

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 28 August 1985

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

PRISONER: RONALD JOSEPH DODD

Parole: Urgency Motion

THE SPEAKER: Members, I wish to advise that I have received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition—

Dear Mr Speaker,

In accordance with Standing Orders 47 and 48 of the Legislative Assembly, I give notice that at the commencement of the sitting of the House today, August 28, 1985, I wish to move "that the House do now adjourn" for the purpose of debating a matter of urgency, namely—

"THAT this House expresses its alarm at the decision of the Attorney General, at the recommendation of the Parole Board, to release convicted murderer Ronald Joseph Dodd on parole next week and calls on the State Government to immediately reverse the decision in the light of deep public concern that prison sentences for serious offences should be toughened."

Mr Speaker, this is a matter of public importance and immediate urgency and in my view is properly brought forward within the Standing Orders.

The Opposition believes that there is serious public concern about the release of this man and that a number of people in the community are in fear of reprisals on his release from prison.

The Attorney General has failed to give assurances that similar crimes will not be committed by Ronald Joseph Dodd on his release from prison next week.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. B. HASSELL MLA,
Leader of the Opposition.

28 August 1985.

Seven members having risen in their places,

THE SPEAKER: As sufficient members stood in their places in accordance with the Standing Orders, I approve the request by the Leader of the Opposition. The debate will take up to one

hour. Speakers on my left will have the opportunity to speak for 30 minutes and those on my right will also have 30 minutes in which to speak. The matter of how the 30 minutes is made up is a matter for the sides to organise behind the Chair.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [2.21 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The House should adjourn for the purpose of debating the matter of urgency outlined in my letter to the Speaker.

Ronald Joseph Dodd was charged with wilful murder by the Crown in 1976. He was convicted by a jury of wilful murder and sentenced to death by Mr Justice Wallace who said at the time that there were no extenuating circumstances. There was no question at that stage of commuting the sentence.

Dodd then appealed and the court of appeal reduced the conviction from wilful murder to murder. The reason for the reduction in the conviction is not known but presumably it related to the application of the criminal law in the circumstances. Dodd had originally pleaded that he was under the influence of alcohol at the time of the offence although in the eyes of the jury this was not sufficient reason to reduce the conviction. He was then automatically sentenced to life imprisonment; that is, after the reduction of his conviction from wilful murder to murder.

Under the provisions of the Offenders Probation and Parole Act in cases of life imprisonment the Parole Board is required to report after five years. The report is a statutory one, the first of which was received by the then Attorney General, Hon. Ian Medcalf, in about November 1982. The recommendation of the Parole Board at that time was that no action be taken and that Dodd not be released. The then Attorney General, Hon. Ian Medcalf, agreed to that recommendation because of the particular viciousness of the crime. Every year since then the Attorney General for the Labor Government, Hon. Joe Berinson, would have received reports on Dodd. Last year Hon. Joe Berinson told the Legislative Council that he automatically accepted the recommendations of the Parole Board. I assure members of this House that that was not the practice of the former Attorney General, Hon. Ian Medcalf. He weighed up considerations such as public safety which do not necessarily form part of the Parole Board's considerations. The former Attorney General never automatically accepted the

recommendations of the Parole Board. He regarded those recommendations as important guidance and advice to him but, of course, as the first law officer of the Crown, he was not bound by them and he was entitled to consider the issues more widely. Indeed, the former Attorney General, Hon. Ian Medcalf, considered that he had an obligation to consider the issues more widely.

However, more recently the present Attorney General, Hon. Joe Berinson, has said that he does not always automatically accept the recommendations of the Parole Board. In this case we certainly do not think he should because of the seriousness of the crime and danger to the public if Dodd is released. I know that it will be said by the Government, in defence of its decision, that Dodd is to be sent to the Jigalong community mission and that he will be required to stay there as a condition of his parole. That is simply inadequate as reassurance to the public of this State that it will be safe to release a man responsible for such a vicious murder which, I remind the House, was committed by Dodd the last time he was on parole.

Although the present Attorney General has said that nine years is within the range of sentence for someone convicted of murder, each case must be considered individually. There is no such thing as an average murder and in every set of circumstances factors such as the safety, concern, and security of the public, and the feelings of the victims and their families, must be taken into account.

There is reason to believe that in this case special circumstances should be taken into account by the Attorney General when dealing with Ronald Joseph Dodd. One of those special circumstances is that the man he murdered in 1977 or thereabouts is believed to have been someone against whom he had a grudge. In other words it was a pay-back murder. The man he murdered was called Brown and he was probably a witness in a previous case against Dodd or had spoken to the police or the authorities about Dodd.

When Dodd was released on parole—he was serving a sentence for a violent crime at that time—he went to Brown's home in Robinson Street, East Perth and murdered his victim on the front lawn of his home. He then forced two men to help him to shift the body to a pine plantation and there buried it. The murder was particularly gruesome: Dodd slit the man's throat through to his spine and cut off one of his ears. It has been suggested that this was a

sinister ritual to indicate that Brown had heard and spoken of things he should not have. The men who were forced to help Dodd to move the body gave evidence at the trial that they were terrified of Dodd and in fear of being attacked by him if they did not comply with his demands. Presumably these men would still have very real reason to be concerned about the release of Dodd. It should be remembered that Dodd is an able-bodied man of approximately 35 years of age who, along with others, has been well cared for under the prison system for the past eight or nine years.

We have not seen any indication or evidence of any reassurance from the Attorney General in the statements that he has made so far that those people who were witnesses at the trial against Dodd on a charge of wilful murder will themselves be secure. They must be afraid that they now will be the first people on whom Dodd will seek revenge when he is released from gaol.

There has been no reassurance from the Attorney General that Dodd will not repeat his violent crime. He has been a hardened criminal, in and out of gaol since the age of 16. He has a long history of violent crime, including the offence for which he is currently in prison, which was we believe undoubtedly a pay-back killing. There is no basis upon which he should be released into the community at this time.

There is certainly no basis upon which Dodd should be released without the Attorney General of the State being able to give reasonable and strong reassurances as to some change in Dodd which could give comfort to a public which is increasingly concerned about the early release of prisoners who have been convicted of serious criminal offences. No such assurances have been given.

I find it amazing, indeed staggering, that the Attorney General is so totally insensitive to the feelings of the people of Western Australia, increasingly expressed publicly and privately and conveyed to members of Parliament, that he should have announced yesterday his intention to release this man Dodd, who was convicted by a jury of wilful murder in 1977, a gruesome murder which there is every reason to believe was a pay-back killing and one in a succession of increasingly serious offences. I might say the Attorney General announced it when he was challenged about it; he did not announce it before, as I understand the position.

Surely the experiences of the past tell us that the circumstances of this case do not present a picture of safety upon which it is reasonable for the public of Western Australia to accept without complaint and without concern the release of Dodd. My colleague, when he speaks in the debate, if he is given an opportunity to do so, will outline further information in relation to this.

I want to point out that the situation which prevails today in relation to Dodd would not have arisen if there had not been a change of Government. The former Attorney General, Hon. Ian Medcalf, had been to Cabinet and obtained approval for changes to the parole system. Under those changes the required time for review in the case of a prisoner sentenced to life imprisonment for murder would have been raised from five years to 10 years. In other words, under those changes which were approved by the Cabinet of the former Government there would have been no review until at least another year in Dodd's case.

Of course that review would not in itself have been treated as a minimum term; it would have been treated as a review of the situation, and in the case of Dodd, bearing in mind the total circumstances, it is unlikely that he would have been released on parole even after 10 years, and certainly not after eight or nine years.

This is a very serious matter and it reflects very badly on the Government and on the Attorney General. It particularly reflects badly on Hon. Joe Berinson because this is not the first time that this Attorney General has failed in his duty to the State in relation to upholding the law. The Parliament and the public are very much aware of the case of John O'Connor, the TWU secretary, who was let off serious criminal charges on the direct intervention of this Attorney General without his being responsible or accountable to anyone for his actions in letting a man off charges after he had been committed for trial by a court of law.

We now have the same Attorney General proposing to let back into the public a man whose record culminated in a conviction for murder. The circumstances dictate he should not be released at all.

Using the only procedure available to us in the circumstances, we have brought forward this urgency motion. The unfortunate aspect of it is, of course, that under the Standing Orders of the House, the motion must be withdrawn. But the fact that the motion must be withdrawn

will not alter the anger, the concern and indeed the fury of the public of Western Australia that in the light of the currently expressed strong level of genuine concern about law and order, this Government and this Attorney General, are proposing to release Ronald Joseph Dodd from custody after this relatively short period in relation to the life sentence which he received.

MR TRETHOWAN (East Melville) [2.36 p.m.]: I was telephoned last night by a constituent of mine who expressed very great concern—in fact I do not think it is too strong a statement to say that she was horrified—that such a vicious and violent criminal as Dodd should be released so soon. She expressed these concerns from a first-hand experience.

She also made it quite clear to me at the time that she had absolutely no intention—and requested me to fall in with her wishes—of being identified. She indicated that she was running a very considerable risk if her identity became publicly known for what she wanted to say. I gave her that assurance and said I would bring the matter to the attention of the House.

Perhaps it would be best if I recount to the House exactly what was recounted to me by my constituent.

In 1972 my constituent was a sister at Fremantle Hospital. While there Dodd was admitted from Fremantle Prison supposedly suffering from appendicitis. He was accompanied by one warder. As it turned out the appendicitis was a pure fabrication.

Just before Dodd was due to be taken into the operating theatre the warder had to transfer the handcuffs so that Dodd could be moved from his bed. My constituent was present at the time and she indicated that as soon as his arms were free Dodd viciously attacked the warder, quite unexpectedly.

Mr MacKinnon: What year was that?

Mr TRETHOWAN: That was in 1972. The attack was quite unexpected as he was presumed to be seriously ill at the time.

He rained blows upon the warder until he could easily break away and then he dashed out into the corridor. The warder staggered after him and in the corridor, according to what I was told, Dodd turned on the warder again and viciously beat him until the warder was unconscious. Dodd then ran to the end of the corridor hoping to escape but, unfortunately for him, the corridor that he chose led directly into the operating room and from that section of the building there was no escape.

At this time the nurses and other staff were warned to keep quite clear as Dodd was in possession of an iron bar and was obviously in no mood to take resistance. The police were called, and half-a-dozen or so male orderlies came to that floor to block Dodd's retreat. In a relatively short period, the police arrived and Dodd was again apprehended. An internal trial was held in the prison and I was told that Dodd received only an extra week to his sentence. The prison officer was seriously beaten and his jaw was badly smashed. In fact his jaw was wired together and he spent a considerable time recovering in hospital.

My constituent was among the witnesses and was therefore asked to submit a statement for the trial. Because of that, she was concerned that when Dodd was released on parole later he might attempt to take revenge, or feel that he had a grudge to pay back against her, even though she had not appeared personally as a witness. That was the fear that Dodd's behaviour inspired in her—after she had witnessed the attack Dodd made on the warder.

As members know, while Dodd was still on parole he committed a murder and therefore my constituent's fears were obviously not without basis. She raised the question, and I raise it here on her behalf and on behalf of the community, as to why a person such as Dodd, with a proven record of viciousness, violence and brutality, should be released at such an early stage from his current sentence. There is a very real reason for the Government to act to prevent his being released on parole and to reconsider the case to ensure that assurances given that the community will be protected are acted upon, and that those people who could be attacked and who are in fear of the retribution that Dodd could take upon them, can be protected.

I consider that this is a very serious matter and I know my constituent felt that she was taking a risk by even contacting me in order to ensure that I could bring it to light. We need a system of law and order in this State which is clearly seen to work fairly and effectively and which will ensure that the decisions of our courts are seen to be put into effect and maintained for the protection of the community. People in our community are very concerned about the fact that this Government does not appear to be taking seriously the fears that so many people are expressing. On behalf of my constituents I wish to express great concern about the imminent release on parole of this particular prisoner.

MR GRILL (Esperance-Dundas—Minister for Transport) [2.46 p.m.]: The matter raised by the Opposition today is one which the Government takes very seriously. It is a matter which the Government feels has to be dealt with sensitively and with the utmost caution. The Government is not here to excuse anything done by Dodd in the past; the Government is here to administer justice in this State in the best way it possibly can.

In that respect, I think I should say at the outset in response to one of the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition when he implied that the Attorney General may not have dealt with this matter in as sensitive a way as he possibly could, or should have, that the present Attorney General, Hon. Joe Berinson, is one of the most sensitive lawyers I have ever come across. In general the legal profession respects him as a very sensitive and thorough person. He is also well-respected throughout the community. I can assure the House that in accepting the advice of the Parole Board, Hon. Joe Berinson would not have taken Dodd's past record, or indeed any of the advice he would have received from the Parole Board, lightly. He would have thoroughly investigated and considered such advice before the final recommendation that was allowed—

Mr Hassell: Are you defending this decision?

Mr GRILL: I am not here, and none of us should be here, to defend anything that Dodd has done; but each one of us in this House should be here to defend the system of law and order in this State. Decisions of the type that Hon. Joe Berinson had to make in respect of Dodd are not easily made. They are hard decisions to make—

Mr Hassell: Do you support the decision of the Attorney General?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should be allowed to speak in silence.

Mr GRILL: I will come to that in a minute. May I remind the Leader of the Opposition that he was listened to in silence because, as I mentioned earlier, the Government does take this matter seriously and it wants to answer the series of allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition, despite the incessant rain of interjections he has made during my speech.

One of the facts that should be made clear at the outset, and this is a fact which has been more than just obfuscated by the Leader of the Opposition, is that Dodd, in spite of his crimes, which we are not here to defend, was not convicted of wilful murder. Dodd was finally

found guilty of murder and the facts are these: Although the jury in the first instance came down with a verdict of wilful murder, on appeal that verdict was quashed and the final verdict of the Supreme Court of this State was that Dodd be convicted of murder.

The Leader of the Opposition alleged in the media today, and again in this Chamber, that Dodd was in fact convicted of wilful murder.

Mr Hassell: I said exactly what the position is. I stated precisely—and I have the written notes here—that he was initially convicted of wilful murder and there was an appeal.

Mr GRILL: The Leader of the Opposition clearly said on the radio this morning, and I heard him myself, that Dodd was convicted of murder and sentenced to death. They were his words. He has endeavoured to portray the same picture here today. That was the impression that any unbiased observer would have obtained from his speech today, but it is not correct. That is not the most important matter but if we are to discuss this sensitive and difficult area, we need to get the facts straight. The fact is that Dodd was convicted of murder and the difference, although not being the most important factor, is significant because it bears directly on the parole and probation process. That is why it is important. Let us not get confused about the crimes Dodd committed. They are abhorred as much or more by this Government as they are by the Opposition; make no mistake about that.

We are not here to defend Dodd in any sense. The Government is here to protect the system of law and order in this State; and in that respect this Government—and particularly the Attorney General, who has been attacked today—has a record which is unparalleled and of which we can all be proud in terms of toughening up the Criminal Code, the Evidence Act, and the Offenders Probation and Parole Act. These actions were taken in response to public pressure and opinion. The Attorney General has been attacked today. He is one of the most respected Attorney Generals this State has seen in a long time. Because of that public opinion, this Government and the Attorney General have taken unprecedented steps to ensure that law and order in this State are preserved in the very violent world we live in today.

What we should also appreciate is that under the laws of this State, when a person is convicted of murder, as Dodd was, it is obligatory by virtue of the Offenders Probation and

Parole Act that the decision in respect of his sentence be considered by the Parole Board after a period of five years. In Dodd's case, that was done in accordance with the Statute, and Dodd was not released. His parole was again considered at a later stage by this Government and the Attorney General but Dodd was not released.

One cannot talk of an "average" murderer or a "wilful" murderer, as put forward by the Leader of the Opposition; and I would agree with him in that respect.

Mr Blaikie: Is Dodd average, or what?

Mr GRILL: One cannot say there is an "average" murderer, but one can look at situations that have prevailed in the past by looking at the records of previous Governments with respect to murderers and wilful murderers. The record can be studied to ascertain whether people are being dealt with more leniently, more harshly, or about the same; but with respect to Dodd a case cannot be made out that he has been dealt with leniently if one looks back over the record. If one looked back to 1974, one would find in that year that one person was released who had committed murder, the same crime Dodd committed. This person was released in 1974, at the time of the Court Government I presume, after five years and one month.

In 1975 one person was released after a period of 11 years. I might say that was the longest period of time that officers within the Attorney General's Department could find where a person convicted of murder had to serve a term in gaol before release. In 1976 two people were released, and the average period before release was four years eight months. In 1977 one person was released after a period in gaol of five years two months. In 1978 three people were released after an average period served in gaol of eight years five months. In 1979 and 1980 there were no releases. In 1981 one person was released after serving a time of five years three months and in 1982 there were three people released after having spent an average of six years one month in gaol.

Mr Hassell: If you agree that there is no "average" murderer, then this case has to be looked at on its merits. What is the relevance of those examples?

Mr GRILL: That is a fair question and I have conceded the point that one cannot look at an "average" murderer, but one can look at how previous Governments over a decade—and in this case they were conservative Govern-

ments—dealt with a range of people who had been convicted of murder. In almost every case the previous conservative Governments dealt with those persons in a much more lenient fashion than the present Attorney General and the Parole Board are intending to deal with Dodd.

I do not need to remind the Leader of the Opposition that in 1981-82 he was a Minister in a Government that would have considered those parole decisions, so although I concede one cannot look at an "average" murderer, one can certainly look at the record and see what was done over a period of 10 years.

Mr Old: You are espousing the record to the House of why these people were parolled but they may not have been in the same class as Dodd. You do not know. You have not researched that.

Mr GRILL: Some of those crimes would have been quite heinous. I do not think it will serve the case of the Opposition, this Government, or the law and order of this State if the Opposition wants to sensationalise every Parole Board recommendation in this fashion. It is easy for any Opposition to bring forward and sensationalise a particular case.

Let me remind members of the Opposition of the procedures with respect to a release of this nature. The recommendation for release is made to the Attorney General by the Parole Board.

Who comprises the Parole Board? It is not members of the Government, not members of any political party, not supporters of the Labor Party. The Parole Board comprises firstly, a Chairman who is a Supreme Court judge, and secondly, senior officers of the Police Department, the Prisons Department, and the Department for Community Services and people from the community. All of those persons together make the recommendations. The recommendation for Dodd's release on parole was unanimous.

Mr Old: Did Cabinet consider it though? Did it go to Cabinet?

Mr GRILL: Decisions of this nature can and do go to Cabinet, but by and large the recommendations of the Attorney General are accepted.

Mr MacKinnon: But this decision?

Mr GRILL: I cannot say.

Mr Old: Weren't you there?

Mr GRILL: I cannot remember the matter coming before Cabinet.

This recommendation was the unqualified recommendation of the Parole Board and it was not in fact accepted immediately. It was arranged that Dodd be transferred from a medium security prison to a minimum security prison where he could be supervised and observed for a further period of four months before his release. So the consideration of releasing Dodd was made by highly responsible people in the community. The decision was not immediately accepted by the Attorney General and was further reviewed before the final decision was made to release him. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition and even to members of the public that the Parole Board is an independent statutory body. It does not come under the direction of this Government. Its recommendations are clearly its own.

Mr Hassell: All it does is make recommendations. It is the Government's responsibility to make the final decision. You are responsible for letting Dodd out. Let that fact not be blurred by talking about the Parole Board.

Mr GRILL: No-one is shirking that responsibility. At no stage in my speech have I indicated other than that it is finally the Government's decision; but I remind members of the Opposition, as I did a few minutes ago, of the procedures that need to be followed before such a decision is made. In this case the decision was made responsibly and sensibly, and with sensitivity.

Mr Hassell: You are telling the House that the decision was made responsibly and sensibly, yet you cannot even tell the House whether it went to Cabinet.

Mr GRILL: As I indicated earlier, these matters can and do go to Cabinet. This Cabinet has a very high regard for the Attorney General and is prepared to accept his recommendations in these matters.

Mr Clarko: You cannot remember it, yet you have a special interest in this matter. Only two people in the Cabinet do.

Mr Barnett: He didn't say he could not remember.

Mr GRILL: That is correct. I cannot remember this matter coming before Cabinet; that is quite true.

Mr Clarko: My point is that you are a bit different from the others because you have a special interest in this matter as the Government spokesman in this House.

Mr GRILL: I say I cannot remember, and that is putting the situation as frankly and as fairly as I possibly can. If the Opposition simply wants to sensationalise this matter for the very narrowest of political purposes, it can do so.

Mr Hassell: This case is sensational because of its facts, not for anything that has been done by the Opposition. The facts make it sensational. It is sensational that you should let him out.

Mr GRILL: The Leader of the Opposition can sensationalise these matters as much as he likes, but I remind him that this Government already has a very enviable record in respect of law and order. The Government has an enviable record in respect of toughening up the Criminal Code and in respect of the Evidence Act and the Offenders Probation and Parole Act. It has a record in this area that has not been approached by even a former conservative Government, and that is not a matter of debate. I would also remind members of the Opposition that matters of this nature are notoriously difficult and need to be handled sensitively. I suggest to them that in fact this one was handled sensitively and carefully.

Mr Hassell: Can you tell us now whether you are defending the decision of the Attorney General?

Mr GRILL: I will tell the Leader of the Opposition in about two minutes.

The first recommendation to the Attorney General was not in fact accepted. I would remind members of the Opposition that the arguments that have been brought forward today have been carefully considered by responsible people and, in the light of that fact, neither the Government nor I feel it is appropriate that those recommendations and the decision that has been made should be further reviewed.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.07 p.m.]: The Minister for Transport who has just resumed his seat, has asked us to put the facts straight. Let us look at the facts. The facts are that a vicious killer is about to be released onto the streets of this city.

Mr Grill: You are going to sensationalise the situation.

Mr MacKINNON: Dodd is a vicious killer whose record was outlined by the member for East Melville when this man tried to escape from hospital; obviously, if he had had the opportunity, he would have killed the warder on

the way out. In 1977 he committed a murder of the most brutal nature and in 1985 he is now about to be released from prison.

Let us look at what the *Daily News* reports tonight in regard to what one of Dodd's prison colleagues says about him. The article reads as follows—

"There was no messing with him. I doubt if anyone like that would change their ways.

"These guys who are heavy on the inside are normally heavies on the outside."

Those words were spoken by one of Dodd's colleagues, yet Dodd is about to be released onto the public of Western Australia. The Minister's defence is that our Attorney General has an unparalleled record. He has an unparalleled record all right; which other Attorney General in this nation has let off a convicted union official or union thug? Which other Attorney General of this nation has appointed a judge who publicly says that she does not believe in imprisonment? That is the record of the Attorney General, and that is the record of this Government.

The Minister for Transport went on to say that he did not know whether this matter had been considered by Cabinet. I assure members of the Government that the former Attorney General, Hon. Ian Medcalf, was meticulous in the way he handled these cases before the Cabinet. My colleagues on this side of the House would agree with me. Every time a serious case came before him, whether the Parole Board recommended in favour or against, he would bring the matter before Cabinet and it would become the subject of quite lengthy debate.

The Minister sits here today and defends this decision, given on the basis that—he spent some time on this point, as members would know—it was murder and not wilful murder. Do members think the public of Western Australia really care whether the person who is now dead was murdered or wilfully murdered? I do not think they do. I assure the Government that the member for East Melville's constituent has quite clearly fixed in her mind the nature of that man who is now about to be released upon the public of Western Australia.

The Minister also said we should not be defending Dodd, but defending law and order. We are defending law and order; we want to defend the people of this State and ensure that law and order prevails, and that vicious people like Dodd serve a proper sentence in this State and are not let out into the community when

they should not be. The Minister also went on to defend the situation by giving us some past history. Again, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out the hypocrisy of that argument. What does past history have to do with Dodd? Absolutely nothing at all. Each case must be looked at on its merits and in the light of the Parole Board's advice as well as the facts of the matter. The facts are quite clear—in our view Dodd should remain firmly and securely where he is.

The Minister also says we should not seek to sensationalise. We are not seeking to do that; we are seeking to personalise the issue on the basis that that man is about to be released into the public and will come into contact with people. He could come into contact with your family, Mr Speaker. Are members opposite secure in the knowledge that Dodd is safe? Would they like him to live next door? That is the question that needs to be asked and answered by this Minister, but he cannot do that. We are not sensationalising the matter; we are personalising it.

The Minister says we should be looking at the Parole Board. We do not pass the buck; the buck rests squarely at the feet of the Government, the Attorney General, and the Minister in this House. The Parole Board does not carry the can—the Government does, as the Minister well knows. Therefore, the Government is responsible and the Attorney General is responsible.

Finally, the Minister came into the Parliament today and said the Government was handling this case with all due sensitivity. How sensitively did Dodd handle the man he murdered? Was he very sensitive at the time? Did he deal sensitively with the prison warden whom he bashed on the way to escaping? Of course he did not. We do not believe Dodd has changed his ways, and neither do his prison colleagues. We agree with the Acting Secretary of the Police Union that the Government should immediately review its decision and reverse it in the best interests of law and order.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balga—Premier) [3.14 p.m.]: Truth is often the first casualty of politics and I think we have seen that demonstrated amply today. Without wanting to exacerbate the situation, it is important to note that the Leader of the Opposition was not telling the truth in claiming that Dodd was convicted of wilful murder. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was not telling the truth in claiming that the Attorney General absolved a convicted union official.

Mr MacKinnon: What did I say?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: You said, "a convicted union official."

Mr MacKinnon: In what respect?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That the Attorney General let off a convicted union official.

Mr MacKinnon: I will reverse that. He was not convicted; we all know that. He was charged. If I made a mistake I will admit it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am simply pointing out that in the emotionally charged atmosphere of a political debate truth is often a casualty as it was in those two examples I have given. It may have been a genuine mistake, but nevertheless it was a mistake and an untruth that subsequently has been withdrawn.

Mr Clarko: You stopped O'Connor from being convicted.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Karrinyup!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Karrinyup compounds the problem by saying that I stopped O'Connor from being convicted.

Mr Clarko: Of course you did.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is absurd on its face—

Mr Clarko: He could not be convicted if you stopped the trial and prevented him from going to trial.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not want to take all the minutes that are mine in answering this point, but it could be argued that I stopped O'Connor from being acquitted.

Opposition members: How?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: By the same twisted logic—

Mr Clarko: I accept that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I suggest to the member for Karrinyup that he put it in a particular way because it suited his political ends. He did not say I stopped the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union from being acquitted, but that I stopped him from being convicted. I am trying to point out that that sort of truth or objectivity is often the first casualty of politics, as it has been today.

It is important to note that this Government, by objective criteria, has attempted to accommodate what it perceived to be the public concern on matters related to the maintenance of law and order. For example, we have provided more police officers than has any previous Government. We have moved in some areas of

the law to make the penalty more precisely fit the crime in ways that have generally been judged to be the imposition of harsher penalties in particular areas such as those covering sexual assault that are perceived by the Government to be of great concern to the public.

It is true that, while one cannot pick an average murderer, all but one of those people convicted of the same crime of which Dodd was convicted were released by the previous Government after serving a fewer number of years than Dodd has served. I am not saying there is no cause for concern and serious consideration about the release date of anyone convicted of wilful murder, but even if there is no average murderer or wilful murderer, it is still true to say that all but one of the people convicted of the crime of which Dodd has been convicted served a shorter period in gaol than Dodd has served.

That is the first point. I do not draw absolute comfort from that. Had I chosen to take the case histories of those 19 people released after shorter periods in gaol than Dodd has served, I could have listed the grisly details of heinous crimes to which we would all object as well. It ill-behoves the Leader of the Opposition, who has been admitted to the Bar of this State, to attempt to distort the truth for his own political purposes in a way that undermines—

Mr Hassell: There is no distortion whatever, and you know it. In my time as Minister in this area a lot more restraint was put on the release of prisoners than has occurred under your Government.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If it is not distortion to claim that a man was sentenced for wilful murder when he was sentenced for murder, I do not know what is. That is a distortion or misrepresentation of the truth. Dodd was not imprisoned for wilful murder, but for murder.

Mr Trethowan: He was sentenced for wilful murder.

Mr Hassell: He was convicted and sentenced.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I understand that if we are in search of the truth we should at least know the record. After being sentenced for wilful murder, Dodd was convicted of murder.

Mr Hassell: That is exactly what I said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition has deliberately—

Mr Hassell: Would you like the notes which were read? You can have a look at them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will be seated and will remain silent. He was heard in silence and I would hope he would give the same respect and courtesy to the Premier.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition has deliberately sought to create the impression that Dodd was convicted and sentenced for wilful murder. I heard him on the "ABC News" this morning, and he did not say anything about an appeal or about Dodd's being sentenced for murder. The Leader of the Opposition said on radio this morning that this man was convicted of wilful murder and sentenced to hang for wilful murder.

Mr MacKinnon: All of which is totally irrelevant. Dodd is being let out.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition then proceeded to condemn the Government and the Attorney General.

Having said that, it is obviously a matter of great concern and sensitive decision-making to entertain the release of someone who has been convicted of murder. That is a very difficult decision to be taken by the Parole Board in the first instance and by the Minister on the recommendation of the Parole Board.

I am not sure what we are saying about the Parole Board which unanimously recommended Dodd's release. Surely we are not impugning the motives or the characters of those who sit on the Parole Board. If we are not doing that, I suppose we have to acknowledge that the Parole Board is set in place to reflect the best possible expert advice in decisions that relate to the release of prisoners. If the alternative is what the Leader of the Opposition wants pursued—that is, that the recommendation of the Parole Board should inevitably be overturned—the Parole Board should be done away with.

As far as the Government is concerned, this matter was considered carefully by the Parole Board. The board was unanimous in its recommendation to the Minister. The Minister, in adopting the Board's recommendation, has seen that Dodd has stayed in gaol for a longer period than was endured by all but one person released by the previous Government. The Opposition can do anything in the name of politics, but I hope that the newspaper reports reflect it for what it is and that is an Opposition prepared to sacrifice, for political expediency, any principle whatsoever.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

BILLS (4): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Local Government Grants Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Carr (Minister for Local Government), and read a first time.
2. Members of Parliament (Financial Interests) Bill (No. 2).
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Brian Burke (Premier), and read a first time.
3. Criminal Injuries Compensation Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Grill (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.
4. Health Amendment Bill (No. 2).
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Williams, and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 27 August.

MR TOM JONES (Collie) [3.26 p.m.]: It must be apparent to all members that natural gas is now the greatest threat to the coalfields of Western Australia. Everyone will be aware of the surplus of natural gas.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you standing for Parliament?

Mr TOM JONES: I am quite capable of making my speech without support from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. In the half an hour available to me, I wish to refer to the problems which the agreements entered into by the previous Government are causing to the coalfields of Western Australia. The people who work in those coalfields are uncertain about their futures. They do not know where coal is heading. What happened to the stability reached a few years ago when we knew where Collie and the industry were heading?

Everyone should appreciate that I have a vital interest in this subject. I was secretary of the Collie miners' union for 17 years and have represented the coalfields in this place for 18 years. That gives me some 35 years of reasonable knowledge of what has gone on in the coalfields. The Collie coalfield depends mainly on Government instrumentalities for selling coal. It will be appreciated that now that the railways are run on diesel, large orders for coal have been superseded. The coalfields are now dependent on the State Energy Commission, and limited private trade.

In the early days of the coalfields there was no such thing as coal contracts. Agreements were entered into between the Government of the day and the coal mining companies for the supply of coal. In 1957, the Hawke Labor Government entered into a three-year contract for the supply of coal. That was the first Government contract actually written. Prior to 1957, particularly in the 1940s, the McLarty Government entered into an agreement with Amalgamated Collieries of WA Ltd to introduce a cost-plus system which guaranteed that company a profit.

That was considered, on the coalfields, to be a payola to the then chairman of directors of that company who was an important figure in the Government party at that time.

The Hawke agreement entered into in 1957 provided for a three-year contract only. In 1960 we saw the contract renewed under the Brand-Court Government and we saw some 600 men retrenched from the coalfields as a result of the increased use of open-cut coal.

Last night I heard the member for Nedlands being very vocal about this Government's inability to solve the problems in Albany. I wonder if he remembers what his father did when he was one of the Ministers on the Government bench at that time. In my opinion, he was responsible for putting 600 men out of work on the Collie coalfield. I wonder whether his son, who represents the electorate of Nedlands, recalls that. He expressed certain views last night in relation to Albany. Does he recall how the 600 men felt then in the Collie coalfields? It is all right for him to get up in this place and to castigate this Government for acting in a certain manner in relation to Albany. He forgets the very bad record of his father. In the time available to me I will demonstrate clearly the performance of previous Liberal Governments in Western Australia.

We saw the opening up of the Muja generating station at Collie by the Liberal Government, and then we saw the building of the Kwinana power station based on oil as a fuel. As I have said previously, and I am not going into the history of the Kwinana power station, while that Government was going for oil the rest of the world was swinging back to coal as a fuel.

We cannot forget that in building the Kwinana station the Brand Government entered into an agreement whereby the price of oil could not be disclosed. It was an agreement similar to the recent gas agreement. If members

have done their homework, they will realise that the gas agreement contains a provision whereby the agreement cannot be made public, so the question of the cost of gas to the SEC in this State cannot be revealed. This was another deal entered into by the Liberals so far as oil was concerned—the competitors in the oil industry knew the price of coal, but the coal companies were unable to find out the price of oil. In my opinion—and I do not think anyone would disagree with me—that was very unfair competition.

We now have a similar agreement whereby this Government is unable to disclose the terms and price arrangements contained therein. What were the terms of the gas agreement? In November 1977 the gas agreement provided for the purchase of 250 million cubic feet of gas per day. In September 1978 the Government exercised an option to take a further 50 million cubic feet per day; and in 1979 an agreement was signed to purchase a further 70 million cubic feet per day to supply two beneficiation plants in the Pilbara, namely Hamersley and Cliffs. Unfortunately, as members would know, those two operations did not eventuate and I understand that the venturers approached the Liberal Government of the day and actually told it of the situation where, while the extra 70 million cubic feet of gas had been made available, the project to burn the gas in the north-west region of this State could not eventuate.

In 1981, after considering the gas arrangement, the SEC was so concerned about the situation that it drew the Government's attention to the drastic state of affairs whereby there might be a surplus of gas; where the Government had made a commitment to take a certain volume of gas but might not have the customers for it. The SEC saw that in 1981. It warned the Liberal Government of this State that it should not go on with the construction of the pipeline but should renegotiate the agreement, especially in view of the impact it would ultimately have on the coalmining industry of Western Australia. But, quite obviously for political purposes, the Liberal Government said, "No, we are hell-bent on going on with gas", in the same way as Sir Charles Court was hell-bent in going on with nuclear energy. We all know that when Sir Charles Court was the Leader of the Liberal Party in this State, he is on record as saying that by 1990 Western Australia would have a nuclear power station to supply its people with electricity. And we all know what happened. When the Government was on the Opposition benches I moved several

motions condemning Sir Charles Court's policy on nuclear energy in Western Australia. Here we have a similar exercise—not in the same terms, but it will have the same dramatic effect on the coalfields of this State.

Mr Mensaros: You never moved a motion condemning the purchase of gas.

Mr Parker: There is no problem with the purchase of gas—it is the volume of gas.

Mr TOM JONES: And the member for Floreat knows why I did not. We could not find out what was in the agreement. I was dying to know what was in the agreement, because I was dying to know what the Government was paying for oil. However, I could not find out because it was a secret. It was a similar arrangement to that entered into by the Liberal Government in respect of the gas sales agreement, when the public of Western Australia and the coalmining industry were not allowed to know the price being paid for the fuel. That was the problem, and it is only now that we are able to ventilate the situation and allow the public to know the clear position.

The former Liberal Government has a lot of questions to answer, and it is not in a position to answer them because it has dumped this State into a hopeless financial mess. But surely the former Government is responsible to somebody, and there are three essential questions which must be answered. They are first, the decision made in 1978 to take a further 50 million cubic feet of natural gas per day; second, the decision in 1979 to take a further 70 million cubic feet of natural gas per day, which was allocated to the joint venturers in the Pilbara; and, third, the refusal to heed the SEC's advice in 1981 that consideration should be given to delaying the North-West Shelf gas project.

The former Liberal Government did not take any advice—it would not take the advice of people who knew the situation. It buried its head in the sand and said, "We are going ahead with the agreement irrespective of the effect it may have on Western Australia." That is the true situation, and it cannot be denied that if the original agreement had been adhered to—that is, that the SEC would take 250 million cubic feet of gas a day—there would have been little difficulty in overcoming a situation which now, of course, has become a hopeless problem.

The previous Liberal Government's actions in this matter clearly spell out its inability to manage the State Energy Commission. And

what about the cost to the taxpayer? It has cost him very dearly. The Liberals were hell-bent on putting single burning units into the Kwinana oil-burning station, and they were forced to convert them back to coal. As the Minister would know, it cost the State \$83.1 million, and that is not peanuts. After that they decided to convert it from coal to gas, so they converted two units at Kwinana at a cost of another \$4 million. The conversion costs involved therefore amounted to a capital cost of \$87.1 million. Would the former Minister like to laugh at that figure? Surely it is something that should concern him. Yet while this has been going on, inroads have been made into our natural resources, and I refer particularly to the coalmining industry.

Of course, the use of natural gas has had severe implications for other areas as well. What has it done to Westrail? It has robbed Westrail of a very big order. The use of natural gas within our power generating system in Western Australia has taken \$6 million in revenue from Westrail alone. Again, this is not peanuts—that is \$6 million in revenue that Westrail will not receive as a result of the use of gas.

What did the Opposition, when in Government, do to the coalmining industry of this State? It robbed it of in the order of 650 000 tonnes of coal per annum. Had it not been for the measures introduced by the Minister for Minerals and Energy and the Government, of which I am proud to be a member, there would have been retrenchments in the Collie coalfield. No doubt that would not have worried the member for Floreat because in March this year he said the following in this Parliament—

A Labor Government is much harder put to utilise gas for firing electric power stations because it always has to consider what effect that would have on the Collie coal industry. It is easier for a Liberal Government not to increase the use of coal and to advocate a greater use of gas

Mr Mensaros: I said that in July.

Mr TOM JONES: The member for Floreat may have said that in July, but he has admitted that he did say it. The member can laugh, but it is a very serious matter.

My interpretation of the member for Floreat's statement is that a Liberal Government would convert to gas in preference to Collie coal. I hope that Liberal supporters in the south-west will be made aware of what the member for Floreat said in this Parliament.

It was an easy matter for the Liberal Government of the day to burn gas in preference to local fuel. Is it any wonder that the people in Collie are concerned that one day there will be a change of Government and they will not know what to expect?

It is often of concern to many people of this State, particularly the State Energy Commission, that some of the surplus gas will be used at Kwinana and this would result in the ruination of the Collie coalmining industry. Does the member for Floreat deny that the price of gas is not any lower than the price of coal?

Mr Mensaros: It would be if you used three shifts.

Mr TOM JONES: I am not in charge of the Coal Industry Tribunal. I am a member of Parliament and it is outside my jurisdiction to make any determination in regard to the industrial sector.

It is obvious that the member for Floreat made a terrible mistake when he was associated with the gas project. He is one of the men who is responsible for the hopeless mess in which we find ourselves today. I am sure he considers that because he is a member of Parliament he is not answerable to anyone except the Liberals in Floreat. Someone should be answerable to the points I have raised this afternoon because it is a very serious question to the Labor Government and the people of Collie.

The public know where the Labor Government stands and in that regard it gives preference to Collie coal. This Government has made an announcement that the next power station which is built will use Collie coal. I do not think a Liberal Government would make the same commitment, especially when one considers the statements made by the member for Floreat in Parliament recently. It is quite obvious that a Liberal Government would use further volumes of gas for power generation in this State in preference to coal.

No one can say that the industrial record in Collie is bad. The Collie coalmining industry has done everything right and it has lost only three days' work over the last 25 years as a result of industrial disputes. It is a record that is unmatched by any other coalmining industry in the world.

The Government is concerned about the effects of the gas deal made by the previous Government, because it went too far. The Liberal Government did not heed the warnings given by the SEC in 1981 not to proceed with

the then proposed venture because it could foresee problems that could result in surplus gas.

I am pleading on behalf of the people I represent because I remember only too well when in the 1960s, 14 mines were closed and 600 men lost their jobs overnight. It was a spectacle I would not wish to see again. I do not know whether the member for Floreat or the Minister for Minerals and Energy have been involved in a situation where 600 people have been sacked.

Mr Mensaros: What about the people in the Building Management Authority who were retrenched by this Government?

Mr TOM JONES: I was not involved in that situation.

Mr Mensaros: Your party did it.

Mr TOM JONES: It was not to the same extent as that which occurred in the coalfields.

Mr Mensaros: It involved more than 600 people.

Mr TOM JONES: The policies of the Opposition when in Government were a mess. Naturally the Opposition will not admit it, but everything it did in regard to oil and gas was a failure. It failed to manage the electricity affairs of Western Australia and it did not heed the warnings it was given.

When the previous Government converted to oil at Kwinana, what type of fuel was the rest of the world using? There was a general swing away from oil, but the previous Government knew better and made a decision to use oil. The member for Floreat cannot deny that.

Several members interjected.

Mr TOM JONES: The member for Floreat can mumble as much as he likes, but he should be answerable to someone in regard to this matter.

On behalf of the people of Collie I express concern about the situation that has developed because of the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Act.

I have already mentioned the secrecy which surrounded the deal undertaken by the previous Government. I would like to know the reason for the secrecy and I wonder whether the former Minister for Fuel and Energy could answer my question.

Mr Mensaros: How much secrecy is there now?

Mr TOM JONES: What is the member for Floreat talking about? His Government made a secret oil deal and a secret gas deal and I ask

the reason that it was thought necessary. Can the former Minister for Fuel and Energy who is present in the Chamber answer my question? Of course he will not, because the answer is quite clear: It was a deal made purely on a political basis. If the previous Government had been honest it would have told the public what was contained in the agreement. It is an agreement that has reflected on the Collie coalfield and it has not been of any advantage to the State.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you standing for Parliament again?

Mr TOM JONES: I notice that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has returned to the Chamber after his afternoon nap. I am standing in this House making my speech and the question of whether I will stand as a candidate for the next election will be left to me, my party and the people of Collie. No doubt members of the Liberal Party will be doorknocking in my electorate very shortly to spread the word around. The people of Collie will welcome them because it is the only time they see members of the Liberal Party or Liberal members of Parliament in Collie.

Quite often I am asked whether I am the only member of Parliament who represents the Collie district and I advise people that there are another two members from another place who also represent the district. However, these members apparently do not make themselves available to people of the electorate because it is thought that I am the only member of Parliament for the district. I take that as a tribute.

When members of the Liberal Party visit my electorate during election time and tell the sad story that I have not performed it does not go unnoticed by the people. I look forward to a further visit by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in January or February next year.

Mr Spriggs: We will set a date.

Mr TOM JONES: The honourable member will make a date for then. My judgment was not far wrong again, was it? I think I have made the position very clear. Unfortunately we do not know why the then Government made these decisions. They were bad decisions and were entered into against the wishes of the SEC. The State is now paying the penalty. The Government is paying the penalty. Collie and the Collie coalfields are paying the penalty. Orders have been taken away from us at an additional cost to the commission. The then

Government and former Minister involved stand condemned for entering into the commitments that I mentioned.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [3.50 p.m.]: It is with considerable regret that I am unable to deal with a number of subjects I wanted to raise because of the personal attacks in which the Government has indulged in the run-up to the election. Therefore, I feel obliged to answer those attacks and to spell out the facts by putting them on the record correctly.

First, I respond to the attacks of the Minister for Education and the Minister for Health. The attacks were made in what might be termed the least gentlemanly way in so far as they were made in answer to Dorothy Dix questions which meant that their opponents—in this case myself—could not say a word in reply. Both Ministers have used semantics in accusing me of changing or doctoring the words of a motion. Of course, that is absolute nonsense. I have issued a statement welcoming the motion moved by the Floreat branch of the Liberal Party. I have never said what I understand the Ministers to have implied, namely that the main curriculum or something like this exists in all schools, teaching homosexuality as a normal alternative lifestyle. What I have said and what the branch has expressed its concern about is that such teachings, if in practice, should cease as complaints have been made. Of course, this is connected with homosexual practices which, as is generally accepted, are some of the main ways of transmitting the dreaded disease of AIDS. Therefore, the concern was understandable. There were complaints about this teaching method in schools. There was an accident in the Pilbara which the Minister might recall; it was not an isolated incident. The concern of the Floreat branch of the Liberal Party however was equally or even more based on the 1984 State platform of the ALP which states, *inter alia*—

Accordingly, the Labor Government will ... act to reform and introduce laws and change societal attitudes ... by ensuring that in sex education programmes homosexuality is presented as a capacity fundamental in some human beings, the expression of which is basic and natural.

This is an alarming statement. Such a policy justifies a more fierce reaction than the polite motion put out by the Floreat branch and my statement on the matter.

As for the call by the Minister that I should apologise to the Education Department, I am very happy to do so. I express great regret, not in respect of what I have said, but because the Education Department, which is respected individually and collectively, may be required by the Government to implement such an insidious policy as the one to which I have referred.

The other matter I have to deal with is the large-scale character assassination wrapped in a Press conference by the Premier and the Minister for Minerals and Energy. In an entirely unprecedented way, they denigrated not only the previous Government, but also previous Ministers of the Crown. They used a political document and dressed it up as a factual report in an attempt to gain political advantage, again in the run-up to the election. They have tried to allay the suspicions of people that the document was brought forward at the start of the election campaign by coming up with two untenable and entirely false arguments. One argument used by the Minister concerned the secrecy clause of the contract which had thus far prevented him from saying anything. That secrecy clause existed in the contract and agreement. It has never been changed. If it prevented him from disclosing it before, it would have prevented him now. If it did not prevent him now, it would not have prevented him earlier.

The other excuse he used was that he did not want to jeopardise the export phase of the project. Perhaps the Minister has not learnt quickly enough, but we all know that the Japanese involved in the export phase of the project know the truth of the material which he cited in his document. They know 100 times as many facts as the Minister. They know those facts much better than the Minister does. That consideration would not have influenced him. Neither are the Japanese impressed by political gossip and vilification. In fact, they do not respect it at all. They respect the opposite, honest and respectful behaviour.

What was the point of this great condemnation when the Premier himself, not long after he became Premier, made a speech at the Octagon Theatre at the University of Western Australia—I was there—in which he said—

... the benefits to be gained from the project are absolutely immense.

... looking to the worst possible debt profile ... the project from the State's point of view remains immensely attractive.

He also said—

... the very thorough briefings that we have received have demonstrated ... that the project ... has ... the ability to accommodate all those problems which we—

Meaning the Labor Party; to continue—

—drew attention to while we were in Opposition. ... the project will benefit the State financially to a degree that will in the year 2005 equal approximately two and a half times the present ... State Budget.

I will later seek permission to have that extract of the Premier's speech incorporated in *Hansard*. The question then is: What is the Government's despicable action really about? It diverts attention; it is a cover-up for its own negligence, inefficiency, non-achievement, and mistakes.

The infamous document in which two ex-Ministers of the Crown are freely libelled and defamed contains many distorted statements and guessed projections based on the day it is issued or a few days earlier, in the very same way as the decisions were based on projections at the time we made them. The document contains many opinions based on those facts. However, those opinions are dishonest and are not consistent in any way with the facts. Those opinions are rude and quite characteristic of our opponent's usual manner of behaviour.

As I give the brief history of the project, I will refer quite frequently to a document, pages of which I will seek to have incorporated in *Hansard*. It was a briefing to the Minister of the day dated September 1981. It was made by the State Energy Commission, in particular by the commissioner who is still the commissioner and who, according to the Minister yesterday, was the author of this document and the author of the defamatory statement about former Ministers. It said that both the member for Narrogin and I were irresponsible and incompetent, or words to that effect. To impute those words to the commissioner is an insult to that man, whom I know and respect.

The Liberal Government, in the inevitably long lead-time period, skilfully saved and nursed the project by facilitating, amongst other things, the taking over of Burma Oil by BHP and others and by defeating the Connor attempt to defeat the project altogether. I refer to that project which the Premier called magnificent. The Liberal Government furthered the project by writing the agreement and the contracts and, later, by ordering the original minimum viable quantity of gas about which the complaints are being made today, in hind-

sight. It also furthered the project by leading up to the export phase without which there would not have been any project.

That was quite obvious from the beginning and it is obvious from the files which the Minister and the Premier had. Of course, the project was necessary not only because it provided work, export earnings, and royalties to the State—because industries can be based upon it—but also simply to supply the metropolitan area with gas. Everybody knew at that time that the Dongara gas was about to expire. I am sorry to inform the member for Collie that we certainly would not have planned to use expensive Collie coal to manufacture gas for the increasing market in the metropolitan area.

The Labor Party is nothing but envious of its opponent's skill and performance which has been demonstrated in the past. It is trying to take away and demolish the Opposition's reputation with the public, but it will not succeed.

Three statements in particular are referred to in the document, two of which apply to the time I was in charge of the administration of this area. These are also quoted in false terms and with rude opinions. Firstly, the Government claims that we were incompetent and irresponsible for having added 50 million cubic feet to the original quantity of 250 million cubic feet. It conveniently forgot that this occurred in a period when times were booming, oil prices were constantly increasing and one OPEC crisis followed another. At the time demand for energy was high. In addition, of the 50 million cubic feet extra capacity, Alcoa had promised to take 40 million cubic feet.

Mr Parker: They did not. When you made the decision they told you they would not take that quantity.

Mr MENSAROS: That is not so and if the Minister reads the SEC report it is evident. If the Minister has any decency remaining he will not deny me the right to incorporate the report in *Hansard*. It is not just me saying this, it is stated in the report to which I referred earlier and part of which I wish to incorporate in *Hansard*. It indicates that in 1977-78 when the decision was made to increase the quantity by 50 million cubic feet, 230 million cubic feet were projected to be used—other than in the Pilbara—in 1985. Therefore, there was a shortage of 70 million cubic feet and that did not take into consideration any major project which the Government would bring to Western Australia. It was estimated that by 1987, only two years later, the full 300 million cubic feet

would be used and in 1990, 365 million cubic feet. Based on these projections, my decision—not against any advice—is called an “incompetent attitude” and “irresponsible”.

I refer to a few points from this document. The determination of the quantity of gas—the 300 million cubic feet; that is, the 250 plus 50—was influenced because the Government wanted the development to proceed and the joint venture partners were adamant that it was possible only on the basis of export development which could be linked with the project supplying Western Australia. That is what the Commissioner of the SEC said and he is still the commissioner today.

Mr Parker: That has never been denied.

Mr MENSAROS: Yet the Government says that we acted against advice and were irresponsible. If Western Australia had sought to limit its domestic commitment to too low a level, application for an export licence would have been refused and therefore no project would have been proceeded with at all. Is that what the Government wants? Of course, it is easy to say with hindsight, after the Labor Government has been in power for three years and is left with a surplus, that it is the Opposition's fault for making a decision at that time which nobody else would have made differently.

The document also states that the quantity of 300 million cubic feet was a sensible proportion of the total 1 450 million cubic feet a day. At that time it was considered likely that Alcoa would require 190 million cubic feet. That is what was said. It is not just me saying it. Mr Kirkwood has said it, the man the Government accused of having written the slanderous report.

The report also states—

The volume of 300 million cubic feet was considered to be near to the lower limit of gas quantity for which a sufficiently low transmission cost could be achieved.

In other words if a smaller quantity had been ordered for use in the south-west the transmission cost would have been much higher with regard to capital and servicing the capital. The report continues—

It was seen as important to secure a sufficient quantity of gas so that there would be opportunities in the future for the attraction of industry based on the use of this gas supply.

Of course, that is what we were all about. In other parts of the report it states that the alternative to export—the concept of a transcontinental pipeline—proposed by the venture partners, was strangely opposed by the Western Australian Government and the commission. The Government is now talking about our having acted without advice. The report states that—

We were able to convince the National Energy Advisory Committee that the present form of development was the most advantageous from both a national and state viewpoint.

It says that the project concept which was adopted was considered to be a reasonable and sensible—not irresponsible and incompetent—allocation of resources between export and domestic requirements.

It deals also with the development of the project and mentions particularly that during the period of the Whitlam Government, Mr Connor tried to take away the project altogether. In fact, it says it was only as a consequence of the decision of the Western Australian Government at the time and me in particular, that it was saved and Mr Connor did not succeed. I take responsibility in that situation for acting without advice; in fact, contrary to the advice of the then Under Secretary for Mines.

The second part of the Government's blatant and libellous accusations against me refers to taking over from the joint venture the marketing of 70 million cubic feet a day in the Pilbara. From the beginning it was the endeavour of the SEC to market this quantity and when it came to do so we grabbed this because, contrary to what is implied in the report, there was no sign that there would be a reduction in demand or a smaller market for energy. In fact, prices went up at that time and that was the reason that the Hamersley pelletising plant had to be closed. However, the pelletising plant did not close because of lack of energy demand. It closed simply because the Japanese, in a business decision, supported the Brazilian pelletising plant and Hamersley was not able to compete with the imported oil as feedstock for their manufacture. At that time Russ Madigan, as he then was, of Hamersley Iron, often came to me and said that if we could supply him with cheap gas it was more than likely that the plant would be reopened. It should not be forgotten that at that time the projected price of gas was about 60 per cent of the price of imported oil. We had all this plus the new projects which the present

Government is completely unable to carry out but which we would have been successful in developing had another Government not been put into power in 1983.

I will not deal with the third accusation; I will leave it to the member for Narrogin who was in charge of administration at the time.

An additional fact which should be on the record is that I never acted against advice, which again was implied not only in the document but also in the Minister's convenient answer to a Dorothy Dix question. That seems to be the only way we can communicate in the Parliament now. The level of proceedings in this Parliament has been dragged down. I have not heard one genuine question from a backbencher.

He implied that I acted against advice. Not only is that not true, but also, all the way through I have discussed and negotiated every step personally. I discussed matters with the Commissioner and the Chief Executive of the SEC, and sometimes with the board itself. After lengthy discussions the SEC advised the Minister by way of a minute, and that will be on file. They drafted or helped to draft the Cabinet minutes, and every decision of this magnitude which is being referred to in the report was considered by Cabinet. There is no case in which we would have disagreed and I would have proceeded. I do not believe Mr Kirkwood would have given untrue information to the contrary. I have more respect for the Commissioner of the SEC.

The Under Treasurer, who also put in his advice to Cabinet recommendations, would have stood up and said, "You are acting against advice," had that been the fact.

I enjoyed the speech of the member for Collicie; it reminded me of the old days. He has said the same things for the past 15 years: "Why did you put in oil-burning power stations when everybody did? Why did you not know in advance oil would be more expensive?" He has said the same things that he has said before. Hindsight wisdom!

Not only was there a recommendation by the SEC, but also, that recommendation went to the Treasury and to the Under Treasurer, Mr McCarrey, whom the Minister abused.

Mr Parker: I did not.

Mr MENSAROS: Yes, you did.

Mr Parker: I said he wrote 95 per cent of the report.

Mr MENSAROS: He denies it.

Mr Parker: What do you mean?

Mr MENSAROS: The Minister says that he, Mr Hohnen, and Mr Kirkwood prepared the libelous and defamatory report.

Mr Parker: I did not say that at all.

Several members interjected.

Mr MENSAROS: The input was there at every decision, so it cannot remotely be said that something was contrary to advice.

Why did the Government decide on this whole exercise? It is obviously only a cover-up exercise in the run up to the election because of deficiencies and lack of results. Not one project which this Government would have initiated eventuated during its term—apart from games of two-up and casinos. This Government is expert in that field, as Sir Charles Court so rightly said. The smelter slipped through the Government's fingers.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It should not be necessary for the member for Floreat to have to lean forward to be heard.

Mr MENSAROS: Concerning the alleged bad handling of the North-West Shelf deal, we advanced the project and made the decision in a bullish environment. Yet we did cater for worse conditions and we had an escape clause, a price redetermination clause. When this clause should have been used this Government ran away intimidated. It gave up this protection clause for five years. The Government did this on the assumption that the present conditions and the present trend would never change. It left the SEC without an escape route. Am I wrong?

Mr Parker: You are wrong.

Mr MENSAROS: Is it a fact that the Government sought legal opinions from a Queen's Counsel in the UK, Mr Anderson, and from David Malcolm QC of Western Australia? It was said that article XI of that clause is perfectly valid and can be used. Is it not a fact that, having received this advice, the Government said to Mr McCarrey that he should negotiate with the joint venturers for price redetermination? Is it not a fact that then the joint venturers ran to Canberra to see the Prime Minister and his cohorts, who summoned the Minister and the Premier and told them to shut up and not go ahead with the negotiations because the Prime Minister was a bit nervous that the export project might not go ahead? This was a clear bluff which the negotiators should have recognised. Could it be ac-

cepted that after decades of preparation, the project could have just ceased to go ahead? The opposite of such a possibility could have been recognised by anyone who was experienced.

I can understand those companies which, like Morgan Guaranty, coordinated and guaranteed loans to Woodside, which did not have any assets other than part of the project, became uneasy. Of course they were nervous, but that is not proof of anything.

That is the real story. Then the Government, instead of negotiating properly, froze the escape clause for five years, being afraid of jeopardising the project. How ridiculous!

Does this show that the Government has negotiating skill? Does that show that the Government has competence? It shows that it is incompetent. Does it show that the Government has produced results? It shows a lack of these. It is the opposite of what I did at the time when I unilaterally extended the permit. I acted against Mr O'Connor and I was successful. But the Government lay down. I would think that the successors of the joint venture's then negotiators, the Rick Charltons and the Sweed Nelsons, are just as tough and respect strength in their negotiating postures and do not lie down.

I hope that in the very short time available to me I have been able to place on the record what ought to be placed there. I ask that I may be allowed to have incorporated in *Hansard* these statements of the State Energy Commission in which it expressed the view, in 1981, about what caused the project to start, and to continue, and the reason for these now attached decisions. Those decisions were made not contrary to advice, and these statements should be incorporated.

Mr Parker: Just before you seek permission for them to be incorporated—a move to which I have no objection—you should identify who wrote them and at what time.

Mr MENSAROS: This was a report to the Minister about the North-West Shelf gas project, dated September 1981. That was retrospectively summing up what had happened.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In respect of the member's request to have material incorporated into *Hansard*, Standing Order No. 115 does allow for certain information to be incorporated. However, it applies to graphs and statistical information only. There is no opportunity for members to have written statements, which are not part of their speeches,

incorporated into *Hansard*. If graphs or statistical information are included, the member may, at the end of his speech, seek leave of the House to incorporate them in *Hansard*, but the balance cannot be incorporated.

Mr MENSAROS: I would not like to argue with the Chair. However, the Minister expressed the view that he would not object. In order to give an opportunity to my successor—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I assure you I do not have the power to grant that leave; Standing Orders are quite clear and specific on the point.

Amendment to Motion

Mr MENSAROS: In order to give an opportunity to the member for Narrogin to make the facts clear during the time of his administration, I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

But we regret to inform Your Excellency that the Government, in its desperate effort to gain political support in the run up to the election, reverted to unjustified accusations of incompetence against the previous Government, and character assassination of two of its Ministers, which action—bad as it is in itself—is bound to undermine the economic climate and result in lack of confidence in Western Australia by both domestic and overseas investors.

Before I ask that the amendment be seconded I seek leave to incorporate this table into the *Hansard* record.

By leave of the House, the following document was incorporated—

TABLE 7(a)

1976/77 NORTH WEST SHELF GAS MARKET ASSESSMENT (MMCFD)

Year	1980	1985	1987	1990
South West	—	142.3	192.3	241.6
Alcoa	—	—	—	—
Worsley	—	—	—	—
SEC	—	30.0	30.0	30.0
power gen.	—	32.0	51.4	64.1
reticulation	—	13.0	14.0	15.0
WMC	—	8.7	9.3	10.3
Midland Brick	—	4.3	230.3	4.3
Swan Cement	—	—	4.3	301.3
				4.3 365.3
Pilbara	—	70.0	70.0	70.0
power				
other				

Total NWS Gas Demand	—	300.3	371.3	435.3
<hr/>				
Total Non Transport Fuel Demand (MMICFD equivalent)	\$84	1 214	1 310	1 529

Points of Order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Can you direct the member to table those papers from which he has been quoting?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Standing Orders are quite clear in this respect, too. The only members within this House who have the right to table papers are the Ministers. Private members do not have that right under Standing Orders.

Mr Mensaros: Frequently—and I hope that you will confer with the Clerk on this—a member asks the Chair to direct someone to table a document which has been used during a speech and which has been quoted or referred to. The Chair has ruled previously that the documents should be tabled.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will state the position again. It has become common practice, and it has been common practice for at least the whole of this Parliament over the last three years, that private members do not have the right to table papers, nor does any member of this House have the right to ask that private members table papers, even those papers from which they have been quoting. It is my understanding that the member for Floreat has not even been quoting from these documents.

Mr Mensaros: I have.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So it is quite extraordinary that he should wish to table his papers. It is quite apparent under Standing Orders that I am not able to ask that private members table papers. They do not have the right to do that.

Mr BLAIKIE: My recollection is that during the debate on the amendment moved by the member for Albany last night, the member for Mitchell sought to have papers and tables included in the *Hansard* debate, which request received the approval of the House. I believe that the request made by the member for Floreat is in a similar vein and that a precedent was set last night. Under those circumstances, I ask that you review your decision.

Mr CLARKO: On the same point of order, you may be aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, that I sat in your position for five years. During the debates that took place people frequently would quote from their papers during their

speeches and I would be asked by other members of this House, "What are you quoting from?" The people thus questioned would say that they were quoting from a particular piece of material and so on. Often they would be called upon to table this material and the Presiding Officer would allow that to happen. You were correct, Mr Deputy Speaker, when you pointed out the problem, because you know the Standing Orders very well. You said, however, that the member for Floreat had not been quoting from his papers; I distinctly heard my colleague say that he had been quoting.

The member for Clontarf may not have put his request in the normal way, but during the five years I was in your position when an opponent said, "I want to see that," I allowed him to do so. I think the same situation really applies with that is happening now. The member for Floreat was using material which has now been sought to be tabled and I think this is a parallel with many other examples which occurred during my five years in your position. The papers should be tabled unless the person says, "They are my personal notes and I do not wish to do that."

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will state again the situation. There is no provision in Standing Orders now for members in this place to ask that a member of this House, who is not a Minister, table papers. If it is the desire of the Opposition to make those papers available for other members, the member for Floreat can lay them on the table of the House for the balance of this day's sitting. Members cannot ask for papers to be tabled and there is a difference.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

The papers were tabled for the information of members.

MR PETER JONES (Narrogin) [4.38 p.m.]: I second the amendment. It is a sad day that this kind of device has to be used to answer the insinuations that have been made, but more particularly that various people will have to be quoted and that elements of their correspondence, Government matters, minutes, and so on will inevitably be made public.

Over the last two days I have had discussions with the participants in this matter regarding exchanges between the Chairman of the SEC and the other people involved at the time, with a view to reaching agreement about what could be and could not be made public in the interests of the project in which they are still engaged. Quite frankly these people were horrified at the position in which they have found

themselves in recent days. They are in fact still in the process of putting together their funding for the second stage and the sensitivity that has now been brought to this project must now be countered. It must also be brought forward in a way that will meet whatever requirements are placed upon the participants by the financiers with whom they are now in discussion. Above all I have been reminded—and I think that the State Government has been reminded—that the credibility of Western Australia has taken a severe battering. I am sure the House will agree with that; it is not only my opinion but also the opinion of the participants themselves.

It is unfortunate that the person who collated this information is a man whose contribution to this project was mainly industrial disruption. During his time as a union secretary his contribution towards the fulfilment of the project was to encourage the industrial disruption that occurred to the project.

I state for the sake of the record and the persons concerned that the Minister for Minerals and Energy said clearly that the document was written by Mr Kirkwood, Mr Hohnen and Mr McCarrey.

Mr Parker: I said at question time yesterday that 90 to 95 per cent of the document was largely based on the work of the gas strategy committee and its documents. I repeat that today. That document was written by Mr McCarrey, and authorised by the committee through Mr Kirkwood, Mr McCarrey, and Mr Hohnen.

Mr PETER JONES: That is a qualification. I would just like to place the matter on record in relation to the information that has been given to me; we will pursue this situation later.

So far as the project is concerned and the actions of the former Government—particularly from September 1981 which seems to be the kick-off point following the receipt of a report in September 1982—I advise the House of certain matters, and correspondence that occurred between the various parties.

I wish to dispel the three accusations levelled particularly at me. They are, firstly, that I acted against advice; secondly, that I acted without advice; and thirdly, that decisions were made with regard to a commitment to the pipeline against and or without advice. Those three points are the substance of allegations made. I will not confuse the issue by referring to figures, although I will be seeking advice with

regard to incorporating those figures in *Hansard* and making available other public documents.

I refer to a letter I wrote on 29 September 1981 following the receipt of the report to which reference has been made. It was a letter to the commissioner. I do not know whether that letter has been made available to Mr Thomas, but I indicated the need to involve the commission as a whole. The commission comprises the associate commissioners who expressed some concern to me that decisions were being made by Commissioner Kirkwood without reference to the commission as a whole. They were not always sure that advice reached me as a result of its having been passed through board meetings.

When the Government changed, I wrote to my successor, Hon. Peter Dowding, advising him of this and I told Mr Dowding in a confidential minute that he would need to be aware that advice he had been given had been ratified by the commission at a commission meeting. In my letter I referred to the points in the 1981 report. It is alleged in the document that I did nothing following the receipt of the report yet I indicated to the commissioner certain matters I wanted pursued. The commission should have been made aware of the contents, the reason that document was written, and the fact that there needed to be some follow-up on various matters.

On 22 March 1982 I wrote again to the commissioner. At this time virtually all my communications were in writing. In addition to discussions after most meetings we had, I subsequently confirmed what we had discussed in writing. I quote from that letter as follows—

I see no alternative at this stage to the necessity of indicating to the Joint Venturers no later than next week that we are intending to publicly announce our intention to challenge under the contract, and that no further work will be committed to the pipeline until some resolution is reached.

Further on it says—

—neither the Government, nor the SEC has anything to gain by withholding our intention to challenge, and I therefore wish you, in your discussions in Melbourne tomorrow, to make it quite clear that this is our intention, and that both the Government and I have taken a very poor view of Charles Allen's approach to the Premier

whilst I was away, especially in the light of the understanding which we were given following my visit to Melbourne.

I must say that the commissioner failed to adequately act so I again wrote to him on 5 April and I quote—

In summary, however, I gave the matter a lot more thought last night after our meeting yesterday afternoon, and have now firmly decided that we should advise the Joint Venturers of the broad substance of the marketing situation, and certainly not permit ourselves to be tricked into a detailed assessment on an industry-by-industry basis.

Further on it says—

Indeed, it would be my intention to contact Shell and BHP next week, indicating that we are intending to move and, based on the response from such an approach, we could then either formally advise of our intention to challenge the coal competitive price, or even seek to re-open the contract as a whole.

For the sake of the Minister and the record there was a reluctance to do so. For some months discussions had been conducted, in secret, between the commissioner and the representatives of Woodside acting for the participants; that is, mainly between Mr Ray Hutchinson of BHP and a representative from the Shell company. One of the concerns the participants had was that any such meetings should be secret. There was no public indication from the Government to challenge the contract at the time because there was no project, and Woodside would have collapsed. It is as simple as that. The Minister has been made aware of some of that information, if not all of it. It would have collapsed because Woodside had reached a lending agreement with its bankers, an agreement which was based on the financing of the domestic gas phase, and if any attempt was made to challenge, alter, amend, or change the contract they had to be notified. If Woodside's bankers, the financier, pulled out, the project would have collapsed and there would have been considerable delay. That is referred to by the commissioner in subsequent papers to which I will make reference.

On 16 April 1982, because I was dissatisfied with the progress the commissioner and his colleagues were making, I met with all the participants in Melbourne and in the minutes of that meeting—minutes which I have today received approval to make public—I indicated that the

State Government could not authorise the borrowings and the pipeline construction contracts could not proceed unless it could be established that there were reasonable prospects of continuing viability in relation to the project. The matter was then discussed in great length, and not without some acrimony. I again repeated that the Government would not and could not authorise support by guaranteeing massive SEC investment unless it could be demonstrated that the project was financially sound. Subsequently, there were exchanges of letters which I am quite happy to make public because those concerned have agreed that the confidentiality can be waived.

I refer to a letter dated 28 April 1982 in response to that meeting, in which I was reminded of the provision in the contract that allowed for the gas to be marketed commercially in a mixed energy market. That clause was referred to by me and by State Treasury as the "lifeboat clause". It gave us the right to redetermine and challenge the agreement, although not until 1985, when gas commenced flowing. My stance at that time was that we were wanting to challenge it then, although it was seen as an abrogation of the agreement simply because of the changed circumstances.

It has been suggested that persons acted without advice. On 11 May, I responded to that letter. My reply was prepared by the SEC Commissioner, the Treasury, legal advisers in London, and the Crown Law Department, all of whom contributed to the preparation of the stance being taken by the State at that time and advised us regarding that matter. In the covering letter Commissioner Kirkwood said—

I attach for your consideration a revised letter to the participants which I believe incorporates most of your suggested amendments.

It must be borne in mind that my efforts were to make it a lot stronger than the commissioner intended. Further on he says—

If you are in agreement we believe that it can now be dispatched.

Various other matters had to be addressed in regard to the total situation of the project, because the participants had agreed to renegotiate the gas contract. As part of that process in June 1982 a further assessment was carried out regarding the market and its prospects. In that assessment the SEC commissioner referred to adverse conditions. He also referred to the agreement and again reminded the Govern-

ment of the day—not only myself—that the price to be paid by SECWA to the joint venture partners for gas purchased was based upon the principle that SECWA must be able to commercially onsell that gas against alternative fuels. He then referred to the coal situation, and the tonnage that the Government had indicated to the SEC would still be required to be won from the Collie coalfield. He also referred to the financial situation. I want to quote from that document of June 1982. He advised that the coalfield had accepted the Government's acceptance of the SEC's recommendation that Collie coal would continue to be taken at a minimum rate of 3.4 million tonnes per annum. Mr Deputy Speaker, I will seek your permission to incorporate this table of quantities and dollars into *Hansard* at a later stage. He also shows that on that scenario the cumulative deficit peaks at \$110 million in 1987-88, while a surplus of \$81 million will exist by 1989-90. The document contains two tables, the SEC's advice to the Government on the current best estimate at that time on which the figures I have just quoted were based, together with their market low estimate; in other words, the worst possible case.

I wish to comment upon two further matters. One is an outward telex from the SEC. I am sure this telex would be available to the Minister. It is the SEC's copy of an outward telex from the commissioner which was sent to me on 22 July 1982.

Again he refers to discussions which he is continuing to have in regard to the gas contract with Treasury, and with the Department of Resources Development regarding a whole range of matters. He refers, for example, to the agreement to a discount for gas burnt in power plants, that discount representing approximately 20 per cent of the price of the coal competitive classification under the contract. He then says that the conditions described in the side letter when applied are likely to be acceptable to both Treasury and Government and are manageable so far as the SEC is concerned. In 1982 Mr McCarrey reviewed with the SEC and State Treasury the total project and all decisions made up to that time before we were committed to the pipeline and before any further commitments were made including the acceptance of the renegotiated portions of the contract that had been completed and undertaken by the SEC.

I now quote from a minute dated 13 August 1982 to the Treasurer and Cabinet, which considered the drafting of the side letter. It reads as follows—

I have been kept closely informed by the Minister and the State Energy Commission of developments in respect of the project and negotiations.

In the interests of saving time, I will go down to this point—

6. Although we have yet to get final figures from the Financial Advisers, the figures prepared by the State Energy Commission indicate that on the basis of the current outlook, the project is marginal in the early years. However, the resulting cash flow will not be a drain on the Commission's finances in the early years and the project is shown to be quite profitable at the end of the decade.

That is the total project. To continue—

7. The projections we are looking at have to be recognised for what they are, merely projections, and the market assumptions on which they are based may or may not be realised. However, the projections have been made on a carefully conservative basis and should there be an upturn in the market by the end of the decade, the position will be greatly improved on that now envisaged.

8. In seeking Cabinet's approval for the execution of the side letter the Minister is proposing a significant step for the project and the Government. If the conditional responses are received from the JVP's and the Financial Advisors confirm the Commission's projections,—

They did that, as the Minister would be aware. To continue—

... then the contract for the construction of the pipeline is to be let.

That telex, together with its attachment wherein Cabinet is asked to endorse the recommendation from the SEC that Executive Council approve of the pipeline, really puts to bed any suggestion that the project was not assessed by anybody other than myself, which is the implication contained in that document; but more particularly, apart from any comment I might make, here is what is said by the man the Minister is now dependent upon for similar advice. As I have indicated, there are many more documents from which I could quote, but I do not propose to produce them at this time.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek your permission to have the two statistical tables from which I quoted included in *Hansard*.

By leave of the House, the following document was incorporated—

W.A. COAL PRODUCTION 1985/86-1989/90

The case studies consider the maximum gas usage in power stations based on the assumption that the total production for both Commission and industrial purposes could be limited to 3.4 MTPA for those cases without an aluminium smelter and to 3.8 MTPA for studies with a smelter.

The data used to calculate gas used to replace coal in the studies are recorded below:

1. Coal usage without smelter (MTPA)

Company	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90
Cockburn Cement	0.20	0.24	0.27	—	—
Swan Portland Cement	0.10	—	—	—	—
Worsley	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42
Capel	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Total industry: 0.77 0.71 0.74 0.47 0.47

SEC usage: 2.6 2.7 2.7 2.9 2.9

Minimum coal usage: 3.4 3.4 3.4 3.4 3.4

NOTE: Cockburn Cement and Swan Portland Cement are assumed to be gas customers from 1988/89 and 1986/87 respectively. SECWA may have store coal to bring consumption coal figures up to contract quantities of 3 MTPA.

2. Coal usage with a smelter (MTPA)

Company	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90
Industry as above	0.77	0.71	0.74	0.47	0.47
SEC usage	2.6	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.3

Minimum coal usage: 3.4 3.8 3.8 3.8 3.8

TABLE I
CASE A
CURRENT BEST ESTIMATE

1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90

1. GAS MARKET SUMMARY (MMCFD)

Alcoa	106	111	120	149	159
Large Industrial	54	59	60	72	72
Domestic & Small Commercial	12	14	17	21	23
Medium Industrial	5	6	7	8	9
Commercial	1	2	2	3	3
Power Stations	76	81	93	99	111
Pilbara	34	39	40	42	43

Total: 288 312 339 394 420

2. ESTIMATED GAS SALES REVENUE (\$M)*

TOTAL: 405 439 475 551 584

3. ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE (\$M)*

Government Levy	12	13	14	16	18
Pipeline Financing	96	85	75	65	57
Charges	—	—	—	—	—
Operations, Maintenance & Distribution	17	19	20	21	23
Gas Purchases	313	371	368	366	371

TOTAL: 438 488 477 468 469

4. SURPLUS (\$M)*

Annual: (33) (49) (2) 83 115
Cumulative (incl. interest): (39) (93) (110) (37) 81

*January 1982 dollars

TABLE 2

CASE B MARKET LOW ESTIMATE

1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90

1. GAS MARKET SUMMARY (MMCFD)

Alcoa	100	100	100	125	125
Large Industrial	54	59	60	72	72
Domestic & Small Commercial	12	14	17	21	23
Medium Industrial	5	6	7	8	9
Commercial	1	2	2	3	3
Power Stations	76	81	93	99	111
Pilbara	34	39	40	42	43

TOTAL: 282 301 319 370 386

2. ESTIMATED GAS SALES REVENUE (\$M)*

TOTAL: 396 422 445 515 533

3. ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE (\$M)*

Government Levy	12	13	13	16	16
Pipeline Financing	96	85	75	65	57
Charges	—	—	—	—	—
Operations, Maintenance & Distribution	17	19	20	21	23
Gas Purchases	313	371	368	366	371

TOTAL: 438 488 476 468 467

4 SURPLUS (\$M)*

Annual: (42) (66) (31) 47 66
Cumulative (incl. interest): (45) (123) (175) (150) (102)

*January 1982 dollars

Point of Order

Mr WILLIAMS: May I again ask the member for Narrogin to table his papers for the remainder of this day's sitting?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Subject to the concurrence of the member for Narrogin, those papers may lie on the Table of the House for the balance of this day's sitting for the information of members.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed.

The papers were tabled for the information of members.

MR PARKER (Fremantle—Minister for Minerals and Energy) [4.47 p.m.]: Like the member for Floreat and the member for Narrogin, I regret that the format of the debate that has been chosen by the Opposition on this subject does not allow any of us to canvass in more detail this extraordinarily complex situation. I recognise that neither of the two Opposition members nor myself have had sufficient time in which to fully develop any of our arguments. I indicate that the Government would welcome the opportunity to allow both the Opposition and the Government the time in which to much more fully develop our position on this matter, because it is extraordinarily complex. I am absolutely confident that every-

thing we have said will be able to be borne out both now and in any more extensive debate that might take place.

Let me make two other points before I get onto the areas of disagreement outlined both by the member for Floreat and, particularly, the member for Narrogin. At all stages of this project, right from the word go until a few months ago the financial position of Woodside was always one of critical importance to the relationship between the project partners and the Government; there is no doubt about that. There is also no doubt that, were it not for actions and decisions that were made by Governments of the day, whether it be the former Court Government and its Ministers or the current Government, in support of Woodside, the company would have been bankrupt long ago. Any ordinary company would have gone into liquidation long before this time had the sort of support for Woodside not been advanced by my colleagues on the Opposition benches when they were in Government, and more recently by ourselves. There is no question about that at all. It is true to say that at all stages during the negotiations the question of Woodside's solvency and its impact, of course, was uppermost in the minds of all negotiators.

Indeed, during the negotiations which I conducted earlier this year prior to the takeover of Woodside by BHP and Shell and prior to the raising of \$200 million of equity capital as a result of that takeover—a decision which was patently obviously needed by Woodside but which had been resisted by its board for some years—it had been put forward to the company by the Government, the former Government and the banks. Everybody suggested to them, "Why the hell don't you get some more equity capital into your company?" and they refused to do it. It was only when Shell and BHP obtained the majority of the directors on the Woodside board that they were able to go for the equity capital raising that they so badly needed and had needed for some years.

The combined effect of that BHP-Shell takeover and the equity capital raising of \$200 million more recently by Woodside has been to prevent and eliminate that problem of a Woodside insolvency. Therefore, it is no longer an issue. That is one of the reasons we have been able to release this information.

The second point on which I agree with the Opposition is that since the signing of the contract in 1980 people have been flurrying about throughout Government trying to find ways in

which the Government or the State Energy Commission could get out of the problem created for it by the signing of the contract. While I am not immediately familiar with some of the specific documents referred to by the Opposition this afternoon—I will make myself familiar with those overnight—there is no question but that throughout the period following September 1980 when the contract was signed, through the time of the last Government and now, all sorts of attempts have been made to try to eliminate or correct the position that was arrived at as a result of the signing of the contract at that time. That has not been denied. It has been suggested in the document that I produced and which was presented last week that that was the case.

Neither the member for Floreat nor the member for Narrogin have dealt with the critical issues raised in the document. I am sorry; the member for Floreat attempted to deal with two of them, but did not deal with them adequately. He certainly was not able to refer to anything in respect of them.

In the first place, he correctly said that in 1977 he signed a memorandum of understanding which provided for the taking of 250 million cubic feet of gas a day from the project. He said also that the project partners said that the project could not involve just domestic gas but that export gas had to be involved as well. The partners also said at the time that they would prefer not to have a domestic project at all; they would rather have an export project. However, the Government said, correctly, that Western Australia had to have gas as well as the fact that there must be gas for the export market. I am not arguing with that. None of those decisions was wrong, in my view. The decision to commit that amount of gas can be shown to be supportable on the evidence about the demand that was then available and which is now available.

The joint venturers also signed a memorandum of understanding. They were committed, on the basis of 250 million cubic feet of gas a day, to go ahead with the project. There was no question about that. They indicated, with the level of 250 million cubic feet, that they could go ahead with the domestic project and, when they signed the contract with the Japanese, that they could go ahead with the liquified natural gas side of the project. It was hoped, at the time, that the two projects would dovetail.

There was never any suggestion in any of the documents that are in existence or that have been referred to that, in order to go ahead with the project, they had to have the extra 50 million cubic feet for the south-west or the extra 70 million cubic feet for the Pilbara. The Opposition's comments in public have been directed to the point that they needed to get the minimum amount of viable gas to make the project go ahead. According to the memorandum of understanding, the minimum amount of viable gas, according to the joint venturers, was 250 million cubic feet, not 370 million cubic feet. That is my first point.

The second thing the member for Floreat said about that was that at the time that the 50 million cubic feet was taken up—here I am referring to the decision to increase the amount from 250 million to 300 million for the south-west—it was thought that Alcoa of Australia Ltd would also be taking its extra 40 million cubic feet of gas a day. When the first memorandum was signed and when the option for an extra 50 million cubic feet of gas was inserted in the memorandum, it was then thought that Alcoa might take an extra 40 million cubic feet of gas a day. In 1978 when the option was exercised by the Government to take its extra 50 million cubic feet of gas a day, not only was the Government not entitled to think that Alcoa would be taking its extra 40 million cubic feet of gas, but more than that, the Government had been advised by Alcoa that it would not be taking up its option to take an additional 40 million cubic feet. That was the position at the time of the 1978 decision to take up the extra 50 million cubic feet.

Mr Mensaros: Have you read what Kirkwood said?

Mr PARKER: None of the reports referred to by the member for Floreat—

Mr Mensaros: It stated that the quantity was more than the expected demand.

Mr PARKER: I will come to that in a moment. None of the documents referred to, either by the member for Floreat or by the member for Narrogin, was written earlier than September 1981. I am sorry; I think the member for Narrogin referred to some letters. However, none of those was written earlier than 1981.

Mr Mensaros: Did they lie in 1981?

Mr PARKER: It is quite clear that Alcoa had advised the Government that it would not be taking up its extra 40 million cubic feet. We did not refer to the question of the market demand

in the report. However, I have correspondence. I do not know whether it is appropriate to table it although I could probably do so. There is correspondence within the Department of Resources Development files which indicates that the market for gas that they were talking about, as was stated in those letters signed by the member for Floreat at the time, referred to firm markets for 250 million cubic feet of gas a day at that time. That market projection was based, not on a firm understanding of the true market, but on a market survey which the Government had undertaken through P.A. Management Consultants which had asked people what the market for gas would be in this State. It was on that basis that the Government made its market projection.

The Alcoa decision had been made at the time the decision was made. The second decision which was to take the 70 million cubic feet of gas a day was distorted. The member for Floreat has spoken about distortion. He is carefully distorting two facts. The first fact was that, at the time the first negotiations took place, the joint venturers insisted that they have the marketing rights in the Pilbara. The SEC was also trying to insist, as was the Government, that the gas marketing rights in the Pilbara should be with the SEC. That certainly was the case in 1977 and earlier. Members may recall that there were major battles at the time between the joint venturers, the SEC, the public, Hammersley Iron Pty Ltd, and other companies, all arguing about the price of gas and what was viable. The joint venturers won that battle and got the right to market the gas.

Certainly, earlier on, the SEC wanted to market the gas. But the time when the joint venturers came back to the Government and asked it to market was the time when they, the SEC, and the Government knew the Hamersley pellet plant which would have consumed about one-third of the available Pilbara gas had shut down—it was shut down well and truly by then—and it was a few months before the Cliffs Robe River Iron-Associates pellet plant actually shut down. It would have consumed another one-third of the gas. That was the timing of it.

If the member for Floreat is saying that the Government grabbed the opportunity to market the Pilbara gas at that time because of the earlier view of the SEC that it wanted the Pilbara gas marketing, it is doubly incompetent for having done that. It should have reassessed

the market position at that time. Talk about lying down and dying. It should have been aware of the fact that the joint venturers were hardly likely to be coming back and presenting this thing to the Government if there was some benefit in it.

Mr Mensaros: Are you suggesting that the Government went against the recommendations of the SEC?

Mr PARKER: There is no evidence whatever of any advice by the SEC—

Mr Mensaros interjected.

Mr PARKER: The member for Narrogin constantly tries to hide behind Mr Kirkwood's coat-tails.

Mr Mensaros interjected.

Mr PARKER: I listened to the member for Floreat in silence except when he asked me questions. I expect the same courtesy from him.

Mr Clarko: You interjected all the time.

Mr PARKER: He asked me some questions and I responded to them.

One of the reasons that this report was prepared and presented in the way in which it has been was the constant attempt—I admit not by the member for Floreat, but by the member for Narrogin—to hide behind the coat-tails of Mr Kirkwood and to blame him for all the decisions that were made, to call for his resignation, and to slur his reputation in terms of his ability to communicate with the Government and his associate commissioners. This was tried again this afternoon. Once again the member has tried to hide behind Mr Kirkwood's coat-tails. That is unacceptable to me. I have access to the information concerned, and I have worked with Mr Kirkwood for two years. I am aware of his abilities and the sort of advice that he gives. That is the position. It was not Mr Kirkwood's decision. There is no evidence whatever that the SEC advised in favour of taking up the marketing of Pilbara gas in 1979. Certainly in 1977 the SEC wanted that, but by 1979 that was no longer the case.

Quite apart from that, the member for Floreat himself referred to cheap gas being necessary for the pellet plants. He is wrong even about that. The reason for the closure of the pellet plants was twofold. Firstly, there was the high cost of fuel and the inability to compete with Brazil and other places, which had pellet plants and cheaper fuel available. Secondly, even with zero value fuel, the pellet

plants would not reopen because the market changed. The member for Floreat, in particular, and the member for Narrogin, for that matter, ought to be aware that the Brazilian pellets are quite different in composition and character from the pellets that were produced at either the Hamersley or Cliffs-Robe River plants. There is no market for those types of pellets. That was the principal reason that those pellet plants closed. That change had taken place in the Japanese steel industry in 1979.

Apart from that, if it had been possible, the price negotiated for Pilbara gas, when the then Government took on the right to market it, was higher than the price which it had taken on for south-west gas, either oil or coal competitive. It is the highest priced gas we have available in Western Australia. In fact, international investors who talk to me about these issues assume that it would be cheaper to get gas from the Pilbara region than to get it from Kwinana, Bunbury, Geraldton, or some other place. They are amazed when I tell them that Pilbara gas is the most expensive gas that we have available.

The third point which members opposite have failed to answer is that of the SEC's pleading with the Government in its briefing to the Minister of the day in September 1981 not to proceed with the various actions that would have committed the Government and the SEC to the pipeline contract. As I point out in the paper, which is not a one-sided paper, some of the concerns were unwarranted because ultimately the Alcoa contract, which enabled the raising of finance for construction of the pipeline, was signed. But the position is that there was cautionary advice. It is all very well—

Mr MacKinnon: Did the SEC ever say the project should not continue?

Mr PARKER: In September 1981. Indeed, two final paragraphs are worth quoting from a minute from the Under Treasurer to the Treasurer, presumably for submission to the Cabinet. The member for Narrogin is very good at trying to quote selectively from information. The two final paragraphs read—

11. The Commission is therefore seeking approval in principle to letting the first construction contract so that documentation can proceed.

That is the recommendation of the Under Treasurer, Mr McCarrey, of 13 September 1982. The second paragraph reads—

12. However, I recommend that Cabinet approval be subject to submission by the Minister of details of pipeline economics for Cabinet consideration before the contract is finally awarded.

In other words, he was not advising the Government of the day to go ahead. He was advising it to be very cautious. He was advising the Minister to resubmit certain details. That happens all the time. I know what happens in Cabinet. The Treasury or some other section refuses to accept a particular minute. It then asks that it be resubmitted to the Cabinet. The Under Treasurer did not approve the going ahead of the contract.

Much could be said about this project and much could be said about the information. There is a plethora of information available, as one would expect with a project of this type. The final point I wish to make in the very short time available to me is that the critical points are revealed in this document. Irrespective of the actions that the Government took when it was in office unsuccessfully to retrieve the situation in the letters and so forth referred to by the member for Narrogin, it was the three decisions taken by the then Government that put it, the State, and the SEC in that position. Those decisions have not been addressed in any serious form whatsoever. The Opposition is very good at supplying documents. I challenge the member for Narrogin and the member for Floreat to supply documents dealing with the recommendations or otherwise of the SEC or the other departments of the Government on the decision to take the extra 50 million cubic feet of gas, and on the decision to take the 70 million cubic feet of Pilbara gas. We already have the document outlining the September 1981 view of the SEC. Opposition members have been very good at producing documents that allege certain things, but they have not come forward with those documents. I will tell the House why they have not done so. Although they have their personal files which they took with them as all Ministers do, there is nothing in them. There is nothing in departmental files or in SEC files to reveal any advice from the SEC in favour of taking the 50 million cubic feet extra or marketing the Pilbara gas. There is nothing in those files at all.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [5.07 p.m.]: This is a very sad day for this Parliament and for Western Australia. We could term it the day of the jackal. The actions of the Minister for Minerals and Energy in attacking former Ministers who served the State with distinction

could only be perpetrated by a person who could be described as a dingo or a jackal. That is the sort of Minister we have. It is a very sad day indeed. This squabbling about who said what and who should have done what does not do much for the State.

Mr Court: It destroys the State; that's what it does.

Mr LAURANCE: It destroys the State. The Minister is just a jackal; that is all he is.

In a few months' time the Government of this State will change. I trust that no member of that new Government ever goes on an exercise like this, of assassinating the character of Ministers of a former Government. That is not to say that if I were in that next Government I would agree with all the decisions of former Ministers. However, I would defend their right to make those decisions and I would accept that they made the decisions in the right way at that time, given the facts of that time. That is the important consideration. Ministers must make decisions in the best interests of the State, given the facts of the time.

This Minister, when he made this dingo attack, did not substantiate accusations that the two former Ministers did anything other than make the best decisions for the State given the facts of the day. That is the responsibility with which they are charged. That is the responsibility with which this Minister is charged also. He has a responsibility to make decisions on behalf of the State given the information he has today. He has important tasks for the State in the years ahead. That is what he should concentrate on. He should show some of the vision of previous Ministers. He should try to make the best future for our children and our State. That is his responsibility. It is not his responsibility to dredge up the past in some slimy way by changing the facts as they are known today as against the facts that were known at the time the decisions had to be made.

Important decisions had to be made for the benefit of the State, and what personal gratification did these Ministers get from making those decisions? Fate plays strange tricks and, in fact, the Premier pulled the ripcord on this particular project. On the day he stood proudly before the people, the flags were flying, his name was on the plaque commemorating the opening, and he got the glory. However, the guts to get the project to that point had come from this side of the House and from the two Ministers who are being vilified in this attack. The Premier did not say that he did not want

any part of the project, that he did not want to take part in the opening or that it was wrong for the State. He did not suggest that Andrew Mensaros or Peter Jones be asked to pull the cord at the opening ceremony. He stood there taking all the glory. It was a despicable Laurel and Hardy show. Oliver Hardy on that side of the House lauded the project to the skies. He went to the university in 1983 and said what a magnificent project it was and fancy his being the Premier of a State which could commence projects such as that. The project was officially opened at Karratha and at every opportunity the Premier went out on the hustings saying how wonderful the Government was and how well it was doing with projects such as this.

On the day of the opening he was big enough to say that if it had not been for the actions of the previous Government he would not have been there opening the project. He has accepted the plaudits and the accolades for the magnificent decisions made by his predecessors. He told the people that there was no doubt that the benefits to be gained from the project were immense. He said that it was not just a marvellous resource development but also one that would develop the State's finances to a degree equating approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the present State Budget in money terms.

That is how good our Premier, Oliver Hardy, said it would be. Little Laurel, his sidekick, then decided he would put the boots in and do the dingo trick because it is close to election time and he would kick the Opposition where it hurts most. He is attempting to do that with this dirty trick. It is not on.

Not only the Premier has been on the hustings, but also the Prime Minister is trying to claim credit with his hopeful alongside him, the person who tried to be the member for Forrest and failed. The Prime Minister announced at Collie that many projects would be developed and, for example, the smelter would go ahead. Do members think that he forgot that the smelter would be attached to the end of the pipeline? He lauded to the heavens the wonderful decisions that had been made for which he, the Prime Minister, was responsible and spoke about all the magnificent things that would happen. Of course, nothing has happened because the wheels have fallen off the Hawke Government. The Labor Party is running scared and it has decided to launch an attack by vilifying former Ministers in this State. It knows that if those decisions had not been made to provide the domestic gas phase we would have had no export phase. Everybody

has said how much this will mean to the economy of Australia as a whole, as well as of Western Australia. It is something of which we can be proud and we shall have to make it work in the future. It is disgraceful to launch a scurrilous attack on those who started the developments in this State. It should be beneath any Minister to behave in this way.

I am not in the same position as the two earlier speakers who have been able to justify their decisions but I will refer to some of the evidence I have and cover some of the background.

The decisions were made in the correct way, following established procedure after advice had been heard from experts and those qualified people involved. The decision was made by Cabinet at the time, which was the proper procedure. Decisions were made courageously with great hope for the future of this State and that is how Ministers should be performing in their portfolios today. The Minister for Minerals and Energy should be looking towards the future of the State; that is his responsibility. I will refer to that point at a later stage of the sitting.

The report being discussed at the moment was put together by Bill Thomas, a member of the Building Workers Industrial Union. That union sent the Minister to Russia and it is a union of shame. The Minister and the union cooked up this situation together. It is a very undignified way for a Minister of the Crown to behave and it is unfortunate. The State deserves better than it is getting from this deal.

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

Debate thus adjourned.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: QUESTIONS

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr Harman): I refer to question 324 on today's Notice Paper.

If members care to consult Standing Order No. 106 and the appended summary of rulings they will see that "Questions to Ministers should relate to public affairs with which they are connected, to proceedings pending in Parliament, and to matters of administration for which they are responsible, but not to matters arising from a Minister's actions as a private citizen". Several rulings by various Speakers are cited among the precedents, all supporting the general principle already stated.

In my view question 324 brings in reference to possible activities of Ministers as private citizens. In its present form it is disorderly. To meet the requirements of our established practice in respect of questions, this question would need to be rephrased so that it refers only to the official activities of a Minister or Ministers.

[Questions taken.]

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 p.m.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY

Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [7.15 p.m.]: In continuing where I left off prior to the dinner adjournment, I will quote from one of the documents previously referred to. However, I make the point that it does not matter which document is quoted from. Several documents have been used in the debate so far by the two former Ministers and the present Minister. It does not matter at which stage these documents are quoted from because they all relate to the whole situation. There is no point saying that in 1981 it was full steam ahead and in 1982 some caution was being sounded. By that time the Government would have been well and truly committed to the development. It is rather like saying that a girl is a little bit pregnant; either she is or she is not. Either we had a project or we did not and that decision was made in the early days.

The member for Floreat referred to the long lead time for the project and said that at any stage it would have been very dramatic to have decided that the project would not proceed. If any one of those Ministers had said it would not proceed, think of the flak that would have come from their opponents at that time. If the Government of the day had said the project was 70 per cent along the way but for some reason it wanted to cancel it, there would have been howls of protest from its political opponents. The State required this development and the Government took a visionary approach and said it would overcome any problems.

Mr Pearce: You lie in answer to questions and you whitewash things altogether.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr LAURANCE: The member for Armadale with a great credibility gap for a mouth should withdraw that remark. The use of the word "lie" is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: I have ruled in this House on many occasions with regard to the use of the words "lie", and "liar". I will not tolerate one member calling another member a liar. The use of the words "lie" and "lying" in my opinion is in order but is not to be encouraged.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed.

Mr LAURANCE: In relation to the North-West Shelf gas project, the Western Australian energy scene, and the ministerial brief of September 1981, I refer briefly to a number of points made in that document. On page 46 the following appeared—

The determination of the quantity of gas for which a contract should be made was influenced by the following factors:—

... The Government wanted the North West Shelf development to proceed ...

It is quite obvious by this snide attack that the Minister and the Government did not want the North-West Shelf gas project to proceed. That is the inference given by proceeding in this way. The Government of that day wanted the North-West Shelf gas project to proceed, and the venture partners were adamant that it was only possible on the basis of an export development which could be linked with a project for supplying gas to Western Australia. So we had to have both—gas for Western Australia in order to get an export development. They were inextricably linked together. I quote from page 50 of that document—

The quantity of 300MMCFD for Southern Gas supplies was judged to be a sensible proportion of the total 1450MMCFD to be produced.

I think the above point needs to be emphasised. Another important aspect of the amount of gas to be available appears in the document on page 51—

The scale of the project should be sufficient to achieve a marked reduction in Western Australia's dependence upon imported fuel.

That was the big consideration of the day, and I have made this point right through my remarks. We are looking at a project which will be here for 20 years or more, and at the time there was great concern with respect to our dependence upon imported fuel. Gas was going to relieve that position. It was an important part of the decision of that day. On page 51 the following appears—

It was seen as important to secure a sufficient quantity of gas that there would be opportunities in future for the attraction of industry based on the use of this gas supply, and not to restrict the contracted quantity to a level which could be sold readily under any circumstances, as this would provide no opportunity for future development.

That point is important too, because if we arranged sufficient gas to last just until the end of the 1970s or early 1980s, we would have been blasted as being short-sighted in not looking to the future and not making arrangements. If we attracted extra industry gas would be available. What Government in its right mind would have contracted for a very small portion of gas or used a very small pipeline so that when a major industry was attracted at the southern end of the pipeline we could not supply the gas? This Government would be the first to criticise if we took that type of short-sighted view. That is exactly why some of these decisions were made.

On page 55 of that same document the State Energy Commission was able to influence the National Energy Advisory Committee, and the document says this—

We were able to convince the Committee that the present form of development was the most advantageous from both a national and state viewpoint.

The authors of this document, which the Minister has prepared, say in this statement that this form of development was the most advantageous from both the national and State viewpoint. If Ministers had not acted on that advice they would have been criticised. They did the right thing. This document and other documents prove that, given the conditions that pertained at that time. I quote further from page 56 of the document—

... the project concept which was adopted was considered to be a responsible and sensible allocation of resource between export and domestic requirements.

So the Minister now jumps up and says that we contracted for too much domestic gas at a vital time. When a review was done in 1981 we were told, as the Government, that it was a sensible allocation of the resource. I continue to quote from page 56—

Mr. R.F.X. Connor was the Federal Minister for Minerals & Energy and he had ambitions to secure the acreage held by the Bocal Group at that time for development by the Commonwealth Government.

They were going to take the gas at the wellhead. Members will remember the bogey of R.F.X. Connor at the time. This report said, and I quote—

... it was only as a consequence of the decision of the Western Australian Government and, particularly, of the Minister for Mines at that time, Mr. Andrew Mensaros, who was the Designated Authority in terms of the Petroleum Submerged Lands Legislation that Mr. Connor did not succeed.

In other words, the "Feds" would have ruined this project if it was not for the strong action of former Ministers. I quote further—

It was an important action by the Western Australian Government which finally made the present form of development possible and which saved the Venture Partners from the loss of these important lease areas.

Time and again in that document it is shown that the Ministers responsible at that time made the right decision for the future of the State.

I ask this Minister to stop looking back for political reasons in order to obtain a shallow advantage leading up to the election. It is the Minister's job to look forward, not to look back and criticise. I say to him, let it be on his head that he makes the right decision on behalf of the State today. He is charged with that responsibility and not to use his time and that of his officers to denigrate previous Ministers when it is quite obvious they did the right thing. They made bold and courageous decisions and tried to look forward by making the right decisions for this State and its future.

The size of the pipeline had to be bigger than was required at the time to allow for future development. If we had chosen a cheaper, smaller gauge pipeline we would have been shown to be short-sighted and not taking the future of this State sufficiently into account. These decisions were the right decisions. If it was so bad that it would lose so many billions of dollars, when did the Government find this out and why has it proceeded? It is because the Government thought that was the right decision and was forced into exactly the same position.

Mr Parker: We had not criticised the size of it.

Mr LAURANCE: The Minister might as well criticise it because he has criticised the whole project. He said it should not have gone ahead and that three major decisions were wrong.

Mr Parker: That is right.

Mr LAURANCE: They could not have been wrong. The Government is saying that if those decisions were wrong we should not have a project. The Minister should grow up. He is a dingo. Either he wants the project or not, but he cannot go back and halve the size of the pipeline now.

Why did the Government proceed if it knew this? On what interest rates did it calculate this massive loss? Are they calculated on today's interest rates under its maladministration of the economy, or interest rates obtained before? This is another important question that needs to be taken into account.

The State has to be proud of the decisions of those former Ministers because they made the right decisions at the time. I support the amendment.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [7.29 p.m.]: It is quite obvious that the Government is getting itself into a big mess over the North-West Shelf project. In this last week or two it has begun an exercise in pure party politics where, with the aid of one of the party political advisers, it has sought to dredge up a misinterpretation of the history and the cause of the matter and to use it for party political purposes. That this document is undoubtedly a political document issued in the lead-up to an election is proved by its author, its timing, and its content. In reality, it is simply an attempt by the Government to score political points. It has claimed all sorts of extraordinary things in relation to the North-West Shelf project.

Last night I heard the Minister claim in this House during one of his lengthy responses to a Dorothy Dix question that any of the joint ventures could tell one that the export phase—the second phase—of the project could have gone ahead without the first phase. The Minister, when he made that fatuous statement, completely overlooked the political climate that existed at the time the original arrangements were made. He overlooked in particular the vehement and aggressive attitude then expressed by his own party in relation to foreign-owned projects and exports to other parts of the world without securing supplies for

the domestic market. The Minister forgot the hysteria the Australian Labor Party exhibited for much of the 1970s in regard to foreign ownership, foreign control and exports. He has forgotten the desire of the ALP to withdraw within a narrow, nationalistic shell around Australia.

I will not speak at any great length but I simply want to put this on the record—

Mr Laurance: You might tell us what visionary projects this Minister has been able to get off the ground.

Mr HASSELL: All this Minister has been able to do is sink a smelter which he is now running busily around trying to revive in the lead up to the next election.

Mr Laurance: Perhaps the Minister thinks it came about as an immaculate conception.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not tolerate that type of interjection.

Mr Parker: I know that this Government had more to do with the conception of the project—

Mr HASSELL: The ultimate hypocrisy of the Minister's whole political strategy has just been demonstrated by his interjection in which he claimed credit for the second phase of the North-West Shelf gas project. The Minister still does not seem to understand that there would have been no second stage if there had not been a first stage; he is still unable to work that out.

As I was trying to explain just a few minutes ago when the Minister was out of his seat chatting to his mates on the other side of the room, what the Minister does not understand, in making the very silly statement he made about the possibility of having a second stage of a project without a first stage, is that it was not the financial considerations or the technical considerations that would have prevented that occurring; it was the political considerations. It was the prevailing mood and climate of the nation, much of which had been whipped up by the Australian Labor Party which was obsessed about the export of our natural resources and how this country must stop exporting its energy in order to preserve it for Australia. It was only on the basis that there was going to be a substantial local content, local benefit, and local usage that the whole project could have been conceived in the days in which it was conceived and put into place. It is very convenient for the Minister's memory, and makes nonsense of his assertions. He does not understand the history of the matter. Why does he not stop prattling? He is really just like a 10-

year-old in relation to these matters. His forte, in fact, seems to have been smoke-bombing cars—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader of the Opposition addresses the Chair he might not hear the interjections.

Mr HASSELL: I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, will remember how expert the Minister was at throwing smoke bombs under cars when he was at university. Perhaps that was one of his qualifications. He is now busy trying to tell this House over and over again, in the most vain fashion, how wonderful he is, and what the business community can tell one about his performance.

I would like to tell the House something about his performance during this last week or so and I want to tell the Minister very simply and clearly that his performance and the performance of the Government have severely embarrassed the businesses involved in the project. They are very concerned about what is happening. Despite the fact that this Government claims, through this Minister in particular, to be so expert, it simply does not understand that the confidentiality of discussions and arrangements must be maintained regardless of political reasons and motives. There has been a severe fall-off in business confidence because the first thing that this Minister has done in the opening week of this parliamentary session is to cause severe embarrassment on a number of fronts—

Mr Parker: Give us the names of those companies you claim are embarrassed.

Mr HASSELL: I am sure the Minister would love me to come out and give him some names so that he could start applying some of his strong arm union tactics to the companies concerned—so that he could ring them up and start threatening them. He has this union ploy off to a “T”, as has this Government as a whole. This Government has a great capacity to threaten people, to put them under pressure and in fact to say, “Everything depends on a trade-off and you had better keep quiet about it or you will find that things will become a bit hard further down the line.”

This Minister may pat himself on the back until his arms are bent but it will not do him any good because the truth is that his reputation is not what he tells us it is. His reputation is diminishing day by day and the laudatory comments one used to hear about him occasionally in business circles—I did hear them in the past—are not being made now. I

suggest that the Minister listen to me; he might learn something. The business community is now seeing the Minister for what he is; that is, an amateur who has bungled very badly in an attempt to gain political mileage out of a past event the history of which he does not understand and the result of which he is not able to predict.

The first thing that the Minister has achieved during the past week has been to cause considerable embarrassment in the business world because the businessmen concerned never expected that their private arrangements and assessments would be brought out and abused in the way in which they were abused by this Minister and this Government. The second thing that the Minister has achieved is to tarnish the reputation of Western Australia. I am not talking simply about the reputation of two very fine former Ministers in a former Government, who worked for literally years to save this project and to make sure it happened, despite the concerted opposition of a Federal Labor Government, and a State Labor Government which were anxious to sink it.

They were anxious to sink the project for the most narrow, unrealistic, political reasons. The Minister was part of that movement. There was never any move on the part of this Labor Party to develop the project for the benefit of Australia through taking the best economic advantage that could be achieved. All that this Labor Party wanted to do was to build a massive national pipeline created at enormous cost and get this gas from Western Australia over to its mates in the Eastern States. That was the objective of the Labor Party.

To conclude my point, the second thing that this Minister has achieved in the past week has been to damage significantly the reputation of Western Australia as a good place in which to deal; there is no question of that. In the international marketplace, one cannot have successful dealings in resource development and resource processing unless there is ultimate good faith.

Mr Parker: There is very good faith.

Mr HASSELL: This whole episode has been a breach of good faith. Had this Government wanted to reveal information that the public was entitled to know—and certainly some of the information that has been referred to is material that should have been made available to the public—it could have done so in a completely open and proper way without this political “attempt” that has been made.

We have seen through an examination of the documents, through the discussions that have taken place, and through the revelations that have been made, that his whole exercise is a political stunt of the worst kind because it is not merely a passing political stunt; it is one that causes damage to Western Australia and its future. At all relevant times the former Government, particularly the former responsible Ministers, Hon. Andrew Mensaros and Hon. Peter Jones, who both have a great deal to be proud of in their achievements in WA, along with Sir Charles Court who, above all, voted for this project, acted on advice—

Mr Parker: That is not true. We have shown that that is not true.

Mr HASSELL: They acted in accordance with the advice of people in the SEC and the Treasury of this State together with the advisers to those bodies. At all relevant times they acted in the economic and political context of a booming economy with growing demand where there were doubts in relation to supplies in the world situation and where various parties were desperate to make these contracts, and they negotiated accordingly. They took the chance to make sure that WA's energy position was secure. They took risks within the parameters of advice that was given, not only by our own institutions in this State, but also to those institutions and, more particularly, the lenders to those institutions. What seems to be so often forgotten by this Minister in his attempt to make some cheap political capital is simply this: Not only were we concerned with the future of this State, and not only were the SEC and the other bodies concerned with the future of this State, but also, not surprisingly, the people who were lending money were very concerned about the future and whether all these projects could be achieved. They were prepared to lend that money only on the basis that these whole areas were covered by the best projections and the best estimates that could be made. So we saw advice upon advice in relation to this matter. I well remember Cabinet minutes coming forward. The whole thing was so carefully set out—from the parameters of excellent circumstances down to the least desirable circumstances, and the elements of risk within those parameters were set out on a "best" and "worst" scenario—and at all times the Government acted within those parameters. That was the basis upon which it was done.

I conclude my remarks by pointing out simply that without question we have achieved for Western Australia in the North-West Shelf

project phase one and phase two Australia's greatest resource development project phase for many years, both past and future. We have achieved it. The project was supported by our Government and it has been pursued by this Government. It has been achieved by the work of many people over many years. It is of great benefit to this nation. We claim our credit for it and no doubt the Government claims its credit for its part of it.

It is simply a ridiculous proposition to have a Minister playing these silly, childish, dishonest political games in an attempt to discredit people who have spent years of their parliamentary and political careers working for this State in terms of this project. It is really shameful that this whole exercise should have come about. It is a disgrace to the Minister and it is an embarrassment to the business community. It is damaging to the credibility and the good name of this State and, for the sake of restoring some sense to the whole matter, this amendment should be supported by those members of the Government who are honest enough to recognise that in this matter both sides have worked for Western Australia consistently and both sides are entitled to claim considerable credit.

I support the amendment.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [7.47 p.m.]: I recall when the original North-West Shelf gas agreement was brought before this House; it coincided with the introduction of some amendments to the Liquor Act which dealt with our Sunday liquor trading laws. If my memory is correct, debate on the Sunday trading hours occupied approximately 30 hours in this House, but debate on the North-West Shelf gas agreement occupied merely a matter of minutes. I suppose it was because not very many of us at the time knew the full implications of the agreement, what it would mean to this State and what it would cost this State. We were all told what benefits would accrue to the State from the implementation of this rather massive development project. In essence, the Ministers of the day were taken at their word. The comments they made in the party room and in this House were taken by backbench members as being an accurate reflection of what was going to happen.

Of course since the writing of the agreement we have discovered that there is a surplus of gas. We have discovered that the WA public were to be responsible for meeting the cost of the gas that was not going to be used. We have

discovered that, as a consequence of the surplus gas, on at least two occasions the projected amount of coal to be purchased by the SEC from Collie has been reduced or twice renegotiated downwards in order to allow the SEC, which was the main Government authority involved in the North-West Shelf Agreement, to soak up some of the surplus gas. That was done in the common knowledge that coal in terms of unit energy cost was substantially cheaper than the unit energy cost for gas. Some people have estimated that the cost of energy through Collie coal is roughly half that of North-West Shelf gas. I am not privy to information which can prove or disprove that comment, but it does seem that if the SEC was placed in a position where it had to take less coal which had a cheaper unit energy cost, purely and simply to soak up gas, obviously there was something wrong with the initial North-West Shelf gas agreement.

Of course, this year the agreement has been amended by the Government. Since that time the debate on the project has been highly politicised. Initially, when the Liberal Party was in Government it was a wonderful project. The moment it went out of Government, the Liberals claimed the new Government was destroying this wonderful development for Western Australia. On the other hand, the Government is saying that it has been lumbered with a great white elephant from which it had to try to extricate itself in order to save Western Australians from having to pay such an enormous amount of money for surplus gas which would never be used.

I do not think any member in this House other than those Ministers directly involved have at their disposal enough information upon which to make judgments on either this amendment or on the comments made by the senior players in this debate. It is my view and the view of my colleague, the member for Stirling, that the amendment moved by the member for Floreat is a very poor substitute for the original policy put forward by the Opposition calling for a Royal Commission. There is absolutely no value in an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. There may be some value in a substantive motion brought into Parliament seeking an inquiry. I assure the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Floreat that, if they wanted to move a substantive motion calling upon the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into this issue, they would have our

full support. I think there is nowhere near enough evidence for the members of this House to make a judgment on this amendment.

Mr Hassell: We called for the Premier to appoint a Royal Commission on the basis that the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition should agree who was appointed to that commission. We did not want any Diamond Jim McClellands appointed to it. We both should also agree to the terms of reference so that they covered the whole field and that the Royal Commission was not just a setup by the Government.

Mr COWAN: That is an admirable safeguard. If I were in the same position as the Leader of the Opposition I would call for exactly the same criteria for the setting up of such an inquiry. There is no question that previous Royal Commissions have had appointed as their heads, people—I hope I do not slight the people too much—who were sympathetic to the Government and its particular interests. It has happened in the past. I can recall several Royal Commissions where the commissioner was always going to make a decision in favour of the Government's view.

I applaud the call by the Leader of the Opposition for him to have some input into the appointment of the commissioner and also into the terms of reference. If that motion were introduced, we would support it.

The National Party of Australia will not get involved in a highly politicised debate between Ministers and members who were Ministers and who are being accused of making the Western Australian public pay far too much for the development of a project. We cannot support the amendment. However, I recommend to the Leader of the Opposition and to the members for Floreat and Narrogin that, at the earliest opportunity, they should introduce a substantive motion calling upon the Government to appoint a commission of inquiry to get to the bottom of this issue and to appropriate blame, if blame is to be appropriated, in the correct place.

Amendment put and negatived.

Motion Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mrs Watkins.

House adjourned at 7.56 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

21. *Postponed.*

TOURISM COMMISSION

Operating Costs: Savings

96. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Can the Minister now detail the ways in which \$600 000 in operating costs have been saved by the Western Australian Tourism Commission following its change in operation from a department to a commission?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

On 22 August 1985, the Minister for Tourism made a ministerial statement in respect to this matter.

FORESTS

Northern Jarrah Forest: Royalties

170. Mr BLAIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) What has been the—
 - (a) amount received;
 - (b) royalty earned,
 from logs made available to the timber industry from the area known as the Northern Jarrah forest in each year since 1980?
- (2) What percentage of the State total hardwood log production came from the Northern Jarrah forest in each year since 1980?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) (a) 1980-81—228 734 m³
 1981-82—223 102 m³
 1982-83—193 759 m³
 1983-84—199 837 m³
- (b) 1980-81—\$2 110 170
 1981-82—\$2 472 713
 1982-83—\$2 319 846
 1983-84—\$2 532 504
- (2) 1980-81—16.4 per cent
 1981-82—18.3 per cent
 1982-83—18.4 per cent
 1983-84—17.6 per cent

ENERGY: GAS

Pipeline: Maylands

201. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) When was the route for the North-West Shelf gas pipeline through the

Maylands-Mt Lawley areas finally decided?

- (2) When were the residents affected by the routing of the pipeline advised of this decision?
- (3) How many residents have been affected directly by this decision?
- (4) Were any alternative routes considered?
- (5) If so, what were those alternatives and why were they rejected?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The route for the East Perth lateral gas pipeline through Maylands-Mt Lawley was finally determined in March 1985, when the Environmental Protection Authority approved the variations to the initial route proposed.
- (2) Progressively from that date. Many residents had initially been advised of the route at the time of issue of the environmental review and management programme report in April 1984.
- (3) The final route of the pipeline passes through 42 private residential properties.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Eight alternative routes were initially investigated. The final route was selected on the basis of maximising the utilisation of road and freeway reserves and public open space and minimising disruption to private properties. The use of Westrail's railway reserve was not possible because a new pipeline in this reserve could not be built with safety.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

South West Development Authority: Employees

223. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Regional Development and the North West with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) How many people are employed currently by the South West Development Authority?
- (2) What is the anticipated annual cost in salaries and wages for the South West Development Authority?

- (3) What is the annual cost to run the South West Development Authority, apart from salaries and wages?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) 11 Public Service staff.
- (2) Salaries total \$249 716 based on current rates paid for 11 Public Service staff.
- (3) 1984-85 running costs totalled \$186 663. This figure does not include any abnormal operational costs to the authority.

PORTS AND HARBOURS: BOAT HARBOUR

Hillarys: Maintenance Cost

231. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) What is the estimated annual maintenance cost of the proposed Hillary's boat harbour?
- (2) Has the approval of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority been sought on this project?
- (3) Is approval anticipated in the immediate future?
- (4) When are the tenders for the construction of the boat harbour planned to be accepted and announced?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The estimate is \$80 000 which will be recoverable from lessees of the various facilities.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority approved stage 1 of the harbour on 19 August 1985.
- (4) The Minister for Transport is currently examining the tenders for construction of the breakwaters and will advise of his decision shortly.

TRANSPORT: SHIPPING

Charters: Licences

235. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Do charter vessels have to be licensed?
- (2) What action is taken to supervise this licensing?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) No. They do have to be surveyed under the provisions of the Western Australian Marine Act.
- (2) Not applicable. Surveys of commercial passenger vessels are conducted by the Department of Marine and Harbours annually.

TRANSPORT: SHIPPING

Charges: Servicing

236. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

What facilities are presently available to service charter yachts west of the Fremantle bridges?

Mr GRILL replied:

Fremantle Sailing Club.
Rottnest Island Jetty, Thomson Bay.
Palm Beach Jetty.

MR KEITH GALE

Consultant: Department of Premier and Cabinet

241. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is Mr Keith Gale a consultant to the Department of Premier and Cabinet?
- (2) When was he appointed to this position?
- (3) What financial arrangement has been agreed for this consultancy?
- (4) How much has been paid to Mr Gale by the Government since his appointment?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) Mr Gale was engaged as a consultant with the Department of Premier and Cabinet on 1 April 1985. His consultancy fee is paid by the department, which is partly reimbursed by the WA Exim Corporation. The level of Mr Gale's remuneration is a matter confidential to him, the Government, and to the WA Exim Corporation. However, if the member has any specific concern about Mr Gale's consultancy and provides details, I will consider having further inquiries made.

TRANSPORT: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

Public Attitude

268. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

What research has been undertaken by—

- (a) the Government;
- (b) the Metropolitan Transport Trust,

in relation to public attitudes to—

- (i) the Metropolitan Transport Trust
- (ii) its services;
- (iii) its losses;
- (iv) other aspects of its financial affairs and operations;
- (v) future services?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (a) and (b) I find it surprising that the Leader of the Opposition has found a new interest in what the community wants from its public transport system. This is a very quick retreat from his previous statements that private enterprise was singularly expert at meeting the community's transport needs and that Governments could sidestep such responsibilities. Last week the member did not have to bother himself with such niceties as what people might want; his proposed Government was going to put the job in the hands of the entrepreneurs, and the pursuit of profit would be sufficient motivation to ensure that the community received a modern, comprehensive, efficient public transport system. I welcome the member back to the ranks of those who are interested in what the community's needs are.

As a market oriented organisation the Metropolitan Transport Trust undertakes a great deal of work to investigate community needs and attitudes on public transport. Major recent research is as follows—

- 1. The Image, Attitude and Awareness Studies 1981, 82, 83:
 - image of MTT as an organisation (i)
 - perceptions of reasonable service levels (ii)

effect of location on public transport usage (ii)

comparison of car/bus/train on factors important in modal choice (ii)

train/bus subsidies (iv)

- 2. Citylink Project 1984-85:
 - acceptable levels of service frequency (ii)
 - distance people are prepared to walk to bus stop (ii)
 - reaction to a proposed new service attractive/unattractive features. (v)

- 3. Shopper Bus Studies 1983:
 - awareness and source of awareness of shopper bus service (ii)
 - appeal of the service (ii)

- 4. Public Perceptions of Public Transport 1985:
 - improvements/changes to the system (i) (ii)
 - awareness of fare zones; fare changes; reasonableness of change; understanding the fare system. (iv)
 - attitudes to public transport (i) (ii)
 - public awareness of public transport (i) (iii)
 - perceived budget spent on public transport (iii) (iv)

The reports on the above studies can be made available by arrangement with the MTT.

DECISION MAKERS' LUNCHEON

Cost

272. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) What total cost was incurred by the Government as a result of the decision makers' luncheon held on 10 July 1985 in the Grand Ballroom of the Merlin Hotel?
- (2) How much of that cost was offset by the \$25 fee charged of guests?
- (3) What was the source of funds used to pay for the luncheon?
- (4) What cost was incurred specifically in obtaining the services of Phillip Adams at that luncheon?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) The fee of \$25 enables the decision makers' luncheons to be self-supporting. People wishing to attend pay the \$25 fee in advance. This enables accounts to be met as they occur. If a person attends and has not paid, appropriate follow-up action is initiated to recoup the attendance fee.
- (4) \$1 236.06 for fares and accommodation.

275 and 277. *Postponed.*

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Australian Land and Cattle Co: Forfeiture

278. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Did he meet with Mr Crutcher, Mr McManus, Mr B. Jennings and Mr M. Levy on 12 July 1985, to discuss the forfeiture of the Australian Land and Cattle Company pastoral leases?

Mr McIVER replied:

Yes.

279. *Postponed.*

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Katanning: Hall-gymnasium

280. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Education:

In the planning for the alterations and additions to the Katanning Senior High School, is it envisaged that a hall-gymnasium will be included?

Mr PEARCE replied:

When additions are proposed for the school, consideration will be given to the provision of a hall-gymnasium.

EDUCATION: TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

Art Centre: West Perth

281. Mr CASH, to the Minister for the Arts:

Is it intended to reduce any facilities currently provided at the Tertiary and Further Education Art Centre, located at the former St. Brigid's school, West Perth, to enable additional facilities to be provided for the Department of Corrections?

Mr DAVIES replied:
No.

ENERGY: POWER LINES

Tree Clearing: Road Reserves

282. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What is the State Energy Commission's policy regarding the clearing and maintenance of naturally occurring trees in road reserves?
- (2) What arrangements have been made and agreed to between the State Energy Commission and local authorities for the maintenance of road reserves?
- (3) Does the Government intend to introduce amendments to the State Energy Commission Act this session?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Fast growing species are cut off at ground level and the stumps treated with "Roundup", a herbicide approved by the Health Department. This approach gives maximum protection against bushfires at minimum cost but causes temporary unsightliness. The method is used mainly in hills areas where regrowth is rapid and the effects of tree cutting soon diminish.
- (2) Local authorities are responsible for controlling road verge trees planted or cultivated by them. If they fail to do so the State Energy Commission, after due notice, will cut the trees as an emergency measure and bill the local authority for the work involved. There is considerable consultation between local authorities and the commission about tree control matters.
- (3) Yes, subject to the progress of other parliamentary business.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

Staff: Advertisements

283. Mr CASH, to the Premier:

- (1) Did the Department of Premier and Cabinet recently advertise seven newly created positions for senior management staff?
- (2) If "Yes",—
 - (a) what positions were advertised;
 - (b) what classification and salary levels attach to these positions;

- (c) what was the minimum educational qualification required; and
- (d) were applications for the positions also called from outside the Public Service?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. The positions were created as part of a restructuring of the Department of Premier and Cabinet which included the abolition of six positions and the amendment of another two positions. I refer the member to the *Public Service Notices*, Vol. 7 No. 32 of Wednesday, 14 August 1985.

Ultimately the restructuring of the department will lead to a saving in excess of \$3 000 per annum.

284. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES: ACCOMMODATION

Mineral House No. 2: Wind Tunnel Tests

285. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) (a) Will the construction of Mineral House No. 2 commence prior to the completion of wind tunnel tests;
- (b) if "Yes", what effect will the fumes emitted from the Government Chemical Laboratories have on construction workers engaged on the project?
- (2) (a) Will the vibrations caused by the construction of Mineral House No. 2 have any detrimental effect on scientific equipment located at the Government Chemical Laboratories;
- (b) if "Yes", will the current work load be able to be maintained and the quality of work guaranteed during the construction of Mineral House No. 2?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) (a) Wind tunnel tests are expected to be completed prior to the commencement of construction of Mineral House, Stage 11;

- (b) it is intended that scrubbers will be installed to treat toxic fumes and to render them safe prior to emission.

- (2) (a) and (b) A diaphragm wall technique will be used instead of sheet piling to minimise vibration and the effects on the operation of the the Government Chemical Laboratories.

FISHERIES: TUNA

Quotas: Transfer

286. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Fisheries:

What conditions are placed on the transfer of a Western Australian tuna quota to—

- (a) the lessor;
- (b) the lessee?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (a) and (b) There are no specific conditions relating to the transfer of tuna quota except that the parties involved have to be Australians. The Commonwealth requires that the transfer application documentation be forwarded to the Australian Fisheries Service in Canberra for processing.

Conditions relating to the lease of quota held by the WA Government are set out in my Press release of 7 August 1985.

POLICE

Fitness Facilities

287. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What body building or fitness facilities are currently available to service police officers and where are these facilities located?
- (2) Does his office support the use of these facilities by police officers to maintain and improve their physical well-being?
- (3) Is a police officer required to pay a fee for the use of these facilities?
- (4) Will he consider subsidising the fees of police officers who due to the location of existing police facilities are required to use private health clubs to maintain and improve their physical well-being?

- (5) If "No" to (4), does it not seem likely some police officers are being discriminated against because of the distance from their residence or police station from existing police facilities?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) (a) Maylands Police Academy, Swan Bank Road, Maylands.

Fully equipped gymnasium, including weightlifting room, martial arts room, shower-locker rooms, and volley ball court.

Five-lane 25-metre swimming pool under construction.

- (b) Police Headquarters, Adelaide Terrace, Perth

Well equipped gymnasium, including sauna and showers.

- (c) Police stations at most larger centres throughout the State are either presently equipped, or being progressively equipped, with showers for use by members involved in jogging or cycling programmes.

(2) Yes.

(3) No.

- (4) and (5) I would be prepared to examine any formal submission made to me through the normal channels for proposing changes to working conditions of police officers. However, I would not expect that the provision of monetary motivation would influence members as it is in the interests of each, both professionally and personally, to maintain a reasonable standard of physical fitness.

LAND: RESERVE

Lane-Poole: Resources Development

288. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware of a publication by the Department of Conservation and Land Management entitled: "Towards an environmental and recreational management plan for the Lane Poole reserve", in which it stated: "Logging and bauxite mining are not permitted in the conservation zone of the reserve but the recreation zone will remain available for both of these land uses"?

- (2) Is it Government policy to allow logging and mining in recreation reserves?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) Yes.

- (2) In specific circumstances, logging and mining may be permitted in recreation reserves.

LAND: RESERVE

Lane-Poole: Visitors

289. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Does the Government have statistics available on the number of visitors to the Lane Poole reserve area on an annual basis from 1970 to the present?

(2) If "Yes", what are the numbers?

- (3) How many visitors are projected to visit the area each year from 1986 to year 2000, inclusive?

Mr DAVIES replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) At least 150 000 visitors per year.

LAND: RESERVE

Lane-Poole Resources Development

290. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) In the Press release of 8 June 1985 which announced the setting up of the Lane Poole Reserve Draft Management Plan did the Premier make any reference to the possibility of the logging and bauxite mining taking place within the reserve?

(2) What form did the advertising and public notification of the series of workshops and the preparation of the draft management plan take?

(3) What groups or bodies were directly notified of—

(a) the workshops; and

(b) the opportunity to make submissions on the draft management plans?

(4) (a) Did the questionnaires referred to in the Premier's reply to my question 111(3) make any reference to

the type of land uses that would be considered in the recreation zone of the reserve;

- (b) if so, did those uses listed include logging and mining?
- (5) Did signs erected in the reserve calling for submissions on the draft management plan mention—
 - (a) the boundaries of the reserve;
 - (b) the fact that the reserve was broken into conservation and recreation zones;
 - (c) that logging and bauxite mining were being considered as acceptable land uses within the recreation zone of the reserve?
- (6) Will the Government ensure that the public are aware of the possibility that the Lane Poole Reserve recreation zone may be mined and logged?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) No. This was mentioned in the Press release of October 1983.
- (2) Attendance at the workshop was by invitation to a wide range of users.

A leaflet available at CALM offices at Kelmscott and Dwellingup asked for public submissions.

- (3) (a) Approximately 60 groups and users, including Conservation Council, Campaign to Save Native Forests, Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation, school groups, and Shires;
- (b) those in (a) as well as those who read the leaflet, the signs in the reserve, and a newspaper article.
- (4) (a) Yes;
- (b) no, the aim was to assess public opinion on specific recreation issues.
- (5) (a) No;
- (b) no;
- (c) no. Signs invited the public to contact CALM offices at Kelmscott and Dwellingup for further information.
- (6) Yes.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Substation: Kondinin

291. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) When is construction of the State Energy Commission Kondinin substation scheduled to commence?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is later than the 1985-86 financial year, why?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Preliminary construction works at Kondinin substation including site clearing, fencing, and some civil structural works were completed in July 1985 as part of the transmission interconnection with the Eastern Goldfields region.

It is presently anticipated that construction of the next phase of Kondinin substation will commence in the final quarter of the 1985-86 financial year to achieve a proposed completion date of July 1987.

- (2) Answered by (1) above.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Generation: Gas Use

292. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) In the financial year to 30 June 1985 what volume of gas was used by the State Energy Commission for the generation of electricity?
- (2) What are the projected volumes of gas to be used by the State Energy Commission for power generation over the financial years up to and including 1990?
- (3) Has the State Energy Commission or any Government department or authority assessed the relative unit energy cost to the State Energy Commission of—
 - (a) oil;
 - (b) gas;
 - (c) coal?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), what are the comparative figures?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) 1984-85, 117 million cubic metres.
- (2) 1985-86, 373 million cubic metres
1986-87, 415 million cubic metres

1987-88, 455 million cubic metres
1988-89, 519 million cubic metres
1989-90, 593 million cubic metres.

(3) Yes.

(4) Comparative fuel costs at State Energy Commission power stations are regarded as commercially confidential.

ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Coal Purchases

293. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What tonnages of coal have been purchased by the State Energy Commission in the last five financial years to 30 June 1985?
- (2) What are the projected tonnages of coal for purchase by the State Energy Commission for future financial years to 1990?
- (3) (a) When were the projections first produced;
- (b) have they been updated; and
- (c) have they changed from original estimates?
- (4) What formal agreements or contracts exist between the State Energy Commission and coal producers for the supply of coal?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) 1980-81, 2.90 million tonnes
1981-82, 3.11 million tonnes
1982-83, 3.56 million tonnes
1983-84, 3.40 million tonnes
1984-85, 2.87 million tonnes.
- (2) 1985-86, 2.88 million tonnes
1986-87, 2.86 million tonnes
1987-88, 2.90 million tonnes
1988-89, 2.90 million tonnes
1989-90, 2.90 million tonnes.
- (3) Projections were first produced in 1982 and form the basis of minimum existing contractual obligations. The original estimates have not been changed.
- (4) A long-term contract exists between the State Energy Commission and the Griffin Coal Mining Company Ltd.

A binding heads of agreement exists between the State Energy Commission and Western Collieries Ltd from which a long term contract is being developed.

CHEMICALS: GOVERNMENT CHEMICAL LABORATORIES

Charges

294. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Does the Government Chemical Laboratories not charge client departments funded from Consolidated Revenue?
- (2) If "No", what system is used to account for the analytical services provided?
- (3) (a) Is the Government Chemical Laboratories being required to over-service its client departments;
- (b) if not, what audit procedure is used to prevent client departments being over serviced?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The Government Chemical Laboratories does not charge client departments funded from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.
- (2) The laboratories keep records of the work done for client departments.
- (3) (a) and (b) Consideration is being given to these questions in the context of the review of the laboratories.

WATER RESOURCES

Easement: Retaining Wall

295. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the proposed retaining wall on the Metropolitan Water Authority easement between lot 301 and lot 169 Newton Street, Bayswater, been rejected by the authority?
- (2) Has he overruled this rejection?
- (3) If "No" to (2), has an appeal against the authority's rejection been received?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), when does he expect to make a decision?

- (5) What provisions have been made to alleviate the flooding problem on lot 169 caused by the filling of the easement?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) The developer is required to submit his consulting engineer's detailed plans to the Water Authority and the local authority for approval. These plans should incorporate all engineering aspects, including drainage.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Projects: Funding

296. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Since its inception, what projects and for what amounts has the Western Australian Tourism Commission guaranteed funds?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

A Government guarantee on borrowings of \$60 000 has been extended to Campus Holidays on the basis of \$30 000 being applicable to McCubbin Investments Pty Ltd and \$30 000 applicable to Cap Cinq Pty Ltd.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Honey: Sales

297. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) What have been the total sales to date of the 3-jar honey packs purchased by the Western Australian Tourism Commission?
- (2) Has the commission requested tourist bureaux around Western Australia to assist with these sales?
- (3) On what basis have they been requested to assist with the honey sales?

- (4) What has been the total cost to the commission of transporting the honey to the various non-Western Australian Tourism Commission agencies?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) 6 351 packs sold and 1 500 packs with distribution agents on consignment.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) To act as sales agents on a commercial basis.
- (4) \$687.15.

298. *Postponed.*

EDUCATION

Human Relationships: Handbook

299. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Would he provide me with a copy of the Education Department handbook on human relationships/sex education?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The health education syllabus K-10 is in draft form. It is expected to be issued to all Government schools in 1986. I am prepared to make a copy available to the member on a confidential basis.
- (2) Not applicable.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS: COMMERCIAL TRIBUNAL

Membership

300. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) What members from tribunals are currently being considered for incorporation under the Commercial Tribunal legislation?
- (2) When is it anticipated that the consequent changes in these boards or tribunals will be made?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The matter is under consideration.
- (2) When the enabling legislation, currently being drafted, is passed.

HEALTH: AIDS

Patients

301. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Health:

How many patients are currently being treated in Western Australian hospitals for AIDS?

Mr HODGE replied:

None.

SPORT AND RECREATION

America's Cup Festival of Sport: Government Commitment

302. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

(1) What commitment has the Government given to the America's Cup Festival of Sport?

(2) What commitment has the Government given to the Paul Gadenne concert to be conducted at the time of the America's Cup?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) None.

(2) The arrangements between Paul Gadenne and the Government are privy to the parties concerned.

MINERALS: IRON ORE

South Down: Development

303. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

Has the Government received any proposals for the development of the South Down iron ore deposit near Albany?

Mr PARKER replied:

The proponents of the South Down magnetite project will need to conduct an exploration drilling programme followed by feasibility studies and market research before it would be appropriate to submit a development proposal to the Government.

Information available at this stage is based on surface sampling following magnetometer survey.

AMERICA'S CUP PROJECTS

Expenditure

304. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Will the Minister list the projects on which the \$7 648 404 capital expenditure was committed for America's Cup related projects?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The capital expenditure commitments are \$4 230 732 for construction of the northern boat harbour at Fremantle, \$1 087 672 for the project to upgrade the Fremantle Fishing Boat Harbour, and \$2 330 000 allocated to progress State Housing Commission projects at seven different locations in Fremantle.

HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

Study: Tourism Commission

305. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

(1) Is the Minister aware that in an article headed "Restaurants to undergo Examination" in the *Weekend News* of 11 May 1985, it was indicated that a pilot study had been carried out by the Western Australian Tourism Commission for \$10 000 into the hospitality industry?

(2) To what study does this refer?

(3) What is the nature and extent of the study?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) A pilot study was undertaken by the commission, in association with Hospitality West, to develop the most appropriate cost effective research methodology for a proposed major survey of Western Australia's hospitality industry, such survey to be undertaken by the hospitality industry.

EDUCATION

Aboriginal Access Programmes: Contribution

306. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) During the year ended 30 June 1985, how much did the State Government contribute to the Aboriginal Access Programmes referred to in question 203 of 22 August?
- (2) Have all those programmes been guaranteed funds to continue operation for the balance of the 1985 academic year?
- (3) Will all the same programmes be continued in 1986?

(4) If not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| (1) State contribution— | \$336 281 |
| Full-time salaries | \$143 272 |
| Part-time salaries | \$70 509 |
| Contingencies | \$122 500 |
- (2) Yes.
 - (3) Yes.
 - (4) Not applicable.

AMERICA'S CUP UNIT

Office Staff

307. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) How many people are currently employed in the America's Cup Unit office?
- (2) Will he list those people, their job descriptions and salary?
- (3) What was the total amount expended on the office during the year ended 30 June 1985?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) 8.
- (2)

Name	Job Description	Salary \$
Warren Pateman—		
General Manager		50 000
Ray Bird—Assistant		
General Manager		42 756
Jon Hedges—Admin-		
istration Co-ordinator		25 080
Judith Young—Prom-		
otions Co-ordinator		23 000
Lisa Cotton—Prom-		
otions Co-ordinator		20 000

Penny Buchan—Secretary	18 000
Deanne Biggs—Typist/Clerk	16 000
Lita Fernie—Typist/Clerk	14 120

- (3) The division's total expenditure, including promotional activities, for the year ended 30 June 1985, was \$556 453.

SPORT AND RECREATION: YACHTING

12 Metre Championships: Press Contingent

308. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) What arrangements are being made to accommodate the large contingent of media personnel who are expected to attend the World 12 Metre Championships in 1986?
- (2) What is it estimated that those facilities will cost?
- (3) Will any of these costs be recouped from the media?
- (4) How much is it estimated will be recouped?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Planning is well advanced for the use of the indoor hockey stadium building on Fremantle Port Authority land as the main facility for working media reporting on the world 12-metre championships and the America's Cup challenge from the start of the elimination series in October 1986 until the end of the deciding race in February 1987.
- (2) Cost estimates on work necessary to prepare the building for this use are currently being prepared by the Building Management Authority.
- (3) Media will meet their own costs for use of telephones, telex, facsimile transmission, and use of cables for television and radio transmission. It is anticipated that media will meet the cost of provision of dedicated office space should this be required.
- (4) No practical estimates can be prepared in advance of receipt of specific requests from media organisations for dedicated space.

TRANSPORT: AIR

International Flights

309. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is he aware that in January 1983 there were 30 international flights out of Perth each week servicing overseas destinations?
- (2) Is he also aware that as at today's date there are only 23 international flights from Perth each week servicing overseas destinations?
- (3) What has caused this decline in the number of flights serving Perth?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Primarily a decision by Qantas, in February 1983, to rationalise and reroute its European services from Perth through Singapore. Three weekly services Perth-Bombay were discontinued in favour of an additional weekly service to Singapore with ongoing connections. The weekly services Perth-Sydney were also reduced from four to two. In 1984, Singapore Airlines and Air India also removed a weekly service. The Singapore Airlines service is shortly to be reinstated and new services by other international airlines are proposed.

310. *Postponed.*

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Hamersley Range: Mining

311. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Will he please table the environmental review and management programme covering the decision by the Government to allow mining of the Hamersley Range National Park?
- (2) Will he please table the Environmental Protection Authority report upon the mining proposal for Hamersley Range National Park?
- (3) What is the Government management policy for national parks?
- (4) What is the—
 - (a) value of the resource to be mined;

(b) what royalties are expected to be collected by the State;

(c) what value and work is to be reinvested in national parks north of the 26th parallel?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes. I hereby table the document.
- (2) Yes. I hereby table the document.
- (3) The Government's management policy for national parks is to provide the best overall management possible within the resources available.
- (4) This question is a matter for response by my colleague the Minister for Minerals and Energy, and I suggest the member direct the question accordingly.

(See papers Nos. 121 and 122.)

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Swanbourne Hospital Site: Proposals

312. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government finalised what the future proposals are for the Swanbourne Hospital?
- (2) If so, what are the future plans for the Swanbourne Hospital?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) To retain some of the buildings for community purposes, and dispose of the balance of the area in stages for housing development.

HEALTH EDUCATION OFFICERS

School Visits

313. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have Health Education officers been stopped from visiting and giving health talks to schools?
- (2) If so, why?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) For the first time in Western Australia, a comprehensive health education syllabus for pre-primary through to year 10, developed jointly by the Health and Education Departments, will be issued to all schools throughout the State next year.

This has led to a joint policy between the two departments that health education should now be delivered by trained teachers. Health education officers will continue to provide ongoing professional support for classroom teachers by way of training workshops and the provision of materials, especially in the area of drug education. The health promotion branch of the Health Department is in fact liaising more than ever with the Education Department on an increasingly wide range of subjects.

Even with the 40 per cent increase in the number of health education officers appointed since this Government assumed office, it is considered to be much more effective for teachers to deliver health education than by the occasional periodic visits which could be provided by health education officers.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Australind: Commencement

314. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is the anticipated commencement date for the high school to be built in the Australind area?
- (2) Where will the high school be built in the Australind area?
- (3) Will this high school be a district high school or a senior high school?
- (4) Will the high school start at Year 8 only the first year and include Year 9 the next year, and so on?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (4) The matter of provision, location, and method of commencement of a school to serve the area is still under investigation.

DRAINAGE: BENDER SWAMP ADVISORY BOARD

Membership

315. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Who are the members that make up the Bender Swamp Advisory Board?
- (2) Has the advisory board met since its formation?

- (3) When was the Bender Drainage Board closed down?
- (4) When will the management plan be released for the Bender Swamp?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Appointments to the Bender Swamp Advisory Committee have not been finalised.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) 1 March 1985.
- (4) It is anticipated that the Department of Conservation and Land Management will release a draft management plan in March 1986, with the final plan being ready in September 1986.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Pleasure Craft: Sewage Tanks

316. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Health:

Will he amend proposed waste disposal regulations requiring pleasure craft to fit sewage tanks so that they allow for—

- (a) handling sewage only;
- (b) exempting existing craft not designed to have these tanks fitted;
- (c) a phasing-in period so boat builders can amend their designs to cater for the proposals?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (a) to (c) The proposed Health Act (Waste Disposal from Vessels) Regulations have not yet been presented to me for consideration. They are in draft form and are being considered by interested organisations in conjunction with my department. The member's points will be drawn to their attention.

YOUTH: CARNARVON COMMUNITY YOUTH CENTRE

Funding

317. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) Has he received a submission for funds for the Carnarvon Community Youth Centre?
- (2) As this youth centre has an excellent record of involving a large number of Carnarvon's young people and has assisted in reducing the juvenile crime

rate in the town, will he give consideration to supporting the centre financially?

- (3) When can the youth centre expect a reply to its submission?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) Yes. The centre has already received a youth development grant of \$6 000 for 1985.
 (3) The Carnarvon Youth Centre submission for a further grant will be considered along with other youth development grant applications, and a final response will be forwarded to the youth centre committee as soon as this process is complete in mid to late December.

WORKS: BUILDING MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Mr Shaun Fagin: Employment

318. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Works:

Further to question 3617 of 4 July 1985, in which he indicated that Mr Shaun Fagin was no longer employed by the Building Management Authority, can he now advise when Mr Fagin's employment was terminated?

Mr McIVER replied:

Mr. Shaun Fagin's employment with the Public Works Department ceased on 24 October 1984.

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Ningaloo Reef Marine Park: Advisory Committee

319. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Has the advisory committee on the proposed Ningaloo Reef Marine Park been established?
 (2) If "Yes", who are the members and what interests do they represent?
 (3) Have representations been made to extend the interests represented on the committee?
 (4) What interests have indicated that they will not be adequately represented on the committee?
 (5) Is it intended to try to accommodate these interests?

- (6) (a) Has the committee met;
 (b) if so, when and where?
 (7) What further meetings are proposed?
 (8) Is it intended to have any further public input prior to legislating to establish the Ningaloo Reef Marine Park.
 (9) Is it intended that legislation will be introduced in this current session of Parliament for the establishment of the marine park?
 (10) Has he referred to the advisory committee for consideration his commitments to me in the Parliament (question 3612 of 4 July 1985) that he is prepared to reconsider the two issues of the size and location of the proposed sanctuary area and the location of the proposed northern boundary?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) (a) Dr B. R. Wilson FTS—Chairman (CALM)
 Councillor D. Bathgate (Exmouth Shire)
 Councillor B. Teede (Carnarvon Shire)
 Mr Rick French
 Ms Lane Lefroy
 Mr Harry Baxter
 Mr Bryant Stokes.
 (b) It was decided to establish a small committee of people with special knowledge of the area and/or the subject of marine park management. It is not intended that the committee members should represent any special interest groups for to do that would require the proverbial cast of thousands. Instead, it is envisaged that the committee should be a group of informed people around which a variety of other consultative processes can be built. It is expected that the shire nominees will have a special role in this regard.
 (3) Yes.
 (4) Amateur angling interests.
 (5) These and other interests will be accommodated, not by membership of the committee, but by participation in workshops and meetings arranged by the committee.

- (6) (a) Yes;
 (b) in the Exmouth Shire Office; 20 and 21 August.
- (7) Approximately quarterly. Next meeting in Carnarvon, mid-October.
- (8) Yes. A revised draft of the management plan, which takes account of public submissions previously received, will be made available for public comment later this year. Also, a range of special meetings with individuals and special interest groups will be held during the next few months.
- (9) No. The marine park will be gazetted under existing legislation.
- (10) Yes. The EPA, in its recommendations to the Government in 1984, recommended that the matter of zoning of the marine park should be reviewed. That recommendation was passed on to the department, which is also reconsidering the location of the northern boundary. Both matters were discussed at the first meeting of the advisory committee; a copy of the minutes of that meeting can be made available to the member if he wishes.

320. *Postponed.*

TOURISM

Holiday WA Centre: Merlin Centre

321. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Does the Western Australian Tourism Commission still occupy premises in the Merlin Centre?
- (2) What was the original lease term and rental for this property?
- (3) Has there been any change to these original conditions and, if so, what are the details?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Lease term—5 years and 9 months; rent free.
- (3) No.

TOURISM

Regional Travel Associations

322. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) How many Regional Travel Associations are there in the State?
- (2) What financial assistance is provided by the Western Australian Tourism Commission to each of these associations?
- (3) Is it intended to make funds available to these organisations to employ consultants?
- (4) How much will be made available to each association for this purpose?
- (5) Will each association be able to make its own decision on the choice of a consultant?
- (6) Will any direction be given by the commission as to which consultants should be appointed?
- (7) Are any of the Regional Travel Associations currently employing consultants, and if so—
- (a) which associations are involved;
- (b) which consultants are employed in this way; and
- (c) what remuneration is being paid to the consultant or consultants?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Nine.
- (2) Current policy provides for an annual grant of \$7 000.
- (3) No.
- (4) to (6) Not applicable.
- (7) The commission is unaware of any existing consultancy arrangements by regional travel associations.

323. *Postponed.*

SPORT AND RECREATION: FOOTBALL

Victorian League Grand Final: Ministers Attending

324. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) How many Ministers attended the Victorian Football League Grand Finals in—
- (a) 1983;
- (b) 1984?

- (2) Of those Ministers, how many attended in an official capacity?
- (3) How many will be attending this year's Victorian Football League Grand Final?

The SPEAKER: This question is out of order.

MR D. de V. HUNT

Employment

325. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) When was Mr D. de V. Hunt employed in his department?
- (2) What were his salary, duties and conditions of employment (e.g. permanent, temporary, part-time, etc) at the time when he was first employed?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Mr D. de V. Hunt is not employed in the Electoral Department. He is employed as a projects officer currently assigned to assist with the Western Australian Parliament Week Programme.
- (2) Details of his first employment were provided in answer to question 536. However, as from 27 September 1984 Mr Hunt has been employed, under contract, as a projects officer under conditions similar to a temporary public servant.

ELECTORAL

Habitation Indexes: Preparation

326. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) Are Habitation Indexes already prepared for all or any electoral districts?
- (2) If not, when are they going to be prepared?
- (3) Will, or are, Habitation Indexes sold by the Chief Electoral Officer or the Government Printer?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes—for use as working documents by the Electoral Department.
- (2) Not applicable.

- (3) These indexes are not sold at present, nor is sale in future contemplated. Clause 8 of the Electoral Amendment Bill 1985 proposes new arrangements.

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL

Absentee Voters

327. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

Has his department made any calculations or projections as to the number of—

- (a) itinerant; and
 - (b) absentee voters,
- to be expected in Western Australia should the Electoral Act Amendment Bill 1985 pass?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (a) and (b) No. People are entitled to enrol as itinerant or absentee electors for Commonwealth elections and should also be entitled to become State electors. The entitlement to enrolment is more important than the number of people involved.

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL

Absentee Voters

328. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) Is there any State or Territory in Australia where the concept of—

- (a) itinerant voter;
- (b) absentee voter,

similar to as described in clause 5 of the Bill to amend the Electoral Act and introduced recently, exists?

- (2) If so, which are the States?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) Victoria has provisions similar to the Commonwealth in respect of itinerant and overseas electors.

The Northern Territory automatically takes on board Commonwealth electoral enrolment legislation by the operation of the Northern Territory Self Government Act. Thus I believe the itinerant and overseas elector provisions apply there.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

Appointment: Non-members of Parliament

329. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

Is he officially supporting as Australian Labor Party policy the Australian Democrats' announced policy that non-members of Parliament could be appointed as Ministers with the approval of both Houses?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Members of the Australian Labor Party share a deep commitment to democratic responsible Government, which means that ultimately the electors, voting at a fair election, determine who shall hold power. The Government therefore does not support the indirect appointment of non-members of Parliament as Ministers.

ENERGY: GAS

Sales Agreement: Publication

330. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

Has the North West Gas Sales Agreement statement (issued by him recently) been prepared and published on the recommendation of the State Energy Commission?

Mr PARKER replied:

The report was prepared under my direction and supervision following the completion of negotiations with the joint venture participants leading to the alteration of arrangements under the gas sales agreement. Several senior officers of the State Energy Commission were involved in drafting the statement, but the final document was written, delivered, and authorised by me.

HOUSING

Community Housing Extension Programme: Allocations

331. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Housing:

Would he detail the allocation of money under the Community Housing Extension Programme, and the sourcing (such as Community Housing Extension Programme, State, State

Housing Commission, Private, etc.) of the total allocation to each applicant in Western Australia?

Mr WILSON replied:

There is no such programme existing in Western Australia.

332 and 333. *Postponed.*

WA GOVERNMENT HOLDINGS LTD

Subsidiaries

334. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

What are all the subsidiary companies of Western Australian Government Holdings Ltd?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Western Australian Exim Corporation Ltd.

WA GOVERNMENT HOLDINGS LTD

Objectives

335. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

What are the current—

(a) objectives;

(b) categories of business activities, of Western Australian Government Holdings Ltd?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(a) and (b) Western Australian Government Holdings Ltd's objectives and categories of business activities involve the provision of commercial advice to Government on submissions received from industry and commerce seeking Government guarantees.

WA GOVERNMENT HOLDINGS LTD

WA Development Corporation: Subsidiary

336. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

(1) Is Western Australian Government Holdings Ltd a subsidiary of Western Australian Development Corporation?

(2) If so, are all shares held by Western Australian Development Corporation?

(3) If not, who are the shareholders?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

- (3) The Treasurer on behalf of the State of Western Australia.

337 and 338. *Postponed.*

PORTS AND HARBOURS: MARINA

Sorrento: Environmental Review and Management Programme

339. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Will he please list the matters raised in the environmental review and management programme on the proposed Sorrento boat harbour that do not have sufficient data or scientific evidence on which to make without-doubt decisions?
- (2) Will he please list the items recommended by the Environmental Protection Authority that need attention before—
 - (a) development proceeds; and
 - (b) that require management and other research?
- (3) What is the estimated total cost of developing Sorrento boat harbour—
 - (a) land;
 - (b) works;
 - (c) recurring maintenance;
 - (d) contingencies;
 - (e) any other associated costs?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Matters of environmental concern associated with the ERMP prepared for the Sorrento boat harbour proposal are contained in the EPA's report on the project, a copy of which has been sent to the member.
- (2) I refer the member to the recommendations made by the EPA in its report.
- (3) This question should be referred to the Minister for Transport as the proponent.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PRISONER: RONALD JOSEPH DODD

Minimum Security Prison

72. Mr MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of the report in today's edition of the *Daily News* that Ronald Joseph Dodd is being held in a minimum security institution pending his release on parole?
- (2) If the report is correct, is the placement considered appropriate in the present circumstances?
- (3) Will the Premier take up with the Attorney General, the Minister responsible for parole and prisons, the question of whether the placement should be changed?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) I have briefly looked at the story in the *Daily News* but have not seen the part to which the member refers.
- (2) and (3) I am happy to refer this matter to the Attorney General, but I suspect that substantially the same question has been referred to him in one form or another on four or five different occasions, either publicly by the Opposition or privately in my discussions with him.

I am happy to refer the question to the Attorney General, but I think he has already made a public statement setting out the facts of the case as they impact upon this particular question.

Mr Mensaros: The question concerned the placement of Dodd in a minimum security installation.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know what the Attorney General has had to say, so I do not want to contradict him. As I understand it, there is a normal procedure that has to be followed once a decision is made in respect of the incarceration or the release of a prisoner whose situation has been considered by the Parole Board. On that basis, I presume this minimum security installation period to which the member for Floreat refers is part of that procedure but I do not know because I have not discussed that with the Attorney General.

I am happy to refer the member's question to the Attorney General and to discuss it with him, but I cannot say that I have read the details of the story to which the member referred. I can only say that I have not discussed it with the Attorney General and I do not know what his thinking is in respect of that particular aspect.

I am not trying to avoid the question, but had the member referred it to me two hours ago, I might have had the opportunity to discuss with the Attorney the different aspects of the question that the member for Floreat has raised. But the member for Floreat did not do that and I am not in a position to answer him.

HEALTH: VACCINES

Free Supply

73. Mrs WATKINS, to the Minister for Health:

At a seminar earlier this month for community health nurses, the Minister indicated he had approached the Commonwealth with a view to making all vaccines free to overcome the present anomaly where a patient going to a health clinic gets free immunisation, but someone choosing to go to his own doctor must pay.

Can the Minister please advise if he has yet received a response to his approach and, if so, the substance of that reply?

Mr HODGE replied:

We do presently have the anomalous situation where, while some commonly-used immunising agents are free at Health Department and local authority clinics, parents preferring to go to their local doctors must collect a prescription, pick up the vaccine from the pharmacist—and thus incur the prescription charge—and return to the surgery for vaccination. This seems particularly discriminatory at a time when health authorities in Western Australia and elsewhere in Australia are trying to overcome public lethargy about vaccination and encourage more parents to have their children vaccinated.

I am pleased to advise that the Federal Health Minister, Dr Neal Blewett, has acknowledged the WA Government's concern. He has asked the next meeting of the National Health and Medical Research Council—the foremost health advisory body in Australia—to consider whether it is in the best interests of public health to amend the National Health Act and make all immunising agents free.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Australian Land and Cattle Co: Forfeiture

74. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

On Tuesday, 20 August, I asked the Minister whether he had had discussions with the Australian Land and Cattle Co regarding acquisition of pastoral leases by them, and the Minister replied that he had not. Today I asked the Minister whether he had met with Mr Crutcher, Mr McManus, Mr Jennings, and Mr Levy on 12 July 1985 in order to discuss the forfeiture of the Australian Land and Cattle Co leases, to which the Minister answered, "Yes." I now ask the Minister if he has deliberately misled the House?

Mr McIVER replied:

It is a fact that I did have meetings with the people, as outlined by the member for Katanning-Roe. I will have to check the dates he has mentioned but discussions were held with the people he mentioned; and I am waiting for further information from those people in relation to the forfeiture of the ALCCO leases. Up until now I have had no information whatsoever.

EDUCATION: STUDENTS

Safety

75. Mr TROY, to the Minister for Education:
- Would the Minister please advise if he has received representation regarding the safety of students at the Mt Helena Primary School and Eastern Hills Senior High School, brought about by traffic movements at school commencement and school closure times? Furthermore, would the Minister

please outline what developments, if any, have occurred since such a representation.

Mr PEARCE replied:

I am grateful to the member for Mundaring for asking that question because it enables me in part to set the record straight in respect of a question that was asked in the Legislative Council by Hon. Norman Moore. He asked a similar question of the Minister for Transport about the road difficulties in the area near the schools and he received a reply that was a touch misleading. The Minister for Transport is not responsible for this area, and hence he was unaware that a considerable amount of action had been taken to try to overcome the problems that exist there.

Quite simply, the situation is that an access road leads from a shire road past the Mt Helena Primary School and the Eastern Hills Senior High School through to a joint shire-Education Department facility—a gymnasium and associated facilities. The traffic movement along that road and through the parking area has caused some considerable problems.

I have been there on two occasions with the member for Mundaring to have a look at that situation and see the ways in which it might be resolved. The member for Mundaring convened a meeting of Education Department and shire officials last year to try to sort out some interim arrangements whereby any potential dangers to children might be minimised before a long term solution could be undertaken. Those interim traffic arrangements were set in place.

Earlier this year I went back with the member for Mundaring and looked at those arrangements once again. Following the earlier meeting, the Shire of Mundaring undertook to do its own traffic design for the road entrance where the access road, which is on Education Department property, comes out onto the main road system.

We are still waiting for that design to come back to us before we can make final decisions. Although this is a difficult problem that will require co-

operative efforts between the shire and the Education Department to overcome, the fact of the matter is that a considerable number of representations have been made on this issue—all by the member for Mundaring who has acted with speed and efficiency to help overcome this problem. When we have the design proposals from the Shire of Mundaring, it may well be that this problem will be overcome permanently.

WILDLIFE: FLORA

Rare: Harvesting

76. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

I refer to the colony of rare flora, *Acacia guinetii* at the Hamersley property at Glenfield, Geraldton. Further to question 82 of 21 August, does the Minister condone the taking of samples of rare flora from private property before finalisation of compensation?

Mr DAVIES replied:

No, not as a general rule, but I do not think people have rights to the exclusion of everybody else when they have something that is rare, and it is required in connection with the preservation of part of our native flora. While this is generally not something that this Government would applaud, I believe there are circumstances when it needs to be done.

SPORT AND RECREATION: DISABLED PERSONS

Government's Commitment

77. Mrs HENDERSON, to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

Can the Minister give details of the Government's commitment to sporting activities for the disabled in Western Australia?

Mr WILSON replied:

The WA Disabled Sports Association received sports Instant Lottery grants totalling \$4 997 for the year ended May 1985. This money has been allocated for sporting equipment which will ultimately give the State's

disabled sportsmen and women the opportunity to participate and compete in a growing number of sporting activities.

The Government has also fully funded a sports development officer for the association to the value of \$24 000 per annum for a three year period.

Our commitment to the disabled in this State through sports funding will help those already actively involved in disabled sports and provide increased facilities and opportunities for new participants.

CRIME: RIOT

Mullewa: Report

78. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services;

- (1) Has he called for a police report on the incident which occurred in Mullewa last Saturday evening?
- (2) If so, has he received the report?
- (3) What action has he taken on the report?
- (4) Will the report be made public?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) to (4) I have been in regular consultation with the Acting Commissioner of Police and other senior officers since the incidents in Mullewa on Saturday night. I have not called for a formal written report as such, but, as I have mentioned, I have been fully informed. I am advised that the police have the situation in Mullewa under control, and I suspect that events in the next couple of days will involve an influx of people into Mullewa.

There is no report to be made public.

PLANNING: HIGH-RISE DEVELOPMENT

Scarborough

79. Mr BURKETT, to the Minister for Planning:

In view of the comments made by the City of Stirling as reported in the *Stirling Times* of 27 August 1985, does the Government support further high-rise development on the land in the special beach zone development

between Scarborough Beach Road, Brighton Road, West Coast Highway, and the Esplanade at Scarborough?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The simple answer to that question is no, the Government does not support high-rise development on the Scarborough beachfront. It never has and it never will.

Mr MacKinnon: Chinese restaurants!

Mr PEARCE: I was particularly astounded to read the comments attributed to the council in respect of some of its decisions, because district planning scheme No. 2, the papers for which I have asked the council to send me—they still have not done so—to resolve a different issue, specifically provided for a special development zone along that beachfront with a height restriction of three storeys.

Mr Court: Hang on, this is one of the special projects that your Premier puts out in your releases all the time. He says, "This is one of the big deals we have done—high rises in Scarborough."

Mr Burkett: I am talking about the land between Scarborough Beach Road, the West Coast Highway, and the Esplanade, Tricky Dicky. It is not a leadership challenge at this point of time, so you can quieten down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MacKinnon: You are not challenging for leadership at the moment?

Mr PEARCE: He would be the only one who is not, in that case. The Government does not support further high-rise development on the Scarborough beachfront and there is no reason that the City of Stirling should be considering high-rises going in that area at all because district planning scheme No. 2 specifically allows for a height restriction of three storeys on developments in that special development zone. It is the case that some flexibility is allowed on that three-storey height limit provided that the developments fit in with the general nature of other developments in that area. Certain provisions are laid down with regard to aesthetic appeal and the like; that is to say, in a total scheme for that

area it would be possible for the council, for example, to allow one building of four storeys—

Mr Rushton: How can you sustain one only when the zoning would allow that height for a few other features?

Mr PEARCE: Having a zoning which allows for a height of three storeys was the proposal of my predecessor Minister for Planning. Some flexibility was provided so the council could look at that zone as a whole rather than having to make a series of one-off decisions. I might add that it was never intended by the Government that that flexibility should allow the three-storey limit to be reviewed. The City of Stirling is now talking about those five or seven additional tower developments along the Scarborough beachfront.

Mr Rushton: One only, a privilege.

Mr PEARCE: In that case, let us have this out. Is the member for Dale saying that he, on behalf of the Opposition, supports five or seven beachfront tower developments on the Scarborough beachfront?

Mr MacKinnon: Tell us where you stand, for a change.

Mr PEARCE: I am telling the House I am opposed to it.

Mr Court: Why does your Premier say this is the best thing since sliced bread?

Mr PEARCE: The Premier does not say this is the best thing since sliced bread. That is sheer nonsense.

Mr Court: It is in your publication.

Mr PEARCE: I make two things clear to the member for Scarborough and this House. Firstly, we do not support further high-rise development on the Scarborough beachfront. I understand from the comments made by the member for Mt Lawley last night that that is not the position taken by the Opposition; that is to say, were it to become the Government they would be supportive of an additional five to seven multistoreyed towers along the Scarborough beachfront. There is no denial of that at all.

Mr Clarko: Didn't your Premier say he was opposed to high-rise buildings in that area? I am not attacking you, but I am

simply saying that having said he would not support a high-rise building, his Government approved the 17-storey building that is there now.

Mr PEARCE: The Government did not approve of the 17-storey building. The Government could not prevent it under the provisions of the Stirling district planning scheme No. 1.

Mr Clarko: Scheme No. 1 had no height requirements in it.

Mr Parker: That was the second scheme.

Mr Cash: Planning scheme No. 2, as you well know, still allows for a 10 or 12-storey building if it complies with certain aesthetic requirements. You are the Minister who is about to sign this scheme, so be very careful.

Mr PEARCE: No, I am not. That is precisely where we come to the second aspect of this question, because the second planning scheme allows for a height restriction of three storeys, with some flexibility.

Mr Cash: Explain the flexibility you are talking about because the flexibility I know of allows for 10 storeys.

Mr PEARCE: There is no mention of 10 storeys.

Mr Burkett: Not in the area of land between Brighton, Scarborough Beach Road, and the Esplanade, and you know that.

Mr PEARCE: The relevant section of the scheme reads as follows—

Development within this zone shall be restricted to three storeys in height. However, the council may permit a relaxation of the height requirements if it is satisfied that the proposed development does not have an adverse effect on the amenity, density and character of the area and be considered to be consistent with the objectives of the zone.

I would not read that as permitting five to seven high-rise towers along that area of the foreshore. If it is true that the City of Stirling, through one of its spokespeople here, is now saying that it reads that section to mean it is possible to have five to seven high-rise towers along the foreshore at Scarborough, I will not sign the

scheme with that clause in it until it is written in such a way as to make it perfectly clear that there will not be five to seven high-rise towers along that area of the foreshore, the special development area and, furthermore, that it can never be interpreted to mean that this kind of thing could be contemplated.

Mr Clarko: You have already agreed to three in the one that is there now.

Mr Trethowan: You are in the business of creating commercial monopolies, are you?

Mr PEARCE: No, but we are not in the business of creating a kind of Surfers Paradise down on the beachfront either. I make it perfectly clear that the Government will not countenance high-rise development along the Scarborough beachfront in the way that is contemplated by the City of Stirling, and if it is a fact that there needs to be further amendment to district planning scheme No. 2 in order to prevent that situation, I will not sign the scheme until those amendments are made.

ROAD: BYPASS

Boulder

80. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

Could the Minister advise what action he has taken to overcome problems associated with the Boulder eastern bypass road?

Mr GRILL replied:

I thank the member for Kalgoorlie for some notice of his question. The long-standing problem has now been solved.

Mr Hassell: He should have whispered this in his ear.

Mr Taylor: We want you all to know the facts.

Mr GRILL: Work costing \$330 000 will start in October to extend the bypass by 2.6 kilometres between Hainault and Boorara Roads. The work will take about three months and will be done by Boulder Shire Council's workforce.

The project was given the go-ahead after agreement was reached between the Mains Roads Department, Boulder Shire Council, North Kalgurli Mines, and other mining interests on the alignment of the bypass through North Kalgurli's lease areas.

The MRD will provide \$234 500 towards the project and Boulder Shire Council will contribute \$95 500.

The extension is part of a plan to provide a bypass link from Kambalda Road to Broad Arrow Road.

The State Government recognises the need to alleviate traffic problems in the area caused by heavy haulage vehicles using residential streets.

Discussions will begin soon between the MRD, Boulder Shire Council, and the Kalgoorlie Town Council on construction of the section of the bypass between Boorara Road and Broad Arrow Road. This section will involve construction of a bridge over the Australian National Railway line.

It is hoped to complete the section between Boorara Road and Broad Arrow Road over two financial years starting in 1986-87, subject to the availability of funds.

The major benefit of the eastern bypass route will be to direct heavy haulage vehicles travelling between Kambalda Road and Broad Arrow Road away from residential streets. Piccadilly Street north of Maritana Street will benefit particularly.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Staff Charges

81. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it true that part of the trade-off for granting wages staff, including nurses in WA hospitals a 38-hour week, was to ask those people to pay more for their meals and car parking fees?

(2) Is it also true that those increased charges have been applied to salaried staff in hospitals, even though those persons derived no benefit from the trade-off?

(3) Will he either return the charges to their former level as far as salaried officers are concerned, or agree to the

request of the Hospital Salaried Officers Association for flexible working hours and accrued time in lieu?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) to (3) As part of the package of trade-offs negotiated with both the Royal Australian Nursing Federation and the Hospital Service and Miscellaneous Workers Union, it was agreed that the Government would increase meal charges, institute parking charges, and institute charges for tea. There were a number of other important trade-offs as well.

Mr Thompson: Those people were given the benefit from the trade-offs?

Mr HODGE: That is correct. We made a decision, at the time, of looking at the prices being charged for meals, accommodation, tea, and parking. We decided there was justification, on economic grounds, for increasing those charges for all hospital workers. The charge for a three-course meal in most hospitals was about \$1.30. Parking was not charged for at most hospitals, and tea was free. We decided to introduce a charge of 50 cents a week for tea, \$1 a week for parking, and to increase the price of a three-course meal from \$1.30 to \$2.50.

Mr Hassell: That was a ministerial decision, was it?

Mr HODGE: It was ratified by the Government and went to the Industrial Relations Commission.

The decision was made to apply it to all workers from the highest level of administration staff, salaried staff, and doctors, to the lowliest workers. I am sure all members of this House agree that those charges are modest and very reasonable for these days.

The dispute with the Hospital Salaried Officers Association really has nothing to do with those charges at all. Those increases can stand on their own merit. One only has to consider the price of food and parking these days to realise how modest and reasonable those charges are.

The problem with the Hospital Salaried Officers Association is that, over the years, its members have had a nexus with the Public Service. Public

servants recently were given flexible working hours provided they could comply with certain criteria laid down by the Public Service Board. The Hospital Salaried Officers Association, unfortunately, has great difficulty in meeting those criteria and does not want to negotiate under the guidelines laid down for public servants. Apparently, it seeks to break the nexus with public servants that its members have had for 30 or 40 years. That is the crux of the dispute.

I think the association has to decide whether, in future, it wants its officers to align their conditions with hospital workers in the hospital industry or whether it wants to align their conditions with public servants as it has done for the past 30 years or so. For the last 30 years its members have enjoyed a 37½-hour week, and only recently have other hospital workers got their hours down to a 38-hour week.

DEFENCE: CONTRACTS

Local Bids

82. Mrs BUCHANAN, to the Deputy Premier:

What has the State Government done to encourage local industry to bid more effectively for defence contracts?

Mr BRYCE replied:

I can tell by the look on the face of the Leader of the Opposition that he cannot wait to hear the answer. Defence contracting offers an important means of building up the State's manufacturing base. I am listening to hear the Leader of the Opposition say, "Hear, hear!"

Mr Hassell: If it was not so dreadfully dull, we could bear it.

Mr BRYCE: I am very pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that he thinks that what is happening with defence contracting is terribly dull.

Mr Hassell: You are dull.

Mr BRYCE: I have been called many things in this place, and I have dished out a few compliments over the years. However, I have never bothered very much with any of the compliments that have been exchanged. That is a

first, though. Nobody has ever really accused me of being dull, either in a personality sense—the Leader of the Opposition knows personality just oozes out of the Deputy Premier—or whether he is referring to my intellectual capability, which he knows not to be true. The Leader of the Opposition is not entitled to accolades for originality.

Returning to the answer, this will occur not only through increased workloads for developing industries such as electronics and specialist engineering, but also as a result of an upgrading of technology and workforce skills.

Members of the House will be aware that defence contracting entails observance of rigorous standards of design and production.

I am pleased to inform members that the Department of Industrial Development and the Technology Development Authority have taken major steps to advance the defence contracting performance of Western Australian industry.

The Canberra office of the Department of Industrial Development is functioning outstandingly as a channel for information between relevant State and Federal Departments. Western Australia is better informed than ever before of developments in industry, commerce, technology, and defence.

I remind the Leader of the Opposition and some of his front-bench colleagues about the significance of the decision to transfer the old-fashioned expeditor to Canberra from Sydney. He was installed in Sydney by the Court Government nearly 10 years ago, and everybody forgot about him.

Mr Court: Did you agree with that decision?

Mr BRYCE: No, we thought it was a great big publicity stunt. It was a job for the boys.

Mr MacKinnon: Why don't you tell that to all the people who use his services?

Mr BRYCE: No-one knew he existed. Ten years later, when we did a review of the Department of Industrial Development

we discovered the expeditor on the other side of the continent. It became perfectly obvious in 1984 that there was a real need to lift our game in Western Australia in respect of defence contract work, and it was more sensible to have our department redefine the task and the objectives of the once so-called expeditor in Sydney. We relocated him to Canberra where he now heads the Canberra office of the Department of Industrial Development.

He has the basic responsibility of channeling information to Western Australian industrial leaders in respect of the submarine contract and also, and more particularly, providing information to leaders of industry in manufacturing industries in Western Australia who are very keen to get on top of the very complicated process of contracting for defence work.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: CANNING CITY COUNCIL

Re-election: Eligibility

83. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is he aware that the City of Canning Council has been directed to hold a further council election following a recent magisterial decision that one of the candidates was ineligible to stand as a councillor because he did not meet the requirements to be a councillor in that he was not an Australian citizen?
- (2) Is he further aware that the magistrate stated that it was not the responsibility of the returning officer to ascertain whether candidates meet the various requirements of the Local Government Act?
- (3) In the light of this information, does the Minister intend to take any steps designed to overcome situations such as this which seriously waste the money and energies of both the legitimate candidates and the council.

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) I am aware of the court case which has recently been concluded relating to the Canning City Council May election in which two candidates were found to

be not eligible to stand as candidates. There is also another case currently before the courts relating to the mayoral election in the City of Canning which has some points of similarity to the one that has just been dealt with.

- (2) It is true that the magistrate quite rightly pointed out that the returning officer does not have the power to refuse a nomination that is made on the grounds that a particular candidate may not be eligible. I have called for a full copy of the comments made by the magistrate.
- (3) Departmental officers and myself will examine those comments to see whether a change to the Act may be appropriate. I am happy to advise the member for Karrinyup of the results of such consideration once that has been undertaken.

ROAD: MANDURAH-PINJARRA

Upgrading

84. Mr READ, to the Minister for Transport:

When will stage one of the upgrading of the Mandurah-Pinjarra Road occur?

Mr GRILL replied:

Stage one of the upgrading of the Mandurah-Pinjarra Road will start this financial year.

The work is part of an overall plan to convert the road to a four-lane dual carriageway.

The total cost of the project will be about \$5 million, and will include the duplication of the bridges over the Serpentine and Murray Rivers. Because the cost is so high, construction will need to be staged over a number of years.

It is logical to start with the section near Mandurah that takes the heaviest traffic.

The first stage will involve the construction of two kilometres of second carriageway from the Mandurah bypass to near the Barragup Bridge at a cost of about \$450 000. Traffic over this area averages between 6 600 and 8 000 vehicles a day.

An amount of \$100 000 has been allocated in this year's works budget to allow an early start to be made. The first stage is expected to be completed next financial year.

The second section will involve the duplication of the Barragup Bridge over the Serpentine River and extension of the dual carriageway 5.8 kilometres to Old Mandurah Road. Planning for that is being done now. The work will cost about \$1.9 million. Traffic volumes on this section average between 5 500 and 6 000 vehicles a day.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES: TRANSFERS

Removals

85. Mr WATT, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) Has the Government advertised for tenders for the removal of all Government employees' furniture and effects within Western Australia?
- (2) Are the tenders due to close tomorrow?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that the removal of Government employees' furniture and effects represents a large share of the business of many small country furniture removalists?
- (4) As many country removalists were unaware of the advertisement, will he consider delaying the close of tenders to allow the smaller contractors to make representation to the Government on this matter.
- (5) Is there any evidence that the present system of obtaining two or three competitive quotes has failed?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) to (5) I thank the member for Albany for some notice of his questions. I indicate to him that the tender that has been called relates to the work to be done for the transfer of teachers within the education system. It does not apply across all Government departments, as I understand it. As the Minister responsible for the Tender Board I share some responsibility in this area with the Minister for Education.

The Minister for Education and I met a number of representatives of companies involved in this industry about this day last week. They drew our attention to the impending closing date for this tender and to some of their concerns. We undertook to examine those concerns. The Minister for Education and I will hold another meeting with those interested operators in the next day or so.

Mr Watt: You have extended the date, have you?

Mr BRYCE: Not yet, no. Tenders are due to close tomorrow. I am thinking about that right now. I have not made a decision. I have only this afternoon received a memo setting out a number of the circumstances. I remind the member for Albany that this Government took a fairly major step in changing the procedure so that teachers in Western Australia would no longer be compelled to shift their furniture by Westrail. About 18 months ago our Government made that decision.

The Education Department has had some previous experience with the new system. It has now decided that it would like to change course in some facets of the tender. We will reconsider the matter tomorrow. We have already met with those people who are concerned about the matter. In the next day or so the Minister for Education and I will meet with them again.

HEALTH: WOMEN'S HEALTH IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

Conference

86. Mrs BEGGS, to the Minister for Health:

I am advised that a major national conference on "Women's Health in a Changing Society" is to be held in Adelaide next week. Can the Minister advise whether Western Australia is supporting this obviously important conference?

Mr HODGE replied:

The member is referring to a conference organised as part of the activities for the United Nations Decade of Women which began in 1975.

The conference will be held in Adelaide from 4 to 7 September, and it has attracted both international and national speakers on the important subject of "Women's Health in a Changing Society".

I am pleased to advise that the Western Australian Government has contributed \$10 000 to the operating costs of the conference—costs which include whole or part subsidies for a substantial number of disadvantaged groups who would otherwise not be able to attend.

I understand there is every indication of a very successful and productive conference, and the Western Australian Government is pleased to be supporting it financially and by sending departmental delegates.

CHEMICALS: AMMONIA-UREA PLANT

Sites

87. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Can the Minister advise whether Bunbury or Kwinana are the sites preferred by the companies investigating establishing a urea plant in Western Australia?
- (2) Will the establishment of a urea producing plant in Western Australia mean that this new industry will require protection from urea dumped at world market prices?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) A number of companies have expressed interest in the proposed ammonia-urea plant in Western Australia. As I indicated today in answer to another member, I think in another place, the submissions closed last week. We are evaluating a number of submissions that were received. Certainly at least one submission, if not more, expressed interest in Bunbury as a potential site. Others expressed interest in other sites, including Kwinana.

I have always refrained from commenting on any preferred site. Although there has been some publicity in the south-west Press about potential sites, that publicity has emanated from a particular group that

has some interest in the matter and not from the Government. I make that point very clear.

Certainly there is interest in Bunbury as a potential site.

- (2) So far as the member's question is concerned it has some internal contradiction because by definition dumping cannot take place at world market prices. If the product is being sold on the world market it is not being dumped.

The creation of a urea plant in Western Australia would be to the advantage of urea consumers in this State.

Approximately one-third of the fertiliser produced at such a site would be used domestically in Western Australia and the rest would be sold on international markets. The urea would be produced at internationally competitive prices to compete with world market prices for urea. We would be getting homegrown urea produced at internationally competitive prices which would be a substantial advantage to the domestic consumers of urea in Western Australia.

