

Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Carol Martin; Dr Kim Hames; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Trevor Sprigg; Mr John Quigley;  
Mr John Castrilli; Mr Gary Snook

---

**Division 39: Indigenous Affairs, \$22 147 000 -**

Mr P.B. Watson, Chairman.

Mrs M.H. Roberts, Minister for Indigenous Affairs.

Mr L. McCulloch, Acting Director General.

Mr D. Ford, Director, Policy and Coordination.

Ms I. Hebron, Director, Heritage and Land.

Mr G. Kessar, Assistant Director of Finance and Administration.

Mr C. Vinci, Director, Business and Strategic Management.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I cannot state a specific budget item on which to base my question because I cannot find the appropriate one; therefore, I refer to the review of the department at page 703, which I understand was being undertaken. For how long has that review been progressing, when is it proposed that it will be finished and when will the minister announce the findings?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The reason that the member cannot find a line item is that the review is being done for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I think Dawn Casey, the chief executive officer of the Western Australian Museum, has conducted the review. I guess that she was appointed by the Premier. I understand that the report has gone to Mal Wauchope. The question about where it goes from here is probably more appropriately addressed to the Premier.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Does the minister have any idea when that was completed?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I understand that it has now been handed to Mal Wauchope, the CEO of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I think that occurred a month or so ago.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Given that the department is this minister's responsibility, has she been involved in the assessment of the department by providing information, and will she be involved in the decision-making process?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I have had some discussions with the Premier about it and I would anticipate that a cabinet minute will be developed on a response to the functional review that has occurred. I would expect to have full involvement as part of that process.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** I refer to the last dot point at page 707 of the *Budget Statements*. Can the minister tell the committee what is being done to ensure the government's response to the Gordon inquiry is following its course, and what has been achieved to date?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I thank the member for Peel for that question. As he is no doubt aware, following the Gordon inquiry this government committed \$75 million to implement initiatives from that report. A program of the evaluation - the outcomes and initiatives - is underway to examine the impact of the Gordon response. The phase 1 evaluation is expected to be completed by July this year. That evaluation will examine a range of case states - for example, Balgo and Dampier Peninsula - so that we can determine the benefits of the initiatives and strategies at a community level. We will then be able to identify whether the benefits are long-term outcomes. We are planning to have further evaluations beyond that. We want an evaluation completed by July this year.

In terms of implementing the commitments, they are either completed or well underway. For example, one area that I am particularly familiar with is the remote policing stations that are just about all completed. We are waiting on Warmun, which will probably be the last of the nine. In advance of that, I know that the police commissioner has allocated officers to Warmun who are working out of temporary accommodation. Previously Warmun was policed by the officers from Argyle. I was delighted to open some of those stations, such as Balgo. I know that the now Minister for Police and Emergency Services recently opened the police station on the Dampier Peninsula and some of the others. It is good news.

Twenty-eight child protection worker positions have been created, which is a \$12 million commitment over four years. Under the strong families initiatives, 13 coordinators have now been appointed, and that was a commitment of \$6.6 million over four years. Eight specialist domestic violence liaison officers, who are now called family protection coordinators, have been put in place at a cost of just under \$2 million over four years. Fifteen Aboriginal support worker positions have been created at a cost of \$5.1 million over four years. Place managers have been appointed at a cost of \$6 million over four years. A child interview unit has been fully established, strengthening the joint approach to child abuse investigations between WA Police and what was the

Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Carol Martin; Dr Kim Hames; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Trevor Sprigg; Mr John Quigley;  
Mr John Castrilli; Mr Gary Snook

---

then Department for Community Development. Legislative amendments have been enacted to enable courts to accept video interviews of those minors.

I am pleased that with the more recent announcements that I have made in conjunction with the commonwealth, quite clearly we are able to build on those initiatives. I am delighted that Mal Brough has recognised that the model we put in place for the multifunction police stations is a good one. I know that he has offered capital funding to other states and the Northern Territory on the proviso that they fund and staff the stations. I do not think the offer has been as welcome in those places. I have seen firsthand the fantastic difference of having a multifunction police facility in place. I went to Kintore, when the Northern Territory government opened the Kintore police station for which we provided a police officer to help staff the station to prevent the cross-jurisdiction issues of charging people within the Central Land. Kiwirrkurra, which is on the Western Australian side of the border, is only 60 to 80 kilometres from Kintore, which is close in terms of the Central Land. I must have visited Kintore three or four times in the lead-up to the opening of the police station. Now there is a crime rate in Kintore, when previously there was not because there were no police in the area. An indication of the success of the police station came from talking to health workers. They said that previously they experienced people, particularly women, presenting on a weekly basis with injuries from severe bashings with broken bones and lacerations, and since the police station has been in place they have been dealing with vastly minor incidents. The incident of severe harm being caused to somebody is becoming a rarity. Members can certainly see the difference it made at Kintore.

I am saddened to learn that in Kalumburu up to 10 people have been charged with child sex offences. If we did not have police officers at Kalumburu, nobody would have been charged. These are excellent initiatives and ideas that were well promoted by Sue Gordon and implemented successfully by government.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** The minister should not be surprised.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I guess that when police officers are put into some of these communities in the future, people will be charged. By and large the communities welcome this. The communities that do not currently have the multifunction police stations want them.

*Meeting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm*

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I refer to page 703, delivery of services. What is the reason for the reduction in the budget by roughly \$4 million from this year to next year? That is a nice easy question to start with!

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Which years is the member inquiring about?

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I am referring to the estimated actual for 2006-07 of \$26.020 million, and the budget estimate for 2007-08 of \$21.971 million. What is the reason for that reduction?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** There have been a number of reductions in various projects.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Which projects have been reduced?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** There is a reduction of \$4.049 million in total. The Gordon initiative has been reduced by \$1.626 million, Keating project approvals have been reduced by \$303 000, Dampier Archipelago has been reduced by \$330 000, the functional review implementation team - the shared services arrangement - has been reduced by \$480 000 -

**Dr K.D. Hames:** Is that reduction in FRIT good or bad?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** It could be either. So long as FRIT does the job it is supposed to do, it will be good. Multilateral Indigenous provision has been reduced by \$2.002 million, ALT capital works has been reduced by \$500 000, and the capital user charge has been abolished. That was \$13 000. Taking into account increases in funding, that adds up to \$4.049 million.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Does the minister have any concerns about that reduction?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** There are areas of concern. However, in other areas we are well up on what we are doing with the additional money that has been allocated. Therefore, I am not overly concerned.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** What bothers me is that in my last year as Minister for Indigenous Affairs, the budget was \$19 million. Seven years later, the budget has gone up by only \$2 million. When we consider the increasing cost of staff, the increasing demands, the increasing requirements of the department, and the continuing huge problems in Aboriginal communities, it seems to me that this department is suffering in comparison with other departments because of the limited increase in its budget. Last year, there was a reasonable progression from when we were in government. The budget has now dropped back to only \$2 million more.

Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Carol Martin; Dr Kim Hames; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Trevor Sprigg; Mr John Quigley;  
Mr John Castrilli; Mr Gary Snook

---

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** My focus is more on what each individual line agency department is spending in the area of Indigenous affairs. For example, as we discussed in the last division, the Department of Housing and Works has certainly renewed its focus on Indigenous issues and is doing more in this area, as is the Department of Education and Training and a range of other departments. Indeed, the Department of Child Protection is also expending more money in this area. A range of other departments have increased their delivery of essential services for Indigenous people. Therefore, I am not as concerned about the money being expended by the Department of Indigenous Affairs as I am about ensuring that the major agencies are spending money on the ground. The WA Police has also increased its funding for Indigenous affairs. During the last term of this government, we engaged an additional 40 Aboriginal police liaison officers. These are the kinds of practical, on-the-ground initiatives that can make a difference in Aboriginal communities. That has really been our focus.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** The role of this department has not changed, has it?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** This department has a variety of roles. Not all those roles are to do with providing a better quality for life for Indigenous people, which is certainly my focus.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** If the minister is not disappointed about that reduction in the budget, I will be disappointed for her.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I refer to page 709, the first dot point under "Major Initiatives For 2007-08". Can the minister provide some information about addressing gaps in local service delivery to Indigenous people by working collaboratively with regional organisations?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Is the member referring to the bilateral agreement?

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Yes.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** A range of initiatives have been undertaken under the bilateral agreement that was signed. That agreement established the priorities for intergovernmental cooperation and an enhanced effort in Indigenous affairs. We are now seeing the benefits of that partnership and cooperation between the commonwealth and the state. That agreement reiterated the priorities of the Council of Australian Governments; namely, early childhood intervention, safer communities, and building Indigenous wealth. It also establishes some key outcome areas in terms of law and order; safer places for people; skills, jobs and opportunities; healthy and strong people; sustainable environment, health and infrastructure; land and sea culture; strong leadership; and governance. A number of specific initiatives were implemented for joint action. These include an Indigenous economic development framework; a central desert region petrol sniffing strategy; improved processes and communications between governments in resolving native title matters; a commitment to a whole-of-government approach to support Indigenous art; a commitment to work together to improve government responsiveness to communities in crisis, with an initial focus on the Kalumburu community; a commitment to develop regional partnership agreements and shared responsibility agreements with Indigenous communities, and to monitor the outcomes achieved; the preparation of joint commonwealth-state administrative reporting and dispute resolution agreements; and shared administrative boundaries between commonwealth Indigenous coordinating centres and the Department of Indigenous Affairs. It allows for a collaborative approach between the commonwealth and the state.

[7.10 pm]

I am very pleased that the Department of Indigenous Affairs, together with some other government agencies that are now coordinating much better with us, has really made some advances in terms of that cooperation with the commonwealth. From my discussions with Mal Brough last week, I can certainly indicate that he is very pleased with the level of cooperation that he has received from this department and the state government. He is looking at it as a model for other states. There is potential this year to do some more cooperative arrangements that would require additional funding by the state government on a matched funds basis. We have already entered into agreements with him. This is very much a changed approach to working together, getting some good outcomes for communities and delivering real things - delivering things that actually matter. That has certainly been my focus. It is a focus that seems to have been welcomed by the commonwealth. The fact that we have the hostels being built in Halls Creek that will provide for kids who have been abused is just one example of something that will really make a difference.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Could the minister confirm whether the positives have outweighed anything that happened nine years ago?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Absolutely. The \$112 million package we announced last week is the biggest package of initiatives ever announced between the state and commonwealth governments. It involved some \$60 million from us and some \$51 million from the commonwealth. In addition, the commonwealth committed to a further \$15 million or \$16 million worth of initiatives for multifunction police facilities, which will mean significant

Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Carol Martin; Dr Kim Hames; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Trevor Sprigg; Mr John Quigley;  
Mr John Castrilli; Mr Gary Snook

---

recurrent ongoing costs for the state in staffing stations on a recurrent basis. I believe that one of those new stations will be in the member's electorate in Looma.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** So the government is not dipping into the trust funds to achieve an outcome?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** No.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** From my calculations of what was in the joint press release issued by the minister, the additional state government funds above what had already previously been announced amounted to about \$4.6 million a year. Is that correct?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** No, that is not correct. The press release spells it out. We had already announced - this was over and above any funding agreement that we had with the commonwealth, independent of any funding agreement - a \$36.6 million package for Halls Creek. We had already also announced \$6 million for Wiluna Remote Community School. If we add those two figures together, that is about \$42 million. Our part of the package added up to some \$60 million. The commonwealth agreed to acknowledge that the Western Australian government, unlike the other states and the Northern Territory, determined to prioritise these matters as we had put money upfront. We were the only state or territory, other than the Northern Territory which did Kintore Station, that had made a substantial contribution to putting in place multifunction police stations, for example. In addition, we promised the extra money for Halls Creek. The commonwealth gave additional money and identified Kalumburu as one of the places it wanted to see its share of the money spent. In my view, this will not be the end of it; there will be more.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** The minister's answer to my question is incorrect. She said I am wrong and then proceeded to explain exactly how I was right. The government previously announced funding of \$30 million or \$40 million.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Member, you are required to ask a question.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** This is not an opportunity for government members to snipe from their side. That is an opportunity for us to ask questions of the minister. That is how budgets work.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Member for Dawesville, I ask you to ask a supplementary question or I will give it as your main question. You are next on the list to ask a substantive question.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I would like to ask the minister a question based on the dot point at the bottom of page 703. It relates to Indigenous heritage and land access. Concerns have been expressed to me about regional heritage agreements. I do not necessarily expect the minister to know the answer to these questions. Obviously, they relate to details of specific heritage agreements in those communities, particularly if we look at areas such as Leonora-Laverton. If a mining company wishes to develop a mine or extend its mine in that area, under the Aboriginal Heritage Act there was a requirement for the mining company to employ an Aboriginal heritage consultant who would consult with the elders of the relevant Aboriginal communities for that area. There are generally four of them for that area - Koara, Wutha, Ngalia and Wongatha. Those are the four normal Aboriginal communities that would need to be consulted. Now we have regional heritage agreements in place that require that the mining company only has to go through the regional land body, in this case the Goldfields Land and Sea Council. The goldfields land council can, in effect, determine who needs to be consulted. I understand that those mining companies are undertaking Aboriginal heritage surveys with only two or three of those groups; not necessarily all four of the relevant Aboriginal groups that represent that area. Once that is done and the mining companies have got the agreement of that group, that group is then able to say that there are no areas of heritage significance in a particular area and a section 18 is not needed to approve it. The companies can get their approval to proceed to mining without consulting all the Aboriginal groups in the area. Has the minister had any concerns expressed to her by the Aboriginal groups? Is she aware that that is the current practice so that groups such as Ngalia, which tend to be a bit gnarly, can be left out of a consultation process on an area that affects its land?

**Ms I. Hebron:** The regional heritage protection agreements that the member referred to were developed by the Office of Native Title in response to the recommendations of the mineral tenements task force. Those agreements were primarily aimed at reducing the backlog of tenements, exploration and mining leases that were held by the Department of Industry and Resources. They were primarily aimed at overcoming Native Title Act future acts processes. They were not aimed at heritage protection agreements as such. The department's experience regarding those agreements is that very few of them, if any, have ever been used for the conduct of heritage surveys and that the matters coming before the department in relation to section 18 applications appear to be consulting with a wider group than the one group of the four groups that the member mentioned.

[7.20 pm]

Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Carol Martin; Dr Kim Hames; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Trevor Sprigg; Mr John Quigley;  
Mr John Castrilli; Mr Gary Snook

---

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I understand that what was said is correct. However, they are not going to the minister because no section 18 applications are being made. The correct Aboriginal groups are not being consulted throughout this process. Even groups who do not own the land are being consulted and they are saying that there is no heritage in the area and so there is no need to go to the department.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I am unaware of any Aboriginal groups raising that complaint with me or with the department. If the member is aware of any groups who have concerns with a particular development, I would be interested to know about them so that I can take up the issue.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I am happy to do that. It is happening. It is not the fault of either the Aboriginal Cultural Management Committee or the department; it is the fault of the process that was put in place to address the backlog. That is allowing the Goldfields Land and Sea Council to, in my view, circumvent the proper heritage process.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I would be grateful if the member provided me with some examples.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I refer to the seventh dot point under major achievements for 2006-07 on page 707 of the *Budget Statements*. I want information on the Saltwater Country Project, the Bungarun Cemetery Memorial Project and the Kimberley ranger initiative. I know that they are Kimberley projects. I would just like some more information on them.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The Caring for Country grants aim to fund on-the-ground land care and Caring for Country projects for Aboriginal people to provide incentives for Aboriginal people, communities and landholders to become involved in land care and in Caring for Country activities and to increase the capacity for Aboriginal landholders to manage their lands in a sustainable manner and to deal with environmental issues on Aboriginal land. The program has successfully implemented some 21 grants. The Department of Indigenous Affairs commissioned a feasibility study of the development of state natural and cultural resource management strategy for Indigenous lands. It also partnered with the state Natural Resource Management office to develop a proposal for increasing Indigenous engagement in the natural resource management of Western Australia and with the Australian government Department of the Environment and Water Resources and the state Department of Environment and Conservation to review the state's commitment to the Indigenous Protected Area program. DIA has also successfully partnered with a number of state native title representative bodies and others with on-ground priority land and sea management projects, as agreed under the current successful Saltwater Country Project in the north Kimberley, progressing a Kimberley-wide Indigenous ranger program with the Kimberley Land Council and a natural and cultural resource management plan for Mogumber with the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council.

**Mr T.R. SPRIGG:** This is not a prepared question!

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I am interested to hear the answer, even if the member is not.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The Saltwater Country Project involves traditional owners identifying pressures on and articulating their values in relation to the natural and cultural resources of the north Kimberley coastal and marine environment, allowing for better planning and management for the future. The Kimberley ranger initiative aims to provide sustainable rangers with an employment framework for Kimberley Aboriginal people to care for the country. Bungarun is an ongoing project involving land held by the Aboriginal Lands Trust, as the member is obviously aware since we visited it together. It is the old Leprosarium. A memorial will be completed there.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I refer to the third last dot point from the bottom under major initiatives for 2007-08 in division 39 on page 709 of the *Budget Statements*. One of the department's initiatives is to encourage and facilitate public sector agencies to develop reconciliation strategies with Indigenous people. What public sector agencies does the minister have in mind? What sort of reconciliation strategies are envisaged? Do they include liaising with federal department agencies to this end as well?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I thank the member for Mindarie for the question. Reconciliation, as the member is aware, continues to be a priority of the government. It conceptually underpins all the DIA programs. This year we have asked agencies to develop a reconciliation action plan to help them develop their business practices and take actions that will contribute to the wellbeing and will improve the life of Indigenous Australians. This will be a first; we have not required government agencies to do this previously.

**Mr G.M. CASTRILLI:** Further to that question, have all agencies been asked to develop a reconciliation action plan? Will the minister outline exactly what she expects to be the outcomes of those initiatives? What does she expect from all the agencies? Will the reconciliation strategies be generic or will they be area-specific if they are to be mandatory?

Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Carol Martin; Dr Kim Hames; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Trevor Sprigg; Mr John Quigley;  
Mr John Castrilli; Mr Gary Snook

---

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** All agencies have been approached and asked to develop a reconciliation action plan. They will be agency-specific rather than area-specific. We will take an interest in the various reconciliation action plans that are presented. If we think any of them are deficient, we will give the agencies some advice. We believe that the agencies are in the best position to provide an appropriate plan for each agency. It must be a new way of thinking for the government and agencies. They cannot leave it up to the Department of Indigenous Affairs to deal with everything to do with Aboriginal people. Just about every government department has a responsibility to deal appropriately with Indigenous people and to address the disadvantage of Indigenous people. I am quite hopeful that we will get some excellent plans from the various agencies.

**Mr G.M. CASTRILLI:** Has the minister given the agencies a direction of what she expects to be the key outcomes, or is it up to the individual agencies?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** We have left it up to the agencies to come back to us, although we might have provided them with a template that they can utilise. We have also offered to support the agencies if they need some assistance in coming up with a plan.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I am curious about whether we will be able to normalise services to Aboriginal communities, just as any other citizen would expect.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** That is certainly the direction that we are currently heading towards. We cannot continue to run two standards of services. Sadly, the level of services in some Indigenous communities and in some remote parts of Western Australia are not like those provided in other parts of Western Australia. There are significant issues to be addressed with regard to health outcomes in particular but also on a range of other fronts.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** That was certainly the recommendation of the Hames report that Cedric Wyatt had a lot to do with.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** One could ask why the water and electricity services were handed over to the Department of Housing and Works.

[7.30 pm]

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Because we felt DHW had a much better ability to provide them than did the Department of Indigenous Affairs - and it was the right decision. I refer again to the same dot point on page 703 of the *Budget Statements* regarding Aboriginal heritage, and again my question is fairly specific. I refer to the Weymul Aboriginal Corporation and the relationship between it and Mr Charlie Smith, who as I understand is the chairman of the Aboriginal Cultural Material Committee. I put to the minister the advice that has been given to me about how things operate in the Pilbara region when a mining company wants to undertake further development. As the Ngarluma group has native title approval over that region, if a mining company wants to extend its mine, under the Native Title Act it has to go to the prescribed body corporate, which is the Ngarluma group. The Ngarluma Aboriginal Corporation has 27 members. They direct that all work to be done by a mining company has to go through Weymul, which is the advocate for what happens. Weymul requires Charlie Smith to be the person who decides what needs to be done for that region by way of surveys. Charlie Smith then decides that certain groups need to be consulted. A heritage agreement has to be drawn up and it has to be signed by the mining company first. All sorts of requirements may be put on the mining company. Some mining companies have said that they are being held to ransom. If they do not sign that heritage agreement, it will not progress. Charlie Smith decides who has to do the surveys. After the Aboriginal heritage survey is done, it goes to the ACMC and Charlie Smith is there again as chairman making the decisions on the application.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Can I just correct the member? The ACMC does not make any decisions; it makes recommendations.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Nevertheless, it seems there is a conflict of interest arising from his involvement in Weymul. All mining companies are directed to act through him in consultations on Aboriginal heritage, apart from the fact that they have to do the Aboriginal heritage survey. He decides who should be consulted in that role and then he judges the final result. If another company consults the people they think are the elders, but are not the elders that Charlie selects, he can decide through the ACMC to say, "No, you haven't consulted the people I said to consult, so we will recommend against your application." I am told on good authority that that is what is happening and I would like the minister's comment on that advice.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** First, I would like to clarify that the ACMC is not a decision-making body. The ACMC makes a recommendation to the minister and the minister has to give due respect to that recommendation. The minister can also take into account any other advice or information that is provided by any other group and make a decision in the overall best interests of the state of Western Australia. The advice I have is that if someone on

Mr Paul Papalia; Mrs Carol Martin; Dr Kim Hames; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Trevor Sprigg; Mr John Quigley;  
Mr John Castrilli; Mr Gary Snook

---

the ACMC has a conflict of interest, he or she should declare that conflict of interest and would need to leave the room.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Has that happened with all decisions regarding the Pilbara?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** My understanding is that that has occurred, but I will ask Ms Hebron whether she can shed any light.

**Ms I. Hebron:** As far as I am aware, Mr Smith has excused himself when he has had a conflict of interest, and members have been signing the declaration prior to consideration of each matter.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** Further to that, I am aware of heritage applications and surveys that have been done by other anthropologists who have not consulted the Aboriginal elders that Weymul deems to be the correct ones and their applications have been rejected by the ACMC. They have been told to go away and consult the people Weymul has recommended.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I think the member has raised some interesting allegations or points of information. I am not sure how directly they relate to the estimates for Indigenous Affairs. However, I appreciate that he holds these genuine concerns and I will certainly ask the department to look at the matters he has raised more closely and provide a report to me.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I am satisfied with that. The minister asked me before with the goldfields issue to bring some examples, and I will do that. This is an example I am bringing to the minister in this area and I am satisfied that she will look into it. I just feel there is a conflict of interest.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** In fact, Danny Ford, who is sitting next to me, has been in the room when Mr Smith has actually declared an interest and left the room.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I do not know whether that is enough. I think there are still some activities that do not sit right. It has not been done right.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** We will have a close look at it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I draw members' attention to standing order 77, which applies to estimates as it does to the Assembly. It says a question should not contain preambles. I have been relatively generous but there is a limit to how long these can go.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** I indicate that we have one further question on this item, because other members want to get on with other divisions.

**Mr G. SNOOK:** I refer to the cost of accommodation under "Cost of Services" on page 711. Will the minister outline the exact direction in which the cost of accommodation is allocated and the range of accommodation? The cost in this year's budget estimate is \$1.727 million.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Is the question where DIA is accommodated?

**Mr G. SNOOK:** I am asking what is the range of areas of accommodation - what is the expenditure specifically directed to?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** It is the central office for the DIA, which is located in the Governor Stirling Tower building on the Terrace. We also have regional offices in a whole range of country towns.

**The appropriation was recommended.**