Hon Peter Foss regarding the collation of information at the Metropolitan Markets. This afternoon, after a telephone call to the Metropolitan Market Trust, I realised that Hon Peter Foss yesterday was only politically grandstanding under the pretext that he was representing the interests of growers. If Mr Foss had bothered to make a telephone call to the Market Trust, as I did, he would have learnt that the position he put last night relating to the provision of information for growers was incorrect. Had Mr Foss bothered to call Mr Manning at the Market Trust he would have been informed that Mr Manning has already contacted the Minister for Agriculture and informed him of the problem.

Hon Peter Foss: That is the problem I outlined. Is that correct?

Hon SAM PIANTADOSI: The member should read the speech he made last night to refresh his memory about what he actually said.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Talk to the Chair.

Hon SAM PIANTADOSI: Mr Foss would have discovered that the Market Trust has already advised the Minister of the current problems. The Minister will take the necessary steps to change the by-laws of the Act to ensure that the vendors comply with that measure and provide the information. As the Act stands, nothing within it provides that the vendors must supply the information. Obviously that is one reason growers have not received the necessary information. However, the matter is in hand. I emphasise that had Mr Foss made one telephone call he would have been informed of the facts instead of taking the opportunity to grandstand and have a go at the Government about its inaction.

Hon Peter Foss: I did not have a go at the Government.

Hon SAM PIANTADOSI: We would all have been spared the trouble, and we would have

been the wiser. Had Mr Foss consulted with Hon Phil Lockyer who is well informed on these matters, he would also have been better informed. Some time ago, when the problem was debated as it related to the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's information program on fruit and vegetable prices, Mr Lockyer spoke on the issue. The ABC decided to not continue with that program, and Mr Lockyer referred to the problems involved at that time. The indication was that some representations would be made to the Minister. Had the member listened to that debate, he would have recollected that certain actions were to be taken to overcome the problem on behalf of the growers.

If we are to represent interested people we should take steps to ensure that the necessary information is given to the growers. We should not come into this place to grandstand or to score political points, especially when one telephone call would be sufficient to acquire some information and pass it to the growers. My colleagues on this side of the House who represent these areas will pass the information to the growers. That should have been done rather than grandstanding in this place.

#### *Adjournment Debate - Wind Energy*

**HON MARK NEVILL** (Mining and Pastoral - Parliamentary Secretary) [11.06 pm]: The House should not adjourn until I draw to its attention an article in today's *The West Australian* at page 9, entitled "Wind energy cheaper: expert". The article quotes Dr Mark Diesendorf who works for the Australian Conservation Foundation as saying that wind power could generate electricity at about the same cost as the new Collie coal fired power station. He goes on to say that he believed the Government's decision to build a second coal fired station was made for political reasons and came despite the success of the 360 kilowatt wind powered generator in Esperance. It is absolute nonsense for Dr Diesendorf to suggest that wind power at Esperance could compete with the newly proposed Collie coal fired power station. The simple fact is that wind generation is certainly not continuous or suitable for base load power stations.

Secondly, wind power cannot stand alone; it can be used to feed into a large grid system only with a base load power station. Studies by the State Energy Commission of Western Australia show that the cost of generated wind power at Esperance is about 11.5¢ per kilowatt hour; that is, about two and one half times the cost of generating electricity from a base load power station. So, it is ludicrous for Dr Diesendorf to be making such wild assertions. He was involved in the setting up of the Esperance wind farm, and I would have expected him to be better informed on the issue. I cannot understand why he is taking this tack. The Esperance wind farm is successful in that Esperance is not connected to the State's SEC grid. At various times, its power has been generated by diesel or medium light oil. As everyone would know, the cost of generating power from the two liquid fuels is far dearer than power generated by the base load system, so at Esperance it is economical to actually have the wind generators connected to the grid and supplementing the cost of power.

The State Energy Commission is looking at using wind power in areas such as Onslow, Exmouth, Mt Magnet, and places such as Esperance where proposals are in train to spend about \$7 million to increase the output from 360 kilowatts to about three megawatts. Wind power is viable in this sort of situation but not viable with base load power grids. The figures quoted are that if a three megawatt wind farm is connected to the south west grid it would require a \$500 000 subsidy annually for 20 years. It is nonsense to suggest that that in some way can substitute for a new power station at Collie. Wind power has its uses but certainly not in a major grid system. Wherever we look around the world, wind power has an element of subsidy. Even in the Esperance situation, a NERDEC grant was involved - and the name of that body has been changed to the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Program. They contributed about \$280 000 to that program in Esperance, and the rest came from the State Energy Commission. With that subsidy, the cost of power at Esperance generated by the wind farm was 11.5¢ per kilowatt hour. That is two and a half times more expensive than the SECWA grid power generation cost. People like Dr Diesendorf should check their facts. I am amazed that this story has appeared in the Press, and I hesitate to say that it has been reported incorrectly because Dr Diesendorf is one person who should know the facts. However, for the Press to give credibility to this tripe does it absolutely no credit. Certainly, Dr Diesendorf discredits himself by putting forward such a postposterous notion.

*Adjournment Debate - Fruit Prices - The West Australian Report Cessation*

**HON PETER FOSS** (East Metropolitan) [11.11 pm]: I am pleased that Hon Sam Piantadosi has been kind enough to confirm what I said yesterday about fruit price figures. I quote from what I said yesterday -

It is said that the reason it is not being done is because he -

I have corrected this to read "she"; continuing -

- was not getting full information from the operators on the floor;

Mr Piantadosi has confirmed that that was exactly the case.

Hon Fred McKenzie: You could have been further down the track before making your comments; you could have made a telephone call to the market operators.

Hon PETER FOSS: I did not stand in the adjournment last night to attack the Government; I did not attack the Government until I saw the jocularly with which some members opposite treated the matter. Last night I began my speech -

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the fruit prices report has ceased to be published in *The West Australian*.

I was immediately interrupted in a jocular fashion by a member who also represents the East Metropolitan Region. The attitude of members opposite was to try to turn the matter into a joke, and I considered it to be an important matter which needed to be put on the record. I still regard it as an important matter because many small growers in the East Metropolitan Region regard the continuation of the report to be important.

Hon Fred McKenzie: You did not tell us about the fault with the vendors. The blame really lies with the vendors, and we need a change to the Act.

Hon PETER FOSS: It is not the vendors who are to blame; it is those who operate on the floor. I repeat the previous quote -

It is said that the reason it is not being done is because he -

Corrected to "she" -

- was not getting full information from the operators on the floor;

That has been confirmed by Hon Sam Piantadosi today. The only criticism I made of the Government concerned the attitude of members in this Chamber who were not interested in hearing the information about the constituents of the East Metropolitan Region.

Hon Fred McKenzie: They were, and you were wrong.

Hon PETER FOSS: They were not interested in taking the matter seriously as they thought it would be clever to interject with funny remarks because they did not believe that fruit prices were a serious matter. This is a serious matter which I hope will be of concern to members of this House.

Hon Mark Nevill: You have turned fruity.

Hon PETER FOSS: Nothing Hon Sam Piantadosi said dissuaded me from my view that this is a serious matter for my electorate. I am pleased that we have had the opportunity to discuss the matters as I raised them yesterday, and that these have been confirmed by Hon Sam Piantadosi.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You are right again, Mr Foss!

Hon PETER FOSS: Of course.

Hon J.M. Berinson: One day you will be wrong.

*Adjournment Debate - Fires in National Parks*

**HON MURRAY MONTGOMERY** (South West) [11.14 pm]: The House should not adjourn until it has considered a matter which appeared in the *Albany Advertiser* last Thursday. An article indicated that conservationists have moved to stop the Department of Conservation and Land Management lighting fires in certain areas in national parks. One of these parks happens to be the Porongorup National Park, of which I have a fair degree of knowledge. The other parks involved are the Walpole-Nornalup and Warren National Parks.



The problem is that if man does not take some part in burning controls of those areas, nature does. CALM has been prevented from instituting those protective burns by the Conservation Council of WA, which has suggested that the question of burning areas should be referred to the Environmental Protection Authority for its consideration. That suggests that we have another expert to work out how these areas should be burned. However, we will have the same problems as experienced in the Fitzgerald National Park if we do not take preventive measures.

Hon E.J. Charlton: And Kalbarri.

Hon P.G. Pental: What dieback did not get, the bushfires did.

Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY: I am sure it will happen again, and we will have a situation similar to that which occurred at Dwellingup or Mayanup, and life and limb will be put at risk.

Some of the areas in the Porongorup National Park have not been burned for at least 25 years. When I lived in that area some of the fuel holdings were in excess of 25 tonnes per hectare, and the level that CALM and the Bush Fires Board use as a measure when gauging protective burning is in the vicinity of eight tonnes per hectare. The problem with the Porongorup National Park is that the north face and the south face can become very wet very quickly. If the park is not burnt on the right days, it is possible to have to wait 12 months or perhaps two years before the next opportunity to burn. That is what will happen now. The area has had some rain, and if the rainfall is too great it will not be possible to burn the southern face of the park.

Five or six years ago this still had not been burnt and the fuel loading was in excess of 25 tonnes. I remember being involved in the burns of that area some 10 years ago and we could not burn some of it because it was too wet. It was possible to burn other areas because of the high fuel loading. If the rainfall is too great it is not possible to burn because of the moss and other understorey vegetation growth. I have brought this matter to the notice of the House as it is causing a great deal of concern to the local authorities, the fire brigades and the landowners, who will be under threat if nature takes its course during the summer. Obviously, that will threaten many livelihoods.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.19 pm*

---



hours which had been registered was considered to be equivalent to 15 years of "normal" life for the machine. The "written down value" - depreciated value - of the washer was \$141 482.

- (3) The Senking 50kg washer was part of a public tender for three lines of batch continuous washer systems with an accepted total value of \$3 124 127. Tenders called did not require the contractor to distinguish costs of individual items of equipment.
- (4) The replaced washer was not disposed of. Serviceable component parts have been retained for the future maintenance and repair of the existing washing system.

**RURAL & INDUSTRIES BANK OF WA - ROTHWELLS LTD LIQUIDATOR**  
*Western Collieries Ltd \$6 million Deal - \$2.5 million Payment*

250. Hon MAX EVANS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister assisting the Treasurer:

- (1) Could the Treasurer advise if the R & I Bank paid \$2.5 million to the liquidator of Rothwells Ltd in respect of the Western Collieries \$6 million cheque deal?
- (2) If the answer is yes, on what date was the amount paid and why was the payment made?
- (3) On what date was the claim made by the liquidator?
- (4) Was the claim first made against Western Collieries for undue preference?
- (5) Was the \$6 million repaid to Western Collieries or the R & I Bank Ltd?
- (6) In which annual reports did the R & I Bank make a provision for the claim?
- (7) Was this shown as abnormal payment and if not, why not?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister assisting the Treasurer has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The amount was paid on 17 July 1989. Payment was made to settle prospective litigation between the liquidator of Rothwells Limited, Western Collieries and the R & I Bank.
- (3)-(4) Any claim the liquidator had lay against Western Collieries. The bank is not aware of the date of any claim the liquidator may have made against Western Collieries.
- (5) The \$6 million advance to Rothwells Limited from Western Collieries was repaid to Western Collieries.
- (6) For the financial year ending 31 March 1989.
- (7) It is not the bank's practice to specifically itemise amounts paid in settlement of litigation; however, provisions or amounts to be written off for bad and doubtful debts would have been dealt with in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act, and regulations thereunder.

**BUSES - CITY OF WANNEROO YOUTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*Circular Bus Route Request*

285. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of requests by the City of Wanneroo Youth Advisory Committee requesting Transperth to provide a circular bus route within the city to cater for specific interests of young people?
- (2) What further action is required to ensure this circular bus route within the City of Wanneroo is commenced as soon as possible?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Transport has provided the following response -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I am advised Transperth has researched the committee's survey assessing youth transport needs and found that 36 of the 37 suburbs mentioned in the survey have access to the venues in demand by the youth of Wanneroo through existing regular bus services. An officer from Transperth met a City of Wanneroo Youth Advisory Committee representative this week - Monday, 29 April - and proposed production of a special brochure for young people which will provide at-a-glance information on how to get from suburbs within Wanneroo to the venues popular with youths, namely Hillarys Marina, Wanneroo Waterworld, the Balcatta Rollerdrome, Mirrabooka Ten Pin Bowling and Botanic Golf. The proposal was enthusiastically received by the committee representative. A draft of the brochure will be presented for submission to the Youth Advisory Committee meeting to be held in June.

#### FISH AND CHIP OUTLETS - FISH SPECIES VERIFICATION

##### *Health Ministry Inspections*

286. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What inspectorial role does the Ministry for Health have in respect of the quality of fish species sold at retail fish and chip outlets?
- (2) Has the ministry received complaints in respect of the quality of fish sold at fish and chip outlets?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Health has provided the following reply -

- (1) Inspection of retail food premises such as fish and chip outlets is primarily a responsibility of local authorities. However, the Health Department, in conjunction with local authorities has coordinated surveys to assess the extent of possible substitution of certain fish species at retail outlets including fish and chip shops.
- (2) Few complaints have been received by the Health Department regarding fish substitution at retail fish and chip outlets. It would be expected that complaints on these issues would be raised with the appropriate local authority.

#### TRANSPORT - YOUTH NEEDS

##### *City of Wanneroo Youth Advisory Committee Survey*

287. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the City of Wanneroo Youth Advisory Committee survey which assess youth transport needs within the municipality and the analysis of transport survey 1990 which has been forwarded to Transperth and ask can the Minister advise when the recommendations contained in the original survey and confirmed by the analysis of transport survey 1990 will be acted upon by Transperth?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Transport has provided the following response -

I refer the honourable member to my reply to question 285 which reports on the action taken by Transperth in response to the Youth Advisory Committee survey.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF GOVERNMENT -  
BURKE, MR BRIAN  
*Travelling Expenses Cost*

292. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

What is the total cost to the Royal Commission in meeting the travelling expenses of former Premier Brian Burke in order that he may appear before the commission?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following reply -

I am advised that the Royal Commission is yet to receive a claim for expenses from Mr Burke. Any such claim will be assessed according to the policy on witness expenses set down by the commission and referred to in the answer to question 295.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF GOVERNMENT -  
PARKER, MR DAVID  
*Travelling Expenses Cost*

293. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

What is the total cost to the Royal Commission in meeting the travelling expenses of former Deputy Premier David Parker in order that he may appear before the commission?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following reply -

I am advised that the Royal Commission is yet to receive a claim for expenses from Mr Parker. Any such claim will be assessed according to the policy on witness expenses set down by the commission and referred to in the answer to question 295.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF GOVERNMENT -  
WITNESSES  
*Expense Payments Scale*

295. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Has a scale of expenses been prescribed by the Royal Commission for payment of expenses to witnesses?
- (2) Will the Premier advise the prescribed scale if one has been set?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following reply -

(1)-(2)

I am advised that the Royal Commission has established a policy relating to witness expenses which is in accord with the Royal Commission Act 1968, as amended. Section 23(1) of the Royal Commission Act requires that -

Where a person appears as a witness before a Commission, the Treasurer of the State shall pay to that person a reasonable sum for the expenses of his attendance, certified by the Chairman in accordance with a scale which may be prescribed or, if a scale is not prescribed, such sum as the Chairman certifies as reasonable.

As there is no prescribed scale, the Chairman will generally apply the scale of fees applicable to witnesses in civil proceedings in the

Supreme Court of Western Australia. Having regard to that scale, the allowances to witnesses before the commission will be as follows -

1. (a) Persons carrying on a profession or business as principals, a daily allowance, not exceeding \$147
- (b) Other persons, a daily allowance, not exceeding \$98
2. In fixing the allowance to be made under paragraph 1 regard may be had to the amount of salary or wages, if any, actually lost by the witness, including amounts in excess of the allowance. Proof of such amounts may be requested.
3. In addition to the foregoing allowances, a witness residing at a distance from the place of hearing may be allowed reasonable travelling expenses actually paid, and a reasonable amount for maintenance or sustenance. Air fares will be allowed at economy class rates unless the chairman otherwise directs.
4. Allowance may also be made for such amount as has been reasonably and properly incurred by a witness for qualifying to give skilled evidence.

If a witness claims that he/she has lost earnings over and above the allowance paid while appearing as a witness, an application can be made to the chairman for loss of those earnings.

#### GOVERNMENT MEDIA OFFICE - EASTER WEEKEND EMPLOYMENT

296. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Over the five day Easter break, how many officers worked in the Government Media Office?
- (2) What was the total number of hours worked by these officers?
- (3) Were the officers employed on a contract basis or were overtime rates applicable?
- (4) What was the total cost in having the media office staffed over that period?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following reply -

- (1) Four officers worked in the Government Media Office over the Easter break. Two Press secretaries were rostered on duty over the period. One was rostered on Good Friday and Easter Saturday. The second was rostered on Easter Sunday, Monday and Tuesday.
- (2) Three Government Media Office officers each worked normal shifts of 7.5 hours on Tuesday, 2 April in lieu of their normal Sunday shift. The total number of hours' overtime worked by four officers was 40. Weekend and public holidays are considered part of Press secretaries' normal working arrangements and no overtime is incurred.
- (3) The Government Media Office officers who worked overtime are permanent public servants. The Press secretaries are employed under contract.
- (4) The total overtime paid for the four Government Media Office officers was \$1 078.32.

#### STATE ENERGY COMMISSION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MOTOR VEHICLES *Private Number Plates*

308. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Was it a Government policy decision or a departmental decision to allow some State Energy Commission of Western Australia motor vehicles to have private number plates?

- (2) What criteria determine if a SECWA motor vehicle shall have private number plates?
- (3) What benefits accrue to SECWA in the use of private number plates?
- (4) What benefits accrue to SECWA officers in having a departmental vehicle with private number plates?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister for Fuel and Energy has provided the following reply -

- (1) A Government policy decision.
- (2) The criteria established by the Government motor vehicle policy committee.
- (3) The motor vehicle policy relating to use of private number plates is intended to provide for better asset management of departmental car fleets to ensure revenue raised offsets vehicle maintenance and ownership costs and allows for a reduction in the fringe benefits tax liability.
- (4) Private use of vehicle on which ownership costs are shared.

#### UNDERWATER WORLD - HILLARYS BOAT HARBOUR

##### *Government Interest*

321. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister assisting the Treasurer:

- (1) What interest does the Government, its agencies or instrumentalities have in the ownership and management of Underwater World at Hillarys?
- (2) What has been the capital cost to date for this project?
- (3) What was both the gross revenue and nett revenue for the financial years ended 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1991 to date?
- (4) Is the Government's share in this project being actively marketed?
- (5) If so, by whom?
- (6) Has the Government considered any offers in respect of this project?
- (7) If so, will the Minister provide details?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister assisting the Treasurer has provided the following reply -

- (1) To facilitate the disposal of the operation, the Western Australian Development Corporation has acquired all the remaining interests in Underwater World at Hillarys. The WADC now has complete control of the management and ownership of Underwater World.
- (2) The cost to construct the Perth Underwater World project on opening in 1988 was \$8 180 100.
- (3)

	1988	1989	1990	9 months 31 March 1991
Gross Revenue	\$1 196 025	\$4 529 366	\$3 534 260	\$2 596 389
Net Revenue (Loss)	\$ 234 264	\$ 473 596	\$ (520 101)	\$ (189 876)
- (4) Underwater World is up for sale but is not being actively marketed at present.
- (5) Not applicable.
- (6) The Western Australian Development Corporation has considered one offer in respect of this project.
- (7) The offer price was confidential but was considered unacceptable to the Western Australian Development Corporation. Any private sale of Perth Underwater World would need to be by way of public tender.

**HOSPITALS - ROEBOURNE HOSPITAL**  
*Closure or Downgrading Plans*

335. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Government planning to close or downgrade the Roebourne Hospital?
- (2) If so, what are the reasons for the planned change?
- (3) Does the Government plan to use the Roebourne Hospital in the future as a "C" class hospital and if so, when is it planned to make the changeover?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Health has provided the following reply -

(1),(3)

No.

(2) Not applicable.

**STATE ENERGY COMMISSION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - CORAL BAY**  
*Power Requirements Assessment*

343. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to Hon Tom Stephens representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Now that the State Energy Commission of Western Australia have visited Coral Bay to assess the power requirements of the town, what steps are being taken to take over the electricity for the town?
- (2) What is the time frame to supply the power?

Hon TOM STEPHENS replied:

The Minister for Fuel and Energy has supplied the following reply -

(1)-(2)

State Energy Commission of Western Australia attended the meeting with the Coral Bay Progress Association to discuss the electricity supply options for the town's small permanent population. SECWA has no plans or programs to take over electricity supply in Coral Bay.

**HEALTH PROMOTION FOUNDATION - PROPERTY PURCHASE,  
METROPOLITAN AREA**

351. Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Health Promotion Foundation bought property in the metropolitan area?
- (2) Is it intending to buy property in the metropolitan area?
- (3) If yes to (1) or (2), where, for how much and for what purpose?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Health has provided the following reply -

(1) No.

(2) I am advised the foundation currently has no intention to purchase property in the metropolitan area but that this option may be examined if it appears such an action would assist the foundation to fulfil its objects.

(3) Not applicable.

**HEALTH PROMOTION FOUNDATION - FUNDING**  
*Coaching/Training, Women, Aborigines/Ethnic Groups*

352. Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the Health Promotion Foundation be establishing funds that are exclusively for or that give priority to -



- (a) coaching/training;
  - (b) women; and
  - (c) Aborigines or any other racial or ethnic community?
- (2) If the answer is yes, how will the proportion of Health Promotion Foundation funds that go to such categories be determined?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Health has provided the following reply -

- (1) I am advised the foundation has no intention of providing funds on the basis suggested in the honourable member's question and refer him to the information contained in the foundation's funding guidelines.
- (2) Not applicable.

**HEALTH PROMOTION FOUNDATION - CAPITAL WORKS FUNDING**  
*Sporting and Cultural Facilities*

354. Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

Is the Health Promotion Foundation going to provide funds for capital works for sporting and cultural facilities?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Health has provided the following reply -

I am advised the foundation does not intend to fund capital works.

**MAMMOGRAPHY UNIT - GREAT SOUTHERN AREA**  
*Joint Funding Commitment*

355. Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does the Government's commitment to the joint funding of a mammography unit for the Great Southern area still stand, and will it still honour its undertaking to deliver the unit by June or July this year?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the Great Southern community has already raised its share of the joint funding?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) If yes to (1), will the mammography unit be mobile immediately and, if not, how long after its delivery will it be mobile?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Health has provided the following reply -

- (1) The Government's commitment to joint funding of a mammography unit for the great southern area still stands. I expect that if all arrangements proceed as planned the unit will be set up early in the 1991-92 financial year.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The screening mammography unit will be mobile. Tender negotiations are well advanced, but if delays occur, the installation of a fixed unit in Albany will be considered so that the service can be commenced as scheduled.

**WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION - BORROWING  
\$2 MILLION**

360. Hon REG DAVIES to the Leader of the House representing the Minister assisting the Treasurer:

What was the purpose of the \$2 million borrowed by the Western Australian Development Corporation after 30 June 1989?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister assisting the Treasurer has provided the following reply -

The funds were needed for working capital requirements of the Western Australian Development Corporation.

**UNDERWATER WORLD - SENTOSA ISLAND, SINGAPORE  
Cost**

361. Hon REG DAVIES to the Leader of the House representing the Minister assisting the Treasurer:

- (1) How much did the Sentosa Island project cost?
- (2) Does the Government anticipate making a profit on the sale of the development?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister assisting the Treasurer has provided the following reply -

- (1) The expected total capital cost of the Underwater World on Sentosa Island in Singapore dollars is \$26.9 million.
- (2) The Government hopes to make a profit; however, this depends on the market at the time of sale.

**CATTLE - TRANSACTION LEVY**

375. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Agriculture:

With regard to the cattle transaction levy -

- (1) What are the component levies that make up the total transaction levy and what are the individual amounts within that total?
- (2) Will the Minister make an urgent approach to the Commonwealth to waive the levy on extra cattle that must be turned off because of drought?
- (3) If not, why?
- (4) Will the Minister further approach the Commonwealth to have the levy based on a value basis rather than a per head basis?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) If the burden of the transaction levy cannot be lifted from drought affected pastoralists, will the Minister take steps to have such selling charges rebated under a drought assistance package?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Agriculture has provided the following response -

- (1) \$3.15 - Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation.  
\$0.88 - Australian Meat and Livestock Research and Development Corporation.  
\$2.10 - Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Eradication Campaign.  
\$0.12 - National Residue Survey.

- (2)-(5) The transaction levy is a national arrangement, the level of which has

been arrived at by industry and the Commonwealth. I would be prepared to support changes to the levy as suggested by the honourable member if requested to do so by industry.

- (6) In both the Kimberley and the current Pilbara drought pastoralists get a 50 per cent subsidy on transport of livestock off the property. State drought policy is to be reviewed in the near future and the suggestion of rebates on transaction levies could be examined in that review.

**ELECTRICITY - TARIFFS REDUCTION**  
*Coal Miners' 15 per cent Productivity Increase*

379. Hon MURIEL PATTERSON to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

With the promise of a 15 per cent increase in productivity by the coal miners in Collie, can consumers expect any part of this 15 per cent to be reflected in reduced power costs?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister for Fuel and Energy has provided the following reply -

Yes. Consumers can expect electricity tariffs to decline in real terms.

**HEALTH - PATIENTS ASSISTED TRAVEL SCHEME**  
*Report Tabling*

382. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

I refer the Minister to the answer given on 30 April 1991 to question on notice No 201 and ask -

- (1) Will the Minister table the report?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Health has provided the following reply -

(1)-(2)

The review of the patient assisted travel scheme was undertaken with the intention of producing a revised set of guidelines which would be of practical value in meeting community concerns about the administration of the scheme. Details of the new guidelines are already being widely publicised as foreshadowed in my answer to question 201.

**ROYAL COMMISSION INTO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF  
GOVERNMENT - WITNESSES**  
*Payment, \$65 an Hour*

384. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Are witnesses who appear before the Royal Commission paid at the rate of \$65 an hour?
- (2) If so, when was this figure struck and on what basis?
- (3) Does this rate apply to the former Premier and Ambassador, Mr Burke?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following response -

(1), (3)

No.

(2) Not applicable.

# QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

## JUVENILE OFFENDERS - 16 YEAR OLD

### *Four Year Old Girl Murder and Sexual Assault - Government Agency Care*

172. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Community Services:

Some notice of this question has been given.

- (1) Has the 16 year old youth recently charged with wilful murder and aggravated sexual assault of a four year old girl previously been committed to the care of the Department for Community Services or other Government agency?
- (2) If so, will the Minister provide details of the period during which the accused was in the care of the Department for Community Services or other Government agency?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

I thank the member for giving some notice of this question, to which the Minister for Community Services has provided the following reply -

The youth in question was committed to the care of the department on 15 June 1977 at the Perth Children's Court as a result of a care and protection application. He has been in the department's care since that time. The boy was placed with foster parents from 1977 until November 1989 and again from October 1990.

## AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT - TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

### *Statutory Corporations (Directors' Liability) Bill Review*

173. Hon PETER FOSS to the Attorney General:

I refer the Attorney General to the report of the Auditor General on the Totalisator Agency Board's involvement with various companies, which I think was tabled today. In view of the potential conflicts of interest identified there, and in view of the identified investments in a company by the board of the TAB contrary to the advice of the Solicitor General, will the Minister advise -

- (1) At what stage is the Government's review of the implementation of the provisions of the Statutory Corporations (Directors' Liability) Bill?
- (2) Will he give the House assurance that the work on that project will be expedited?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

I have not had the opportunity to open the Auditor General's report so I am at something of a disadvantage. I simply do not know the background to the question that Hon Peter Foss has asked. I am also not in a position to respond to the second part of his question in any detail, but if he puts that on notice I will ensure that an answer is provided.

## SPEED LIMITS - 110KM REDUCTION DECISION

174. Hon E.J. CHARLTON to the Minister for Police:

Is any decision pending to reduce the speed limit on the highways in country areas or anywhere else from 110 kilometres per hour to a lower speed?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

One of the things I am not responsible for is the setting of speed limits. The police are responsible for policing them. I suggest that the member put that question on notice and I will ensure that the information is provided to him. I

do not want to incur the wrath of the President by embarking upon an answer that is not within my portfolio responsibility and, having done that, to set a precedent that Hon Eric Charlton would expect me to follow tomorrow in a different area. I suggest that the member follow the course of action I have suggested.

**ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY - PAT, JOHN**  
*Police Officer Posting Action*

175. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Police:

I note that in his report on the inquiry into the death of John Pat, Commissioner Elliott Johnston, QC, expressed concern about the inadequacy of the in-service training of the officer in charge before he took up duties at Roebourne police station. What measures have been adopted by the Police Department since the incident at Roebourne to ensure there is appropriate induction of officers posted to rural, and in particular remote, police stations?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Commissioner of Police has initiated a number of procedures in an endeavour to prevent from happening again that which happened with the posting of that officer many years ago. Indeed, before police officers are transferred they are generally appraised to ensure that the right officer is posted to the right area. It has also been a recent practice to improve the training of recruits to ensure that they are better informed about Aboriginal customs and requirements in the areas to which they will be posted. In recent years a general attempt has been made to better inform police officers about many matters relating to Aboriginal culture. For instance, when a police road safety caravan toured the eastern goldfields recently, those officers spent a couple of weeks before they departed acquainting themselves with the basic Aboriginal language and customs of the various communities with which they knew they would be dealing.

However, I suspect that to do this question justice the answer requires much more time than I can give it here. The commissioner will be responding in full to the report after he has had time to study it, and it may be that I will make a ministerial statement on the subject later. I thank Hon Derrick Tomlinson for his interest in the matter and assure him that a procedure is in place which attempts to ensure that the posting of officers is complemented by a knowledge of the communities with which they will be working.

**PAT, JOHN - POLICE OFFICERS**  
*Future Information Action*

176. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Police:

Given the failure of both the coronial inquiry and the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody to determine the time of death of John Pat, the actual time of discovery of his body, whether resuscitation was attempted, and whether the body had been washed, what measures have been taken to ensure that in future police internal investigations will not leave such important questions unanswered?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

That question should be placed on notice.

**ARTS - COMPANIES**  
*Country Tours Funding*

177. Hon MARGARET McALEER to the Minister for The Arts:

- (1) So that rural Western Australians are not excluded from the opportunity to enjoy the arts, will the Minister advise whether major dance, theatre and music companies funded by the Government are required, as a condition of their funding, to tour major country centres?

(2) If the answer is no, would the Minister consider including this requirement?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

I do not think it would be true to say that the major companies which are funded have that as a condition of their funding, but often included within the program they put forward for funding is a program of touring, and they often make additional applications on a project basis for funding to tour a particular performing art or exhibition. As well, funds are now available through the Gordon Reid Foundation of the Lotteries Commission to bring the arts to regional and country Western Australia in a way and with a regularity that we have not previously seen.

I will keep in mind the member's desire to see regular tours by the companies; however, I can assure her that many of the companies look forward to, and actually need, the opportunity to tour. A State the size of ours, with a small population, requires our companies to make the best of their productions and to take them to regional towns. This is done wherever possible; however, for a production to be taken away for a one night show involves a great logistical effort. Nevertheless, it is something the companies are keen to do, and they try to weave this into their programs as much as possible.

#### SCHOOLS - CAMP SCHOOLS

##### *Bookings 1992*

178. Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY to the Minister for Education:

Last week I asked in a question on notice whether all camp schools would accept bookings for next year. However, the answer did not indicate whether it applied to all camp schools or half the camp schools.

- (1) Will the Minister give an undertaking that all camp schools will take bookings for 1992?
- (2) Will these camp schools remain under the control of the Ministry of Education?
- (3) If not, who will assume control for them?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(3)

I thank the member for his question. This matter is currently receiving attention and I hope to be in a position to advise the member of the situation in the next two or three weeks. At that stage, no uncertainty will exist regarding the 1992 school year.

#### POLICE OFFICERS - CORONIAL INQUIRIES

##### *Evidence Requirement Instruction*

179. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Police:

Given the similarity of the John Pat and Stephen Wardle cases in that members of the Police Force refused to answer questions and therefore were not called to coronial inquiries into the deaths of those two men, will the Commissioner of Police instruct his department that police officers have a duty to attend and give evidence to full coronial inquiries?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

That question contains some assumptions which are not necessarily true. I invite the member to put the question on notice. Has the member actually read the report?

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Indeed I have.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I am pleased.

**SCHOOLS - SCHOOL RENEWAL PROGRAM**  
*Union Boycott*

180. Hon T.G. BUTLER to the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister advise the House about the article in *The West Australian* this morning indicating that three unions will boycott the school renewal program?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The member's question is understandable because the union comments reported in today's newspaper were somewhat surprising in the light of the fact that the unions had been involved on the committee which produced the report. The union concerns are documented in the report forwarded for my consideration. All matters within the report are yet to be determined, and it will be available for public comment for one month. In that time the unions, the broader community, parents and citizens' associations and others with an interest in the subject - including members of Parliament I hope - will have an opportunity to comment. The report makes clear recommendations that people's jobs should be protected and suggests means by which this can be achieved.

It is very poor management to have publicly owned facilities seriously underutilised in our community - in the education portfolio there are many of them - when other areas require such facilities. This is understandable with changing enrolments owing to rapid demographic changes. It is a sound management policy, as other States have had to address, to consider amalgamating and transferring resources from areas where the resources are not effectively used to areas in which they are in demand.

The school renewal program will be based on community needs. We are asking the community how the education of children can be improved with the provision of facilities which are not currently available to students in schools. Members will be interested to know that some communities have already indicated an interest in taking advantage of the opportunities which the school renewal program provides. I am confident that once the report is distributed and the community has gained a broader understanding, great and more positive interest will be generated. I seek leave to table the document.

[See paper No 358.]

**SUPERDROME - POOLS**  
*Future Decision*

181. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) Has the future of the three swimming pools at the Perth Superdrome been decided?
- (2) If they are to be mothballed, what will be the cost and how will the work be handled?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(2)

The future of these facilities has not been decided. I understand that some expressions of interest in the pools have been made - approaches have been made by a water polo club and a local authority. However, it is unfortunate that a totally erroneous assessment was made of the water polo warm-up pool by a person from a local authority. This person proceeded to publicise his views of the deficiencies he saw at the pool. Unfortunately, he was quite wrong.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Fortunately, he was quite wrong.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Either way, he has done some damage to the interest which may have been otherwise shown in the pool by other authorities. The

situation has been rectified and this has a high position on the list of priorities of the Perth Superdrome Board. I expect a decision to be made in the fairly near future, but I cannot give a time limit on that.

**SCHOOLS - SCHOOL RENEWAL PROGRAM**  
*"School Renewal" Report Cost*

182. Hon REG DAVIES to the Minister for Education:

I refer to the glossy, expensive looking report titled "School Renewal" which the Minister just tabled.

Hon John Halden: That is the most intelligent comment you have made about it.

Hon REG DAVIES: I saw the name of the chairman of the program -

Hon P.G. Pental: That confirmed that it was a school closure program.

Hon REG DAVIES: - and I was amused by some of the comments in the report. What was the cost of producing, printing and distributing the report?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I am intrigued that such an important report is the subject of such a trivial question.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Hear, hear!

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I do not regard this report as a "glossy publication". Green is a glorious colour, but it could not be said that the quality and thickness of the production was over the top.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am advised by the chairman of the committee, Hon John Halden, that the quote received to produce this report indicated that it was cheaper to have it produced in this printed form than it was to have it photocopied.

Hon Reg Davies: But what was the cost?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: It is not an over-the-top document at all.

Hon P.G. Pental: Will you table both quotes?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am advised by the member that those were the estimates given.

Hon George Cash: Do you believe them to be true?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Does the Leader of the Opposition know what technology is all about these days?

Hon George Cash: I am asking whether you will table the quotes.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: If the member wants further information on this, he will have to put a question on notice.

Hon P.G. Pental: He will have to ask the Minister for printing.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I seek the indulgence of the House - in keeping my word given yesterday - to table an important document titled "Educational Standards in Western Australian Government Schools 1990".

Hon P.G. Pental: Why is it photocopied?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: This is volume 1, titled "Monitoring Standards in Education Programs". Wait until members opposite see it. It even has a different surface.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is seeking to table a document.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Members opposite should not behave like kindergarten children or I will behave like a kindergarten teacher.



The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister cannot behave like that. We are seeking leave to table a document, not to discuss its virtues.

[See paper No 359.]

**POLICE - INJURED PERSONS IN CUSTODY**  
*Medical Treatment Assurance*

183. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Police:

Given the evidence in both the Stephen Wardle and John Pat cases that the proper medical treatment was not rendered to those individuals when in custody, what measures have been taken to guarantee that injured persons are given medical treatment when taken into custody?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I invite the member to put that question on notice to ensure I provide a full answer. A number of steps initiated by the Police Commissioner have been taken. However, members will probably be aware that the Police Force has recently been trialling the attendance of a nurse at the central lockup. In addition, observation cells are used and police officers are required to check people in custody regularly.

**AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY - FUNDRAISING LUNCHEES**  
*Government Funding*

184. Hon PETER FOSS to the Leader of the House:

It has been reported in the Press that the Australian Labor Party fundraising lunch attended by Mr Hawke and Mr Connell at the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet was paid for by the Government.

- (1) Is it usual for ALP fundraising lunches to be paid for by the Government?
- (2) Does the Leader of the House know of any other examples of fundraising lunches being paid for by the Government?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

My portfolios do not include any responsibility related to the payment of lunches. If the member would care to put his question on notice for the attention of the responsible Minister, I am sure he will receive a reply.

**WETLANDS - SWAN COASTAL PLAIN WETLANDS**  
*Environmental Protection Authority Regulations*

185. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Why was the regulation of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 relating to the environmental protection of Swan coastal plain wetlands gazetted on 28 March 1991 and tabled on 30 April 1991 when the EPA has a draft policy titled "Environmental Protection (Swan Coast Plain Wetlands) Policy 1991" in the public arena inviting submissions until 24 May 1991?
- (2) Is it normal practice to gazette and table regulations ahead of the finalisation of policy on the same issue?
- (3) Should not local government authorities have been consulted prior to, and informed subsequent to, the tabling of this regulation?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The Minister for the Environment has provided the following reply -

- (1) The regulation was gazetted to provide interim legal protection for wetlands nominated in the draft policy against filling, draining, mining

and pollution while the policy was under public review. Both the content of the policy and the wetlands nominated for protection will be reviewed after the close of public submissions on 24 May 1991.

- (2) It is normal practice to control activities contrary to the intent of a policy occurring while the draft policy is under discussion. This regulation is temporary, and will be rescinded when the final policy is gazetted.
- (3) Local government authorities were extensively consulted during the development of the draft policy over a period of more than 15 months.

#### CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE TASK FORCE - REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTATION

186. Hon REG DAVIES to the Attorney General:

I refer to the child sexual abuse task force report and ask, when will recommendations 27(d), 28, 29, 30, 31 and 40 be implemented?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I cannot possibly carry in my head what occurred concerning recommendations 27(d) and 28, not to mention the others Hon Reg Davies included in his list. We are moving towards the further implementation of that task force report and, if my memory is correct, we are proposing to do that in conjunction with other matters related to child pornography. Unfortunately that is as far as I can take the answer, but if the member wants to take it further I will be happy to look at any additional questions.

#### PRISONS - NEW METROPOLITAN PRISON

187. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Corrective Services:

I refer to a question I asked the Minister during March this year on the location in the northern suburbs of the next metropolitan prison.

- (1) Why did he not make a ministerial statement on that matter in view of his previous promise to this House?
- (2) Where will the metropolitan prison be located?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

I did undertake to make a statement. From memory I said that I would be in a position to do that in about a month's time. I stand to be corrected on that as always. I may have said "within a month", but my memory suggests that I said "in about a month". Either way, that is what I should have said because the presentation of a report of this nature, when it has not yet been compiled, cannot be made subject to a strict timetable. Unfortunately the Leader of the Opposition is always anxious to grasp at any straw which suggests I may not be meeting an undertaking I have given. He came a cropper by interjection only a couple of days ago on a similar matter related to Mr Foss' disaster. For the moment it remains my intention to make a comprehensive statement on further moves on prison accommodation; and all relevant matters, including potential siting, will be dealt with at that time.

Hon George Cash: In view of your insistence in recent days that we be specific in our questions about timing, will you state a specific time when that statement is likely to come forward?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: No.

#### CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE TASK FORCE - REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTATION

188. Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I thank Hon Reg Davies for sending me an extract of the child sexual assault task force report to which he referred. I cannot take the answer that I gave

earlier much further in precise terms. However, having now seen recommendation 27, for example, I am reminded that this general area is the subject of a very extensive report by the Law Reform Commission, that the release of that report is imminent and that I will be looking to an early opportunity after adequate exposure for public input to put a submission to the Government for legislation.

---