

Legislative Council

Thursday, 22 August 1991

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

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT - LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Stephens, Hon Tom - Smith Prosecution Evidence

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Attorney General) [2.35 pm]: I move -

That Hon Tom Stephens have leave to attend and give evidence in the prosecution of Robert Smith for alleged perjury committed before a Select Committee of this House.

The motion is self-explanatory and needs no elaboration.

HON P.H. LOCKYER (Mining and Pastoral) [2.36 pm]: I would like to hear an undertaking from the Attorney General before the question is put. I understand that Hon Tom Stephens is not the only person required to give evidence in this matter. I should think it in keeping with the procedures of this House that giving leave would be necessary for every person involved in the giving of evidence. I understand that Hon N.F. Moore is also required to give evidence and that leave to do so will be required in exactly the same way as it is required for Hon Tom Stephens. Hon E.J. Charlton is also involved in the case. Therefore, it would be good sense were leave sought by such a motion to cover the leave of absence of all three members.

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Attorney General) [2.37 pm]: I give an assurance that any leave required would certainly be supported by Government members. My understanding is that leave for every member who may be required for this hearing has in fact been granted already, and that Hon Tom Stephens' position could not be attended to at that time because of his absence from the State. If that turns out to be incorrect I will ensure that the position is regularised.

Hon N.F. Moore: If the case is delayed for several months, the previous motion may not apply.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Whatever formalities need to be attended to in order to allow the appearance of any member at this hearing would certainly be supported.

The PRESIDENT: I have been informed that the other motion was in the same terms as this motion.

Question put and passed.

MOTION - JUVENILE REMAND CENTRE, MURDOCH PROPOSAL

Moratorium

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Metropolitan) [2.38 pm]: I move -

That this House condemns the Government's arrogant disregard for the opinions of electors by continuing with plans to build a juvenile remand centre at Murdoch despite -

- (a) the failure of the Government to properly consult with the local community when choosing a site in an urban community;
- (b) its willingness to relocate the remand centre, if environmental values are affected, but not if people are affected;
- (c) serious concerns that property values will be affected;
- (d) the Government originally misleading the local authority into believing that a facility of a different kind was proposed;
- (e) the failure to adequately canvass other sites such as those near Perth Airport, Canning Vale and outer metropolitan rural locations;

and hereby calls on the Government to place a three month moratorium on the development of this facility.

It was the Bourbon royal family in France, a couple of hundred years ago, that receives distinction these days by the observation that it lost the throne of France because it had learnt nothing and had forgotten nothing. This observation comes to mind if one considers the conduct of the present State Government in many matters of public administration in Western Australia, not the least of which is the Government's cynical decision to site a juvenile remand centre on the South Lakes hospital site at Murdoch.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Why is that cynical?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is clear that the Government - like the Bourbons - has learnt nothing and has forgotten nothing. As a result, while the Government may not lose the throne it will certainly lose office in Western Australia some time in the next 16 to 18 months.

I will now give the reasons for saying that the Government's move is an exercise in cynicism, unparalleled by anything else the Government has done.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I think you are getting a bit extravagant in your language.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I do not think any description of the actions of Mr Berinson's Government is over the top. His actions and the actions of the Government defy any description.

Hon T.G. Butler: You were asked to resign from the party.

Hon J.M. Berinson: What precisely are you referring to?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: If Mr Berinson listens in the next 20 minutes he may learn, and he may even vote for the motion.

Hon John Halden: They would need another speaker.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: This motion has as its preamble the suggestion that the Government should be condemned because of its arrogant disregard for the local electors. That is the sort of arrogance that I referred to earlier in a historic context about the Bourbons. They fell because they became too smart by half. They lost their place in society because of the arrogance with which they carried out their duties.

I want to look at the evidence for my suggestion that the Government should be condemned for that kind of arrogance in choosing the Lakes Hospital site for the juvenile remand centre.

Hon B.L. Jones: Admirable positioning.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have no doubt that during the course of the debate the parliamentary equivalent of the three wise monkeys, who see no evil, hear no evil and speak no evil -

Hon J.M. Berinson: Monkeys, Bourbons - what else have you got to offer?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to cease their interjections and take the opportunity to argue the point during the debate rather than now, in the interests of getting through the motion within the hour.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The relationship between the three wise monkeys who saw nothing, heard nothing and said nothing and the three Labor members in this House who allegedly represent this area -

Hon John Halden: Rubbish.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: - Hon John Halden, Hon Garry Kelly and Hon Cheryl Davenport is the response we have heard from them. All these members have been part of a movement south of the river with their Ministers, Hon Eric Ripper and Hon Joe Berinson, to defy the wishes of local people and the local authority. The local authority has been left to do on Friday what the Government has not had the guts to do; that is, to put this whole proposal out to public participation and public comment. The Government has not done that up to now.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You are a champion, Mr Pendal.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Government knows the sort of reaction it will get from the local community.

Hon Mark Nevill: I am going to look at Mr Pendal's solution very shortly because I am going to Auschwitz.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Why did the Government move the remand centre out of Forrestfield?

Hon Mark Nevill: When was the last time you supported a site for a prison or detention centre?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will tell members why, because Hon Gordon Hill did not want it in his electorate. He claimed at the time that he was not advised.

Hon Cheryl Davenport: Are you going to tell us that it is not now in a Labor electorate, Mr Pendal?

Hon Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is no way to be talking about one of the member's senior Ministers.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You were better off when you were talking about Marie Antoinette.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Hon Joe Berinson would know all about her because he is a typical example of someone who is sitting there with his knitting watching the whole kaboodle.

Hon J.M. Berinson: That was not Marie Antionette.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I beg your pardon, she was the one who said, similarly to what Mr Berinson has said, "If they are hungry, let them eat cake." That sounds more like the sort of thing Mr Berinson would do.

Hon J.M. Berinson: When did I say that - while I was knitting?

Hon Mark Nevill: While he was powdering his nose.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The first part of my motion seeks to condemn the Government for its failure to properly consult with the local community when choosing a site for this remand centre in an urban environment.

Hon Mark Nevill: That has a hollow ring about it.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The first evidence of the arrogance with which this Government has treated the local community came by way of a question lodged in the Legislative Assembly on 28 May 1991 when the Minister for Community Services was asked about a report which had appeared in *The West Australian* on 27 January in which the Department for Community Services promised to consult local residents before deciding on the best site for a juvenile remand centre. The report was made a day or two after the Forrestfield site had been rejected by the Government because it happened to be sited in the electorate of a Minister who might be in a vulnerable position at the next election. The Government promised on that occasion that a full measure of consultation would take place with the local people at Murdoch and with their local authority. That did not happen. That was the first promise out of the whole sorry saga that was broken. The first the local community and the Melville City Council knew about the juvenile remand centre was what they read in the Press. So much for the commitment by this Government in January of this year, a mere seven months ago, to the processes of public participation.

Part (b) of my motion deals with my belief that the Government should be condemned because of its willingness to relocate the remand centre, if environmental values are affected, but not if people are affected. All of a sudden the environment is not just an important issue, but it is even more important than the wishes of tens of thousands of people south of the river.

Hon B.L. Jones: The environment can be damaged and the people will not be.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: What is the evidence for that? It comes out of the mouth of another one of the more discredited Ministers of this Government, the Minister for Planning.

Hon Mark Nevill: Where else would it come from?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: On 28 March when the Minister for Planning started to become embroiled in this whole sorry saga he said, "Unless we have overlooked some environmental aspect or some other aspects that the community can bring to our attention, I think this is the best site we will find in the metropolitan area." So it does not matter that it affects people, but if it might affect the environment he might change it.

Hon B.L. Jones: How can it affect the people?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is the arrogance with which the Government treated the electors south of the river. I now refer to part (c) of my motion. I believe the Government should be condemned because I have serious concerns that property values will be affected. What is the evidence of that? The local branch president of the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia, Mr Alan Barnett, was quoted in *The West Australian* of 28 March as predicting that property values in Murdoch would fall with the establishment of a remand centre.

Hon B.L. Jones: That is a narrow point of view.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Let us talk about putting it in Hon Beryl Jones' electorate. Why was it taken out of a Labor electorate -

Hon John Halden: And put into a Labor electorate you fool; you great twit.

Hon B.L. Jones: I happen to live in that area.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Mr Hill wanted it taken out of his electorate for the same reason Mrs Jones wouldn't want it transferred to hers.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Which electorate are you talking about?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I am talking about Swan Hills.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Which electorate are you saying it was put into?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is the Minister's job to find out; he is a member of the Government.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You should be telling us.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members should stop interjecting so that we can make some progress, bearing in mind there is a time limit on the debate for this motion.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I will tell Hon Joe Berinson where the remand centre should go. He asked the question.

Hon J.M. Berinson: No, I didn't.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Leader of the House has just asked the question.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You have got the question wrong.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The remand centre could be located in the heart of the Jandakot electorate because the Leader of the Opposition in another place, who represents that area, said on the public record that there is a suitable site in that area for the remand centre. I intend to make reference to that in a few minutes. I note that Hon Joe Berinson is actually reading the motion now and trying to determine in what part of the electorate the remand centre should be located.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I want to make sure you got it right. Thanks for answering the question that I didn't ask.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Leader of the House did not bother to listen. It is typical of everything he has done in the past six years. It is also the reason that the Government has polled only 30 per cent recently and the reason that the Government is arguably the most corrupt Government in the history of Australia.

Government members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not want to interfere in the conduct of a robust debate, but all honourable members must concede that the debate is getting a bit beyond the pale. If members do not like what is being said they should take the opportunity of putting forward their point of view later. That includes asking questions members want answered instead of waiting for answers to questions that members have not asked. Time is allowed for every member to contribute to the debate and now is Hon P.G. Pental's time.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Thank you, Mr President. It is obvious from the number of interjections members of the Government are making that they are sensitive to the issues I have raised. It is clear that the members of the Government who represent the area to which I am referring are sensitive to this matter. They would know about the public protest meeting that was held on 6 April this year which attracted almost 3 000 people.

Hon B.L. Jones: We were all there.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Members know that it is hard to motivate Australians but this matter has struck a chord.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is a terrible slur.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Government has failed to do its job in the area of juvenile justice and people are so motivated that they turn out in the streets in their thousands to protest about the Government's inaction. People were also motivated in April of this year when they attended a Sunday morning public meeting to show the Government that they regarded it as not only the most disreputable but also the most arrogant Government in the history of Western Australia. Almost 3 000 people turned out to tell people like Hon John Halden and Hon Cheryl Davenport that they were not happy.

Hon Cheryl Davenport: I was there and I heard.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Of all people, Hon Cheryl Davenport should vote for this motion.

Hon Cheryl Davenport: No, I won't.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: If she votes for this motion she will be sending a message to the Government; if she does not she will not be here after the next election.

Part (d) of the motion condemns the Government for misleading the local authority into believing that a facility of a different kind was proposed at Murdoch. I suppose when I give the example Hon Joe Berinson will say that it is okay to tell a bit of a fib because the Government has been fooling the people for years and it does not matter that a fib has been told about the location of a remand centre south of the river. The Government thinks it is acting morally when it gets away with telling a whopper of a fib.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Don't you have anything to say about the motion, Mr Pendal? You seem to be skirting around it.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Yes, I do. I am saying that the Government has told untruths.

Hon John Halden: Who?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Government.

Hon John Halden: Who?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: All Ministers were involved. They told the Melville City Council - and I understand the mayor is of the Government's political persuasion - big fibs. An article in *The West Australian* on 26 March stated -

Council city manager Garry Hunt and Melville mayor June Barton and other councillors opposed this.

He said the council had held talks last year with the government agency which manages public assets and was told that a medical centre for juvenile offenders had been considered for the area.

Is that a big whopper or a little whopper, or does it not matter? Whatever the case the Government told an untruth. The Government told the local authority that a medical centre, not a remand centre, for juveniles was to be established in Murdoch.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Don't you think there might be some misunderstanding there?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is what the Government told those people.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I think you should reconsider that, because there is obviously a misunderstanding. There has never been such a facility -

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon J.M. Berinson: - and there has been no proposition that one should be established.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have asked the Leader of the House not to do that when I ask him to come to order. I am sure that he will want to participate in the debate and if I have ruled that he has already spoken he will be angry with me. I would not want that to happen.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The matter comes down to a question about whether the Government condones the telling of untruths; and when Hon Joe Berinson responds, in the way that you, Mr President, have suggested, he may want to address part (d) of the motion about whether it

is permissible to tell untruths in order to achieve the Government's goals. Most people in this State believe that the Government has turned the telling of untruths into an institution. It is no wonder, considering the evidence that has been revealed in the Royal Commission. However, I am talking about an issue in the southern suburbs where the local authority, the mayor and the city manager were all told by this Government that a facility of another kind - not a juvenile remand centre but a medical centre for sick juveniles - was to be built.

I turn now to part (e) of the motion, which condemns the Government for its failure to adequately canvass other sites such as those near Perth Airport, Canning Vale - and I want to spend some time on Canning Vale - and other metropolitan areas. I ask members to bear in mind the importance of the point I made earlier about the Minister for Mines, Gordon Hill, discovering that the remand centre was to be located in his electorate and how he quickly made sure that it was transferred to another place. I might add that the people at Forrestfield almost had it put over them, but when they discovered that they had not been told by the Government that the remand centre would be sited in their area, Mr Hill, the member for Helena, surviving in that seat with the smallest of margins, decided that it would be better to site it elsewhere.

Hon Fred McKenzie: You do not know the history of Forrestfield.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I would like Hon Fred McKenzie to tell the House the history of it. I would be surprised that he, of all people, would condone the telling of untruths of the kind I referred to earlier. He and I may part company over the issue of the Forrestfield site - and I would be interested to hear his view on it - but I doubt whether we would part company about the issue of telling fibs in the way this Government has. The talk at the time was that it would not be sited at Forrestfield but near the Perth Airport. I understand there were one or two complications.

Hon Garry Kelly: It would be a bit noisy.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The member is right, and I saw a reference to it which said that the Government could not possibly construct a centre for juvenile remand prisoners on a site near the airport because the noise would disturb the prisoners. For heaven's sake, these are the people about whom 20 000 people attended a rally, yet this Government kowtows to them because there will be too much noise when a plane flies over the site. Another complication was attached to it and I think it was that the Minister for Community Services, Mr Ripper, actually represented the electorate in which it was proposed the centre would be sited. In spite of him being the Minister for magnificent projects he did not want the remand centre anywhere near the electorate he represents. I guess he thinks he has enough political problems without another one.

I turn now to the question raised by the Attorney General by way of interjection: He asked where I thought the remand centre should go. It has already been announced by the Lakes Action Group that its preferred site is in another part of a Liberal electorate, if one likes; that is at, Canning Vale.

Hon Mark Nevill: Do you support it?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Yes, I do. By siting the remand centre in the Canning Vale Prison compound instead of on the proposed site the Government would save between \$7 million and \$8 million.

Hon Mark Nevill: Inside it?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Yes. Not to do that would be an act of sheer financial lunacy. The Government would have the option to transfer the metropolitan security unit out of the Canning Vale Prison complex, because it was never built to house it anyway, and convert that unit, probably at a cost of no more than \$3 million, into a remand centre for juveniles. It would have a number of advantages, not the least of which would be to free up about \$8 million. I would have thought that was a pretty attractive proposition to a Government which has arguably wasted more money per head of population than any other Government in the world - it has made a world record of that. It should be an attractive proposition to save \$8 million and divert money, for example, to the school maintenance program.

Hon Garry Kelly: Who said it would save \$8 million? Was it you?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: No, not me. Those figures were put to me by people involved in the

Lakes Action Group. Incidentally, members of that group come from all walks of life, including Government departments, and many of them have expertise in this area. They tell me that the proposed remand centre could be located at the Canning Vale compound, by removing the metropolitan security unit, at a cost of approximately \$3 million. That has the support of Liberal members of Parliament in that area. We are not saying that the proposed centre should be relocated out of that electorate, which Government members so cynically chose to do to placate the people in the Helena electorate. I am told it will add no more than five or six minutes in travelling time from the Canning Vale Prison site to the central law courts -

Hon T.G. Butler interjected.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Hon Tom Butler can have his say in a moment. I will not waste my time on his interjections.

Hon T.G. Butler: It is in the Cockburn electorate.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: What is?

Hon T.G. Butler: Where they are going to build it.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is right.

Hon John Halden: Cockburn is a Labor electorate.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Hon John Halden should call out there one day because the people would love to see him. They saw his name in the newspaper once and they wanted to know whether he actually represented the area. I told them that he did and that he had been in the region on one occasion and that was at the declaration of the poll - he has never been seen there since.

Hon John Halden: In fact, I was not there on that occasion.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: On Tuesday this week the Melville City Council had before it the grandiose plans for the proposed development. I understand that the council will now do what the Government has not had the decency or the guts to do; that is, to put out the proposal for public comment and participation. The Government has not been game to do that because it knows what the reaction of the local people was in April. They went berserk. If their reaction does not affect the lower House member for that area, it will certainly affect the upper House members, and that may worry members like Hon Cheryl Davenport. I hope that after Friday, when the plans will be available for public comment, even this Government, arrogant as it is, will finally listen to what the people are saying. The Government refused to listen to them the other day on the matter of juvenile crime. It was openly scornful of and arrogant towards the 20 000 people who were at the rally outside this House. It still treats 3 000 people in the electorate who protested against the proposed remand centre last April as people who are incapable of knowing what is best for them.

More than 50 000 people live close to the Lakes hospital site, which will ultimately include two hospitals - a Government hospital and a St John of God hospital. Also on that site will be a TAFE college, a 24 hour police station, the Hospital Linen and Laundry Service of Western Australia, which is already on the site, another unidentified health facility and, of course, this infamous remand centre. All these facilities will generate far more noise and traffic than the Government and the local authority will be able to cope with. I will give the House some precise figures. The parking area for the proposed TAFE college was intended to have 1 270 bays, but the Government has cut back that number of bays to 800 in order to fit all these public facilities on the site. Not only will the Government attract thousands of cars to the area in the course of a day, but also it is reducing the number of car parking bays in the original plan.

Hon Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: We have to have remand centres - probably to collect some members of this Government when justice finally prevails in this State.

Next door to the site is the Murdoch University and one cannot get into a parking bay there now. I know this because I was there the other day. The car park is overflowing, so people attending the university are now encouraged to park in the residential streets surrounding it. What will happen when a TAFE college is built there which has had 35 per cent of its

proposed parking area taken away from it because this Government wants to build a remand centre there that nobody wants? I do not believe it is too late to act in this matter.

When I gave notice of this motion at the end of the last part of the previous session, I think in June, I asked the Government to place a three month moratorium on this development in order that nothing would be done and so that it might save its own neck. Those three months have passed and the Government has made no such commitment. It is still not too late for it to do two things: Firstly, reverse the decision to build the remand centre there and, secondly, relocate that centre to an area where the cost will be reduced immediately by \$8 million. Even members on the Government side of the House must realise that the \$8 million saved could be better put to use for them politically by injecting it into the school maintenance system, which has turned into a complete and utter shambles.

The local community, the Lakes Action Group, the Melville City Council and the Opposition have repeatedly made a strong case for this Government to reverse its decision before it is too late. Every reason in the world exists to look at the relocation of the metropolitan security unit and to modify it, perhaps spending \$2 million or \$3 million and thereby saving upwards of \$8 million on the project. If the Government does not do this it will not only waste public money but also put itself in political jeopardy. It has been in jeopardy for a long time, but I would like to think it would go to an election in the southern suburbs on this issue because it would be cleaned up in a manner that would surprise even its more hardened supporters. We have given five separate reasons why the project should not proceed.

Hon Fred McKenzie: Would you like it sent back to Forrestfield?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I am surprised at the interjection from Hon Fred McKenzie. No, we do not want to send the project back to Forrestfield despite the fact that the Minister did not have the intestinal fortitude to fight out this matter with his local electors. I have said we would like to see it relocated to Canning Vale because that would result in savings for an utterly bankrupt State brought about by a morally bankrupt Government.

HON JOHN HALDEN (South Metropolitan - Parliamentary Secretary) [3.14 pm]: I am happy to explain to Hon Phillip Pental exactly where I stand on this matter. I will in no way seek to shirk my responsibilities as an elected representative for the area. I hope I will be able to develop a line that is not as politically opportunistic or bankrupt as that developed by Hon Phillip Pental today. It probably goes without saying that I would not have to try hard to present a better argument than the one presented by him. It is important to go through the member's motion. First, it states that the Government failed to consult properly with the local community when choosing a site. The fact is - and this is something Hon Phillip Pental commonly refuses to include in his speeches - that there has been a process of consultation between various Ministers of this Government, local government authorities and the local community.

Hon P.G. Pental: They do not believe you. Neither does Mr Hill.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: They may not believe me, but the reality of life is that the facts were before them and if it were not for Hon Phillip Pental making up stories we would be better off. His contribution to this debate has been a scurrilous one. He has no concern whatsoever for juveniles. He has taken advantage of this issue to further his own political ends. A process of consultation has been undertaken. The Minister for Planning unveiled the site. The Minister for Community Services wrote to the City of Melville and outlined fully what was to happen to the site. The mayor and the city manager of the Melville City Council met with the Minister for Community Services at Parliament House in March of this year, so there was a full briefing for the City of Melville.

Hon P.G. Pental: After they read about it in the newspaper.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Can I please make my speech?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind members that I have already indicated that I do not want interjections. I do not know whether Hon Phillip Pental wishes to listen, and he does not have to, but I do have to and I cannot hear what is being said if members are interjecting.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am pleased to tell my story clearly. A meeting took place between the mayor and the city manager of the City of Melville, the Premier, and the Minister for Community Services. The City of Cockburn was given a full briefing. A meeting took place

between the city manager and the mayor of Melville and the Minister for Planning. The Lakes Action Group and a representative from the Department for Community Services have had three meetings. Cabinet Ministers and Caucus members have toured Longmore remand centre and Canning Vale Prison. Members of the community have been asked to become involved in the same sorts of tours. So too have the Opposition Leader, upper House members, and George Strickland and Richard Lewis. Also, 2 000 letters have been sent to nearby residents to explain the development.

I fail to see on any objective criteria how the member can say that members of the community have not been consulted. He suggested in his usual befuddled way that they were consulted after the event. He also said it had been suggested to the City of Melville that a juvenile medical centre would be built. I suggest that what was put to the City of Melville is that there were two options - either a juvenile remand centre or a medical centre. It was not a question of a juvenile medical centre. As the Leader of the House has said, the member, and perhaps the city manager from Melville, may have been misquoted. It is more likely that they were confused in their interpretation of what was said to them. Any fair minded person would realise that because of the terms bandied around it would be easy for people to draw a wrong interpretation of what was happening. Those sorts of things happen. However, as a result of the process I have outlined it must be clear to members that there has been long term consultation over two years. I was not part of that process. It may be that there was some confusion about the terminology. However, it is inappropriate for Hon Phillip Pental to come into this House and use the terms he has used because they are not constructive.

Paragraph (b) of the motion concerns environmental values and not the people affected. Again, Hon Phillip Pental must plumb the murky depths to further his argument. The reality is that the Government is very concerned about groups of people, and one group of people about which we should be concerned is that group which will use the remand centre or be incarcerated in it. Most people would agree that the Longmore remand centre is an outdated and vastly overcrowded facility. It was built in 1977 to hold 22 detainees and now accommodates up to 39. The ablution and shower blocks are antiquated and an enormous sum of money would be required to renovate just those facilities. I do not know whether members have seen the cells at Longmore, but they are simply vile. Hon Phillip Pental asked how the new building would affect residents, but he should consider how such incarceration would affect a juvenile - a child under the legislation that we have put forward in this Parliament.

Hon J.M. Berinson: And the effect on that juvenile's conduct when he goes back to the community.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Leader of the House makes a very good point, which should be emphasised. Quite clearly, having been in those sorts of facilities, a juvenile will return to the community with a clear impression about how the community views him or her. That is not appropriate, and the Government's course of action in regard to the new centre is appropriate. I do not know why Hon Phillip Pental would raise such an obscure point, but I suppose that in his obscure little mind to raise any cheap point is an absolute necessity for him.

Paragraph (c) of the motion refers to serious concerns that property values will be affected. There are two issues here. Besides scoffing at that comment, as members of Parliament we should know that at any time a Government - whether it be a State Government or a local authority - proposes to build anything, the first cry is that property values will be adversely affected. If we listened to that view on every occasion, Governments at all levels would never build anything.

Hon P.G. Pental: It is as bad as having a Labor member of Parliament living next door - the tone is lowered.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I could think of only one thing worse, and that would be to live next door to Hon Phillip Pental. I could live next door to many Liberal members, but I would take exception to living next door to him. In support of his claim about property values, what does Hon Phillip Pental do? He takes a one-off comment from a Mr Barnett of the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia. He did not take any valuations over a period of time. I am sure Hon George Cash could have assisted him in this matter, and it is a shame he did not. On the basis of a one-off comment he says property values have declined. Is that

the most objective analysis he can make? Of course not; it just suited his argument. The member sits there smiling smugly, but he knows it is rubbish.

Hon P.G. Pental: I know nothing of the kind.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The thing that separates us on this side of the House from some members opposite, and particularly Hon Phillip Pental -

Hon P.G. Pental: Is that we do not steal public money.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I wish Hon Phillip Pental were standing, because I know what I would be doing. There is something which distinguishes us from members opposite; that is, when these tough questions come up about the difference between property values and the property class and those in need, members opposite opt for their mates on every occasion. They protect them to the nth degree and do not give a continental about the sorts of people who will be negatively impacted upon by the sort of piffle Hon Phillip Pental has brought into the House today. In his motion he has quite clearly said that the children of this State - those who have perhaps been disadvantaged or have come in contact with the law but have not been found guilty - should not have the same rights, privileges and opportunities as others because it might affect property values.

Hon P.G. Pental: I did not say anything of the kind.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: That is what the motion says. The line the Opposition spokesman on this matter would advocate is that we should put property values ahead of everything else, including our children's future. I heard no interjection on that until I raised the issue. It is a scurrilous and indefensible position to put forward. Members opposite know it is indefensible and I suggest Hon Phillip Pental have someone else draw up his motions for him in future.

Hon George Cash: Had you attended the meeting you would have found that that was just one of a number of elements raised by the people there.

Hon P.G. Pental: The 3 000 people there, who wanted to know where you were.

Hon George Cash: It is a contributing factor.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: If I did not even know the name of the town clerk of the City of Melville, I would not comment about anything.

Hon George Cash: Garry Hunt is a close personal friend of mine.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I can assure Hon George Cash that Garry Hunt does not say that.

Paragraph (d) of Hon Phillip Pental's motion says that the Government misled the local authority into believing that a facility of a different kind was proposed. Clearly, that is not the case. There might have been some misinterpretation; but misinterpretation and reasonable doubt do not come into Hon Phillip Pental's thinking. His position in this matter is one of pure, political, grimy gain. It does not matter who is trodden on, what issues might be thrown out the window, or what steps towards the rectification of young people's lives are being considered, one can bet one's bottom dollar that Hon Phillip Pental will come into this House and make any cheap point he possibly can. We know he has a reputation in the Liberal Party for doing that.

Hon George Cash: I think you are saying that only because Mr Pental has actually shown you up.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: They know what he is like, and they are wising up to him. They are suggesting that he take a little leave of absence for a few years. That is a reasonable suggestion which members opposite should consider.

Paragraph (e) of the motion concerns the failure to adequately canvass other sites such as those near the Perth Airport, Canning Vale and outer metropolitan rural locations. Hon Phillip Pental, in essence, is misguided, stupid, mischievous, and on occasions absolutely outrageous; but politically he knows that wherever the Government builds that remand centre it will be politically very difficult. However, he also knows that if a Government is reasonable and responsible it will build it somewhere. In reality, the best option available to this Government is to build the centre at Murdoch, because Canning Vale is five to seven minutes further away in peak times, when people would need to be

transported to the courts. I suggest members make the trip; I have done it because it is in my electorate. Also, public transport is available at the Murdoch site.

As to canvassing other options, a thorough investigation was undertaken. Hon Phillip Pendal has implied that we have transferred this facility from a Labor seat to a conservative one. We have not; it has gone from one Labor seat to another.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Mine is not a Labor seat, is it?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Is he not wonderful!

Hon J.M. Berinson: Is that what your argument was, Mr Pandal? Didn't you know which Assembly electorate it was in?

Hon P.G. Pandal: I knew which electorate it was in.

Hon J.M. Berinson: So you just wanted to ignore it and talk about an upper House seat which covers half of the metropolitan area?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: This is a scurrilous effort by Hon Phillip Pandal to further political ends; he does not consider those who will be disadvantaged by his propositions. He also suggested a moratorium of three months, not to resolve anything or to come to a conclusion but, in essence, to allow debate to continue and the anxieties to continue to rage, no matter what side of the debate one is on. Hon Phillip Pandal clearly has decided that this will be a political tool. In the whole of his speech, through which we sat, he did not put forward a single proposition to resolve the conflict.

Hon P.G. Pandal: I said it should be put at Canning Vale and the metropolitan security unit should be relocated.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The member knows that some administrative problems are associated with that, but he uses that example because he sees that it is a cheap proposition. It may save some dollars but it adds costs on the other side.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I wonder whether the member has considered whether the metropolitan security unit believe the premises lend themselves to it.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Yes we have.

Hon J.M. Berinson: They were not built as MSU premises.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The proposal is a quick fix solution.

[Debate adjourned, pursuant to Standing Order No 195.]

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION - JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON DELEGATED LEGISLATION

Education Service Providers (Full Fee Overseas Students) Registration Bill 1990 - Report Tabling

HON GARRY KELLY (South Metropolitan) [3.31 pm]: I present the Legislation Committee report on the Education Service Providers (Full Fee Overseas Students) Registration Bill 1990 and move -

That the report do lie upon the Table and be printed.

Question put and passed.

[See paper No 632.]

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN COASTAL SHIPPING COMMISSION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 June.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [3.32 pm]: This is a Bill to amend the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission Act. However, in reading the second reading speech, one could be forgiven for believing that the proposed amendments were of little consequence. Given the legal standing that second reading speeches are given within the judicial system, the speech in question is a slur on the

Government. It misrepresents the situation as it does not adequately set out the intentions of the legislation and does not explain the reasons that the Government is making changes to the Act. Therefore, one could almost disregard it.

The Bill proposes a number of changes to the Act. Section 6 involves the composition of the commission. The Bill intends to increase the membership from three to five. Currently, the Chairman of the Coastal Shipping Commission is appointed for a five year term, the vice chairman for four years and the other commissioner for three years. The Bill intends to increase from two to five the number of commissioners and they shall hold office for a period not exceeding five years. The second reading speech does not give the reasons for that change. Section 12 of the principal Act is intended to be amended to increase the quorum of the commission from two to three. Some minor changes are proposed to be made to section 22 of the principal Act in that the words "Industrial Arbitration Act 1912" are to be deleted and the words "Industrial Relations Act 1979" be inserted. This brings the Act in line with current legislation and the Opposition has no grievance in this area.

However questions need to be answered regarding why the Government intends to repeal section 22(2). This subsection reads -

The commission shall not, except with the approval of the Minister, determine the salary of a position in the service of the Commission at a rate exceeding the equivalent of the rate for the time being shown for the classification Group 1, Class 8 Administrative Division in the Public Service of the State.

No indication is provided why the Government wishes to repeal this subsection, and members may draw their own conclusions. If this clause is passed, the commission could set salary levels far in excess of their present level. Section 27 of the principal Act deals with State guarantees. Through this Bill the Government proposes to insert a new section 27A into the Act relating to specific guarantees regarding contracts entered into by the Government some years ago for the purchase and building of three new ships. Members will recall that some time ago the State Shipping Commission announced a plan to modify its fleet. In that process it was intended that a number of smaller vessels be built; these were in the 3 000 tonne dead weight class and the ships were to be built by Cockburn Shipping, which was awarded the construction of three ships.

During the construction of those vessels the Government determined that it would do itself a financial favour by selling the ships to the Westpac Banking Corporation and then leasing the vessels back from Westpac. As a result of that decision the Government entered into certain contractual arrangements with Westpac. This is important because members will remember that in 1988 the Government was receiving considerable criticism for entering into contracts in various business enterprises in Australia and overseas. The Government was also under tremendous attack in the Parliament for failing to advise the Parliament of the various contracts. In late 1988 as an indication of the Government's wanting to come clean with its business dealings the then Premier Dowding established a commission which was later known as the Burt Commission on Accountability. This considered areas of accountability, ministerial responsibility and other such matters. Its report was tabled in the Parliament in January 1989. The then Premier indicated at that time that the Government would accept all of the recommendations of the Burt commission and put them into administrative and legislative effect. The Burt Commission on Accountability, under the definition of accountability, had this to say -

The Commission understands the concept of accountability - when used in a Westminster style political or government context and when applied to government departments and government instrumentalities and agencies (referred to collectively in this report as "government agencies") which invest public moneys or, by the exercise of an authority granted by statute to the executive to guarantee liabilities which the government agency may incur, have the capacity to create liabilities which, at the end of the day, may be a charge upon Consolidated Revenue simply means that legislative authority should exist authorising the investment or the creation of the contingent liability -

They are important words to remember when dealing with the Bill under consideration. The report continues -

- and that each Government agency should be subject to the control of a Minister of the Crown and through that Minister it should at all times be ready and able to account to the Parliament for all that it has done in the exercise of its statutory authority; for the manner in which it has done it; and for the ends sought to be achieved by the doing of it. It is an idea which is fundamental to and which, in practice, conditions the operation of responsible Government.

The report went on to say -

Hence it can be seen that accountability is accountability to the Parliament and, as will appear, the Parliament is the place within which the idea of public scrutiny must find its fulfilment.

Those words are from page 3 of the Burt Commission on Accountability report tabled in this House in January 1989. They are part of the recommendations which the Government said it was prepared to abide by without question.

I digress to remind the House that at that time the Attorney General and the other Ministers in this place acknowledged to the Parliament that they also accepted the recommendations of the Burt Commission on Accountability. As Ministers of the Crown they were therefore aware of the content of the report. Members should consider that report in conjunction with the Bill now being debated - in August 1991 - and acknowledge that we are discussing State guarantees; that is, for the creation of contingent liabilities on the State. Members should also have regard for a letter dated 3 October 1989 signed by the then Treasurer, David Parker, which informed the Westpac Banking Corporation that the Government was prepared to enter into certain guarantees for a lease. The lease amounted to from \$42 million to \$45 million, being the capital amount of the three ships being purchased. It said that the Government would use its best endeavours to amend the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission Act to ensure that the undertakings given in October 1989 by the then Treasurer, David Parker, would be brought into legislative effect.

I raise that important matter to give a clear indication of the way in which the Government was working - who knows, it is probably still working in that way - regarding its commitment to complying with the Burt Commission on Accountability recommendations. As I said, the report was delivered in January 1989. The Government said it would accept it, yet in October 1989 a letter was signed by the then Treasurer saying the Government knew it did not have legislative authority to guarantee the debts it was entering into with the Westpac Banking Corporation, but that it would use its best endeavours to bring the matter before the Parliament at an appropriate time. The point is that in 1989 the Government did not want to acknowledge that this letter had been written by the then Treasurer David Parker. It did not want to acknowledge that the Westpac Bank had entered into the leasing agreement for those three vessels only on the clear understanding that the Government had a commitment under the agreements contained in that letter. One wonders what other hidden arrangements the Government has with financial institutions or business houses which it has not told Parliament about and which may still require legislative changes to give some base to agreements which have already been struck.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm

[Questions without notice taken.]

Hon GEORGE CASH: I repeat: A letter written in October 1989 by the then Treasurer, Mr David Parker, committed the Government to certain contingent liabilities which were not advised to the Parliament at that stage. This Bill is introduced to give the legislative base to those earlier commitments. The point I was making about the Burt Commission on Accountability was that the Government had agreed to those recommendations, but some 10 months after the report it was still carrying out acts which went right against the recommendations, and it clearly was trying again to mislead the Parliament or not to provide proper information to the Parliament.

The Government has proposed a new section 27A which deals with State guarantees for the three vessels which the Government has under lease from Westpac. Before I deal with that question I will run through a very brief history of the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission. Most members would be aware that the commission was constituted in 1912 and has provided as part of its charter a service to the north west ports in Western Australia,

although in recent years it has expanded its shipping activities to take in commercial activities in South East Asia and the Eastern States of Australia. As a result of a review of its shipping routes it recently decided not to continue with trade to the Eastern States of Australia and has cut back on some of its South East Asian activities, in particular Papua New Guinea. It is interesting, if one looks at Press releases and media reports on the activities of Stateships over recent years, to read the glowing announcements made by Stateships about how it had entered into the PNG market, how it anticipated to profit out of that market, how Stateships had committed many hundreds of thousands of dollars in trying to open up markets in that area, only to find that those glowing reports that we heard over a period of time have been worth exactly nothing.

Stateships has failed miserably and has recorded record losses as a result of those additional activities. Those losses of course have been subsidised by the taxpayers of Western Australia. Again when we look at the history of Stateships - and while I am the first to acknowledge the very fine service that Stateships provided to the communities in the north west over a period of many years - it is important to note that since Stateships' inception in 1912 it has made a profit on one occasion only. To date it has totalled up losses of something like \$250 million; \$140 million of those losses being recorded in the past eight years. That alone should encourage people to look very closely at the current management of Stateships to determine whether it is managing the commission in an effective and efficient way. There are those in the commission who have said that losses have been reduced over recent years, and a close reading of the annual report of Stateships will show that there have been some moderate reductions in losses. On the other hand, if one looked at the balance sheet of Stateships one would see that the debts of Stateships, its liabilities generally both contingent and real, have increased dramatically over the last five to seven years. That question of the management of Stateships must be addressed by the Government.

It is clear, even when the announcement was made by persons connected with Stateships that the Government was considering closing down the organisation and getting out of the coastal trade, that those huge debts amassed by Stateships will have to be met by the taxpayers at some stage. As far as Stateships' trade routes to the north west are concerned I confirm that the communities in the north west are entitled to a shipping service, but it is my view, which is shared by many of the commercial shipping operators in the ports of Fremantle and Darwin, that it would be possible to introduce more regular services to call at our north west ports by other than Stateships if the Government were to consider, firstly, lifting the present cabotage restrictions which apply to ships on the Australian coast. Secondly, rather than losing between \$12 million and \$16 million a year in its Stateships operation, the Government should offer realistic subsidies to ensure that commercial ships can call at our north west ports and provide the very important and necessary services that are required by people at those ports. I invite those people who say that Stateships provide external benefits other than services to the north west to a report produced at the University of Wollongong titled "Stateships External Benefits" and published in August 1990 by the Centre for Transport Policy Analysis for the Western Australia Department of Transport. That report says that the external benefits which flow from the operation of Stateships are valued at \$3 million per annum. If Stateships' external benefits are \$3 million per annum how do we justify its continuing to lose between \$12 million and \$16 million per annum? The Government must address that question.

I have a number of questions about the charter entered into by the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission with the Westpac Banking Corporation. Members should understand that the three ships leased by the Government from Westpac cost about \$14 million each year. In round figures the contract is for approximately \$42 million over 10 years. Interestingly, the Government has signed a contract with Westpac which provides that should it cancel the lease within the first five years, all the lease payments for the first five years will become due and payable to Westpac. That is an amazing situation because each ship is costing approximately \$1.25 million per annum in lease payments. That means Westpac is being paid between \$3.75 million and \$4 million per annum for the Government's leasing three ships. That sum increases on an incremental percentage basis over the 10 years of the charter.

The annual lease premium for vessel 291 is \$1 179 450, which increases by \$143 629 in the fifth year. The figures for vessel 293 are basically the same inasmuch as it was costed using

the same base figures as those used for vessel 291 and adjusted as the various final payments for each vessel were brought forward. That incremental percentage increase over the first five years continues in the case of vessel 291 and the annual payment in the tenth year will be \$1 829 714. Questions have been raised by those involved in the shipping industry about why we are paying, 10 years later, \$512 per day for each vessel? The first of those vessels will cost \$3 231 per day in lease charges and that figure must be multiplied by three and adjusted for minor changes. Why, when the common practice in the shipping industry is for long term leases - that is, in excess of three years - is the lease cost increasing during the period of a lease and not decreasing? How can Stateships come to an arrangement in which costs increase on a dramatic scale when it is the current commercial practice for them to decrease over the period of a long term charter.

John C. Napier, who has worked for a long time in the Western Australian shipping industry and been involved in the charter of many ships, wrote a letter to the editor of the *Daily Commercial News* in June of this year which appeared under the heading "Stateships charter parties called naive". That article reads -

For some time now the State Opposition have insisted that the agreements between ASI, Stateships and Westpac Bank be tabled in Parliament before they consent to guarantee payment of charter hire by amending the appropriate Shipping Act to permit Treasury to do so.

At last the documents have been tabled and it is obvious why the Government wished to conceal them as they have the last five enquiries into Stateships.

Briefly the charter parties represent complete naivety on the part of Stateships and an appalling lack of knowledge of current freight market levels and chartering conditions.

The schedule of hire for MV Frank Konecny for example shows a basic rate of annual hire of US\$1,181,275 in the first year rising to US\$1,832,545 in the tenth year.

However clause 26 of the C/P states under B(i) that a penalty of US\$20,000 is payable if delivery is made after 30/9/90 which is added to the first year's hire and then escalated by five per cent p.a. compound for each subsequent year.

In addition under B(ii) a penalty of US\$135 per day is exacted for each day delivery is late and again five per cent compound is applied to subsequent years hire payments.

Since MV Frank Konecny was 116 days late in delivery the first hire increases to US\$1,216,935 and the final year to US\$1,868,205 ie on a daily basis hire rises from US\$3334 to US\$5118 in the final year.

These costs compare with a 3650 dw vessel bareboat chartered by Hamburg association of mine -

That is, the author -

- for five years at US\$39000 monthly for the first three years reducing to US\$34,000 monthly for the final two years or US\$1283 and US\$1118 respectively on a daily basis.

Stateships are thus paying nearly three times market rates in the first year rising to five times in the final year.

Questions that arise are why is the contract in US\$ in the first place.

Secondly why does the hire increase annually instead of decrease?

Thirdly why is the printed clause 10 in the charter party altered from monthly to annual payment?

Fourthly there is no US\$/A\$ rate of exchange mentioned anywhere in the contract.

These are only a few of the terms which my German friends advise Bareboat hire is unusually high. Bareboat hire and sale value are grossly exaggerated.

I have not touched on many of the other obnoxious clauses contained in the charter party. Suffice to say they constitute a complete surrender of all rights by Stateships in favour of Westpac Bank.

Perhaps Deloitte Tohmatsu could apply the same expertise to a study of Stateships operations as they recently did to Fremantle Port Authority.

John C. Napier,
Marquisand Pty Ltd
Attadale,
Western Australia.

That reference to the Deloitte Tohmatsu report was recently made available to some members of the Parliament by the Minister's office. It showed very clearly that the Fremantle Port Authority was in financial trouble. Clearly, the reference here is that if the same study were done of Stateships, it would be found to be in a similar situation.

It is not good enough for the Minister in this House to say in dismissing the questions that I was -

Hon Graham Edwards: Fair go; I have not answered them yet. The Minister in the other place was of some assistance, I thought. For instance, she made available the contracts without any problems whatsoever.

Hon GEORGE CASH: The Minister for Police is right on one count; that is, that the Minister in the other place made available the contracts in respect of the charter of these three ships. However, the Minister for Police has not told the House that the only reason the Minister for Transport made the documents available was that the Opposition refused to deal with the Bill until such time as the documents were available. If members read the *Hansard* debate on the issue, they will see where the Minister for Transport, when first asked to table the documents, argued that the documents belonged to Westpac and not to the Government. That is strange because I would have thought that both parties had an interest in the documents and were entitled to copies of them. In the end, she consented to the tabling of the documents, no doubt hoping that the Opposition would not read them closely and find out that the Government has locked itself into a 10 year charter and that the penalties to get out of that charter are very severe.

I remind members that in most lease agreements when a lease is cancelled both parties know very clearly where they stand and the rebates that will be paid to the hirer on cancellation. However, the document that we have signed with Westpac is no ordinary lease agreement. Members should remember that we are talking about payments of nearly \$4 million a year and we cannot cancel for the five years or everything becomes payable. Clause 35 of the document states -

This Charter may be cancelled by the Charterer -

That is, Stateships -

- on the Fifth Charter Hire due date subject to the payment of all of the future Charter Hire immediately upon cancellation.

We can cancel in the fifth year as long as the Government pays up for the next five years' charter as well. A subsidiary clause reads -

In the event the Charterer -

That is, Stateships -

- cancels the Charter, the Vessel remains the property of the Owner.

Further on in the same clause it says -

Should the Vessel be returned in good condition, the Owner will rebate a portion of the future Charter Hire paid on such terms as will be mutually agreed at the time of cancellation.

That really means that, given that it is vague and general in its statement, Westpac can decide how much, if anything, the State gets back. There is no arbitration clause in the document if a dispute arises about any rebates that should be paid.

It is clear from clause 36 of the charter that, if the vessel is not valued at what has been determined to be the residual value at the time of the charter, Stateships has to pay the difference between the assessed residual value and the actual value of the ship. That is not necessarily an unreasonable clause and could be found in other lease agreements. However,

what is unusual is a provision in this contract which states that, where the charter is determined and the ship is valued at in excess of the residual value that has been agreed between the two parties, Westpac will decide what portion of that excess value will be made available to Stateships. It is a very one-sided contract in favour of Westpac. I can only assume - I am not in the business of answering questions for the Government - that the Government found itself in such a difficult financial position that it could not continue to internally fund the building of those vessels and that its financial situation was so desperate that it was forced to turn to the Westpac banking organisation and negotiate these leases. Obviously when one is at that commercial disadvantage, the lease can be drawn in such a way as to favour the owner of the vessel - in this case Westpac - rather than the charterer - in this case the WA Coastal Shipping Commission.

A number of other anomalies that appear not only in the charter document but also in the bareboat charter form that forms part of the total documentation one of which is, in normal shipping circumstances, bareboat charters are negotiated on a monthly rental in advance. A look at the bareboat charter form on that arrangement indicates that that clause has been struck out - that is, the accepted clause in the bareboat charter form - and a new clause has been substituted. As I said, the new clause varies the normal situation of the monthly charter fee in advance to one where the Government has agreed to pay the lease 12 months in advance. One can imagine the additional burden that imposes on the Government. One could say that it is a pretty good deal for Westpac Banking Corporation, which gets its money well and truly up front. Perhaps it looked at the financial position of the Government and decided that it needed to get the money up front in case there was not much money around when it went to claim it in future.

It is also interesting to note that in the lease document the Government of Western Australia has agreed to subsidise the income tax deductions of Westpac. Special clauses appear in the document which indicate that should Westpac be unsuccessful in obtaining certain taxation deductions arising from the purchase and hire of these vessels the Western Australian State Government will make good the moneys that Westpac would have received had it been granted those deductions. Again, that is very one sided and one wonders what it is all about.

It is not only I who have been somewhat critical of these leasing arrangements entered into by the Government for these three vessels. The Confederation of Western Australian Industry has also studied the documents and the activities of Stateships. It recently issued a formal document calling on the Government to reconsider the position of Stateships. The Minister for Transport criticised the confederation severely for publishing the document. The Minister sought to argue that there were clear commercial benefits in maintaining the operations of Stateships. The University of Wollongong had earlier published a paper showing an amount of \$3 million was being lost, but Stateships losses were between \$12 million and \$16 million per annum.

One could go on and on about the saga of Stateships. I regret to say that it appears to me that the Government will have to come to the conclusion that Stateships should be closed down in the not too distant future, mainly because of the financial burden placed upon the Government by its financial dealings over a number of years. I say regretfully because I am unsure whether, if it closes down Stateships, the Government will still provide by way of subsidy or removal of the cabotage restrictions an opportunity for vessels to call at north west ports and continue to serve that community.

I make clear to the House that if the Government attempts to close down Stateships I will understand why, given the inefficiency and huge losses that Stateships is sustaining. However, the Liberal Party in Opposition, and in a coalition Government, will ensure that shipping services continue to the north west communities so that they are not disadvantaged because of the mismanagement and bad financial dealings of Stateships. I agree with the conclusions of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry that alternative options should be explored. I expect that the Government will need to explore those options within a short time.

During the Committee stage of this Bill I will move to insert the following new section 27A if the House agrees to the State becoming guarantor to these agreements already entered into by the Government -

The Treasurer shall, as soon as practicable after a guarantee is given under this Act,

inform in writing the Clerk of each House of Parliament of the giving of that guarantee and shall, if requested by either House of the Parliament, produce that guarantee for the information of that House, within a period of 60 days after the making of that request.

Members probably remember that about 12 months ago when dealing with the Western Australian Government Railways Bill a need arose to insert a similar clause in that Bill to ensure that where guarantees were entered into by WAGR the record of those guarantees could be made available to the Parliament. That will be the purpose of this proposed clause in this Bill.

I will address a number of matters during the Committee stage, and so that the Minister has some notice of those matters I will outline them. They are: Delivery dates of the three vessels the subject of that charter; how many days late each vessel was; what penalties were imposed for late deliveries; the reasons the Government decided to pay the lease annually in advance; the rate at which the arrangements were struck in respect to United States versus Australian dollars; the final cost of each vessel; whether the letters furnished by then Treasurer, David Parker, were in fact agreed and given with approval of Cabinet and, if not, under what authority those letters were provided; whether Westpac signified that the letters were in an acceptable form to it and, if so, when did it advise of that; why the charter imposes such severe penalties on the Government on early cancellation of any charter arrangements; and why the Government has agreed to pay certain costs related to depreciation.

I will also want answers to the following: If Westpac is not successful in gaining tax deductions for depreciation why is reference made to a registered shipping broker in both the documents and lease charter form when no such body exists? It seems to me that the Chartered Institute of Ship Brokers is the only international body that is recognised and of which it should be a member. Why was the *Irene Greenwood* disposed of in the manner it was? Who was paid commission for the sale of that ship? If the Minister claims that the purchase and lease agreements for these three ships are the same as the arrangements made for the *Koolinda* and the *Pilbara* I will ask that documents relating to those matters be tabled because it is my understanding that that is certainly not the case. Why is the description of the vessel referred to in some documents as being 2 700 tonnes on a 4.6 metre draft when the dead weight is quoted in other documents as 3 400 tonnes on a 5.3 metre draft?

The final question I give notice to the Government that I want it to answer during the Committee stage is, what are the daily operating costs of these vessels? It is clear from the lease arrangements that the lease costs will be something in the order of \$US3 250. Important other costs will have to be added in respect of the operation of the vessel, and part of those include crew costs, provisioning and all the other costs such as fuel which must be met to make the ship operational. I shall be asking how much profit each of those ships has made to date when the expenses are measured. These questions can be left until the Committee stage of the Bill.

Reluctantly the Opposition is prepared to support this Bill as in some respects an element of retrospectivity is involved in that certain guarantee letters were given in 1989. Another reason we are reluctant to support this legislation is that in my view the second reading speech misrepresents the provisions of the Bill. That is a very serious matter. In due course the Minister may care to advise the House who was responsible for writing this second reading speech and whether there was any deliberate attempt to mislead or misinform the House in regard to the actual contents and ramifications of the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon E.J. Charlton.

ACTS AMENDMENT (FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 June.

HON MAX EVANS (North Metropolitan) [5.13 pm]: We have been waiting for three days to have this Bill cleared up. Members should be easy on the Minister for Education. This Bill is designed to bring in line Curtin University and Edith Cowan University legislation. Legislation involving the University of Western Australia and Murdoch University was

introduced in December 1985. Many amendments were made to the Financial Administration and Audit Act at that time, in regard not only to these two universities but also to many other institutions. The review of higher education in Western Australia in 1989 gave strong support to adopting a common approach to all four institutions with respect to exemptions to give them greater administrative flexibility without offending the requirements for full accountability under the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

The Bill calls for the deletion of certain sections of that Act, and I shall quote part of section 21, which provides that departments and statutory authorities may open and maintain bank accounts -

- (1) Subject to the approval of the Treasurer, a department or statutory authority may open and maintain an account with a bank for such purpose and subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasurer approves.
- (2) Except as otherwise directed by the Treasurer, a bank account opened and maintained under subsection (1) does not form part of the Public Bank Account.

Members can see that that section gives universities their own authority to open bank accounts and not be responsible to Treasury for what they do with their funds. That is prudent business as far as those bodies are concerned.

Section 22 is headed "Treasurer may approve overdraft", and it reads -

No officer shall cause any bank account maintained under this Division to be overdrawn, except with and subject to the prior approval of the Treasurer.

That means that universities may enter into overdraft arrangements with their respective banks without any reference to Treasury. It gives them the opportunity to run their businesses in a normal business manner, as large institutions like these should.

Section 42 is to be deleted. It concerns estimates of statutory authorities, and reads -

- (1) Unless the Treasurer otherwise directs in writing, the accountable authority of a statutory authority shall cause annual estimates of the financial operations of the statutory authority to be prepared under such headings and in such manner as the Treasurer may approve or direct.
- (2) The estimates prepared under subsection (1) shall be submitted by the accountable authority for the approval of the Minister who shall cause the estimates when approved to be submitted to the Treasurer by a date not later than that specified by the Treasurer.

This now removes the need for these two universities to have to go back to the Minister or to the Treasurer in respect of the estimates they produce each year.

Section 44 is to be deleted. It concerns accounting manuals, and the first part of that section reads -

- (1) The accountable authority of a statutory authority shall prepare and issue an accounting manual for the use of officers of the statutory authority and the accountable authority shall ensure that the accounting manual is kept under review and maintained in an effective and up to date form.

The section goes on to say that these bodies have to get the approval of the Treasurer for accounting manuals. There is really no need to do that; those institutions are capable of doing it for themselves.

Finally, section 58 is to be deleted, and it concerns the Treasurer's instructions. It says -

The Treasurer may prepare and issue and amend instructions, in this Act called the "Treasurer's Instructions" . . .

Many new regulations are to be inserted here under section 58. The Opposition agrees with them and it is pleased to support this legislation to bring about uniformity under the Financial Administration and Audit Act as far as the Edith Cowan University and the Curtin University are concerned.

HON KAY HALLAHAN (East Metropolitan - Minister for Education) [5.18 pm]: I think

the measures outlined in this Bill are commonsense ones and provide some consistency between the different universities. I am pleased that the Government has the support of the Opposition on this relatively uncontentious and practical matter. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee and Report

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for Education), and transmitted to the Assembly.

MOTION - SWAN BREWERY SITE

Buildings Removal - Parkland Establishment

Debate resumed from 21 August.

HON KAY HALLAHAN (East Metropolitan - Minister for Education) [5.21 pm]: This motion, if it were carried, would require all the buildings at what we now know as the old Swan Brewery to be removed from the site and the area returned to parkland under the control of the Kings Park Board. Three main arguments have been put forward -

Hon R.G. Pike: Will the Minister speak up slightly, please?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: No, I cannot; other people will have to make less noise.

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (Hon Garry Kelly): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: One of the arguments concerns the traffic hazard associated with the site; the second is the very high profile argument of the site's significance to Aboriginal people; and the third, which I do not understand at all, is that those buildings have no heritage value.

It is clear to me that the realignment of the road and the resulting improvement in traffic management and lack of traffic incidents - and we accept that some incidents did occur prior to the work's being done - means that the first argument is only a red herring. One presumes that those people who would like to see the buildings demolished would thereupon set about straightening the road, and creating not parkland but other roadways and cycleways; therefore I am not persuaded by that argument. Indeed, since the improvements have been made the statistics on incidents on that section of road do not support the argument, therefore I will dispense with it.

As to the Aboriginal heritage argument, certainly I think the old Swan Brewery area has a clear value to many Aboriginal people. However, what is not clear is whether refurbishment of those buildings in keeping with their heritage style and value would result in a diminution of the value of that site to Aboriginal people or, indeed, would impinge in any way on the cultural significance of the site to Aborigines. While it is true that the site has become a symbol for Aboriginal protest - to let the wider community know about many of their dissatisfactions - it was my hope when I was the Minister for Heritage that, if a cultural centre portraying Aboriginal culture were created there, it would be a meeting point for our two cultures. Some Aboriginal people put that point of view to me, and it is still the hope of some Aboriginal people that that may yet be the result. Therefore, while it has been a cause celebre for some Aboriginal people, there are others who did not feel strongly that the buildings needed to be demolished in order to recognise the cultural significance of the site to them.

Members will appreciate that the site has been entered on the Commonwealth Register of the National Estate at least partially on the basis of the buildings. It was gazetted on 14 May 1991, which is very recently, and followed an advertising period of intention to list that site.

During that period no objections whatsoever were received. When I say that, it is clear there were no objections from members of the Opposition or from people who may now be making representations to the Opposition; neither were there any representations from Aboriginal people.

I will read a little of what is said in the National Estate Register's statement of significance, just to place on the record and impart to the House some of the flavour of what I believe are very important buildings. It says in part -

The Swan Brewery buildings are a relatively rare illustration of the historical relationship between industry and the Swan River . . .

The extant 1897-1933 brewery buildings exhibit the major characteristics of the federation warehouse style and maintain a unity of scale and design over this construction period. The construction of this style (of building) outside NSW is most unusual . . .

The built elements of the brewery complex in relation to the natural features of the Kings Park escarpment form a juxtaposition of high aesthetic value . . .

The Mounts Bay facade forms a particularly important streetscape and set of vistas . . .

That statement of significance was prepared by Australia's leading professional heritage body, the Australian Heritage Commission, and it was after such a statement and assessment of the site and of the buildings that the site was listed, the intention to list was advertised, and the formal listing took place on 14 May 1991.

The other assessment to which we can refer so far has been by the National Trust of Australia, Western Australian branch. The trust classified the precinct as an historic site, but failed to classify the buildings despite a strong recommendation from the expert, technical built environment committee. To some extent the debate that has surrounded the National Trust in times past has centred on the dispute about the assessment analysis and recommendation of that committee and the failure of the full body of the National Trust to act on its recommendation. In February 1986 the then chairman of the trust wrote to the Minister for Planning advising of the trust's decision not to classify the main buildings and drawing attention to major traffic problems associated with that site. I believe it is possible to infer from that that the National Trust took into account factors other than heritage value when it made a decision not to classify those buildings.

I refer now to the National Trust because a few days ago in a speech a member said that ALP members tried to take over the trust at its annual general meeting this year. I have not received any reports about that. When the National Trust was experiencing some internal conflict and was in some disarray, as the Minister responsible I met with what I believed to be responsible members of the community who were concerned about the National Trust, including the former Attorney General, Hon Ian Medcalf. They put to me the proposition that over time they would carefully deal with the internal conflicts the trust was experiencing. On the basis of their very genuine concerns about the ongoing role of the trust I gave an undertaking - and I held to that in all media statements - that I would be leaving the matter in their hands to resolve. Ultimately, that was the case. I do not know what happened at the last AGM but I have strong suspicions that the allegations made in this House would need some substantiation. I found it rather a disappointing element to have added to this debate, but debate in this place can add any element, and we accept that. I am not sure whether it added to the value or substance of debate.

On 14 May 1991 the current Minister for Heritage formally referred the old Swan Brewery matter to the newly formed Heritage Council of Western Australia under section 6(3) of the Heritage of Western Australia Act, seeking an assessment of the cultural heritage significance of the buildings and site. He made that referral on the basis of a correct recognition that the Heritage Council is the expert authority in this State to advise the Government on heritage/cultural matters and places of significance. I understand that consultants have been asked by the Heritage Council to undertake an assessment and to complete that evaluation by late this year.

I will point to the remarks made in the other place by the Minister for Heritage because they are pertinent to the debate in this place, which has largely been lifted higher than the debate in the other place. We acknowledge his comments because we fought hard in this House to have the Heritage of Western Australia Act passed. The Bill was passed in December 1990. Not many of us would forget that or indeed the consideration given to it by the Legislation Committee. We would not forget the cooperation that ultimately resulted in having the Bill passed during the last hours of Parliament. The Minister for Heritage stated that the legislation was amended in the Legislative Council to place greater controls on the Government's dealings with its own buildings. It seems extraordinary that having gone through that debate, having set up that body, having moved amendments in this House which made stronger claims on the Government in the care of buildings in its possession, that we have in this House now a motion moving for the demolition of the buildings.

The legislation establishes a process for making development decisions. It indicates that assessment should be made against clear, objective criteria and that subsequent decisions about development options should be made in the light of clearly stated cultural/heritage significance. I will stay mystified to my dying day about the motion before this House. Having established that body the Government considers itself duty bound to use it. I do not understand why the Opposition does not likewise see itself duty bound to have decisions made about buildings of questionable heritage significance dealt with by the authority which the Parliament established to do that job.

It is inconsistent for the Opposition to argue for tighter controls on Government buildings and to pre-empt the seeking of advice and assessment by the authority, as this motion seeks to do. We know that various members do things for various reasons but I do not understand the reason that Hon Bob Pike would bring this motion forward. I do not understand the reason it would be supported by other members of the Opposition because we have put in place a very powerful body. We should allow that body to get on with its job. It is a dangerous precedent to attempt to pre-empt an assessment and analysis which is owing to such an old building.

The old Swan Brewery site is remarkable. It is regarded by the National Trust as the gateway to the City of Perth. It has trees on one side and the building on the other. There is a sense of balance about that entry to the city. The revised plans for the renovation and restoration of the buildings, in keeping with their cultural significance and their historic craftsmanship, would be a wonderful addition to the community. We have the capacity to put in place a remarkable museum of Aboriginal culture and history, an opportunity for people to enjoy the river and the recreational centre which is aesthetically pleasing and historic, the likes of which we do not often see.

It mystifies me that while we have so few old buildings we would want to destroy any of them, particularly those under the ownership of the people of Western Australia and the Government. We should give serious consideration about what happens to that area. I am strongly opposed to the motion and I ask the House to vote against it.

HON R.G. PIKE (North Metropolitan) [5.38 pm]: The Minister has delivered a lamentable reply to what is an excellent proposition, evidenced by the fact that the Legislative Assembly voted for it. The Minister said that she did not understand why I had put forward this motion, and that she did not understand the motion. All I can say is that at least the Minister has her health, if nothing else.

Having said that, I turn to Premier Lawrence. She said that the decision by the Legislative Council was premature, unprincipled and misconceived, and that the other place had enthusiastically embraced the motion. The Minister has done that which has been done throughout the issue; that is, she has buried the issue in manifest trivia. We had 20 000 people outside this place demonstrating about law reform on Tuesday. We have a big percentage of Western Australian saying "Take this back and incorporate it in Kings Park, and get rid of the buildings on it", yet we have this incredible delay, this nonsense and bovril from the Minister.

We should support this motion so that the Executive will be forced to take notice of both Houses of Parliament. Members should bear in mind my previous comment that Lawrence has joined Burke and Dowding in the leapfrog club. It is now the Lawrence, Burke and Dowding leapfrog club - the LBDLC. This involves leapfrogging and disregarding

[Thursday, 22 August 1991]

3753

Parliament, believing it is of no account until it suits, and the Executive controlling the State. By their actions the club members have said, "We will be an honest and upright Labor Government, but not this week." I ask the House to support the motion.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.40 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY - ALBANY OFFICE
ESTABLISHMENT
Wetlands Protection

560. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Did the Minister make a public commitment to establish an Environmental Protection Authority office in Albany at the time of the release of the report on Princess Royal Harbour, Albany?
- (2) If yes, when will this office be established?
- (3) Has the Minister recently endorsed the EPA bulletin on the protection of wetlands?
- (4) Has the Minister recently given approval for a development in a wetland against the advice of the EPA?
- (5) If yes, why?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for the Environment has provided the following reply -

- (1) In August 1990 the Minister and Cabinet endorsed the Environmental Protection Authority recommendation to establish an organisation, based in Albany, to provide a clear focus for the coordinated management of the Albany harbours and associated areas. This commitment has been implemented, with the formation of the Albany Waterways Management Authority, a statutory body under the Waterways Conservation Act.

- (2) Not applicable.

- (3) The draft environmental protection policy for wetlands of the Swan Coastal Plain was released on 15 May 1991. It is currently going through the consultation phase required under the Environmental Protection Act.

- (4)-(5)

The Minister has upheld an appeal in part on the Mandurah Quay Proposal.

POWER STATIONS - COAL FIRED POWER STATION, COLLIE
Mitsubishi-Transfield Contract

616. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) When will the contract for the new coal fired power station at Collie be signed with Mitsubishi-Transfield?
- (2) Will the contract be signed on a take or pay basis?
- (3) What will the cost of the energy from the new power station be to the State?
- (4) If the contract is on a take or pay basis, will there be an option for the State to vary the amount taken in the future?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

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

- (1) The current project schedule provides for the final contract to be signed in early 1992.
- (2) Under the contract arrangement, SECWA will pay only when the power station is available to generate and only for the amount of electricity requested by SECWA.
- (3) A single figure cannot be provided. The cost of energy from the new

power station will depend on a range of escalations, and varies over the life of the project.

(4) Yes.

ARGENTINE ANTS - GOVERNMENT CONTROL

625. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the Government's stance currently on Argentine ant control?
- (2) Why did the Government cease its past programs of ant control?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that in some areas such as Bunbury, Argentine ant infestations have increased by 600 to 700 per cent during the last two years?
- (4) How does the Government propose to deal with such infestations?
- (5) Is it likely that the Government's role in ant control will be reviewed in the near future?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Agriculture has provided the following reply -

- (1) Argentine ant control is now the responsibility of individual landholders.
- (2) Government control programs ceased because the community no longer accepted the compulsory use of the chemical Heptachlor, which is the only effective chemical available to achieve eradication.
- (3) Surveys indicate very large increases in Bunbury, as well as other parts of the State.
- (4) The Agriculture Protection Board has expanded its research activities to find alternative control techniques and will continue to give advice on how to minimise the nuisance value of the ants.
- (5) No.

SWAN BREWERY SITE - SCAFFOLDING AND FENCING PURCHASE

Septic Tanks

627. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Heritage:

- (1) Has the Government purchased the scaffolding and fencing on the site of the Old Swan Brewery?
- (2) If so, at what cost?
- (3) Are there any plans to upgrade the security and lighting on the site?
- (4) If yes to (3), what costs are envisaged?
- (5) Are there septic tanks under the old building on the site?
- (6) Have these tanks been emptied since the building has been in its present static state?
- (7) If so, at what cost?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$100 000, including one month's hire cost.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) \$20 000 estimated.
- (5) Yes, for temporary construction toilets.
- (6) Yes, on one occasion.
- (7) \$645.

REGIONAL PARKS - BEELIAR REGIONAL PARK PROPOSAL

645. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) When does the Government intend to proceed with the formal establishment of the Beeliar Regional Park?
- (2) What area of land is involved in the proposal?
- (3) If there are hold-ups in creating this park, will the Minister explain what they are?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Planning has provided the following reply -

- (1) The final report on the Beeliar Regional Park is planned for release in November 1991.
- (2) The draft report identifies areas for the park. Public submissions and other suggestions for inclusion in the park are currently being finalised.
- (3) Public submissions included many suggestions which required further negotiation.

GNANGARA MOUND - SERVICE STATION

648. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Attorney General representing the Premier:

- (1) Has the Premier been asked by the Conservation Council to overturn the decision of Mr Pearce to allow a service station to be built over the Gnangara mound?
- (2) If so, will the Premier intervene, overturn the Minister's decision and thus give the protection to ground water resources, as demanded by the Water Authority of Western Australia?
- (3) If not, will the Premier say why she is not prepared to overturn Mr Pearce's decision?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following response -

- (1) Yes.

(2)-(3)

The Water Authority will be consulted on the conditions placed on the proposal as well as the proponent having to meet the requirements issued by the authority. The Minister for the Environment's determination of an appeal is final.

GNANGARA MOUND - SERVICE STATION

649. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Does the Minister support the Water Authority of Western Australia in its stance that a service station should not be sited above the Gnangara mound?
- (2) If so, has the Minister conveyed his attitude, or that of the water authority, to the Minister for the environment?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Water Resources has provided the following response -

- (1) Yes.

(2) Yes. Furthermore, I have requested the Water Authority to make amendments to its by-laws to control such developments in critical public water supply source areas.

"EOKOMIT" - ENVIRONMAN ENTERPRISES

651. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the Minister recently received information on the product termed "eokomit" from the company Environman Enterprises?
- (2) If so, is it correct that a departmental officer verbally responded to a company representative that the department was ideologically opposed to the use of such methods of soil treatment?
- (3) If yes to (2), why does the department hold this negative attitude?
- (4) If no to (2), what is the department's attitude to "eokomit"?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Agriculture has provided the following response -

(1) Yes.

(2)-(3)

No. A departmental officer had a long discussion with a representative of the company. During the discussion the view was conveyed to the representative that the biological and economic efficiency of products needed to be established before they could be promoted by the department.

(4) The Department of Agriculture sees Eokomit as a product which requires experimentation under local conditions to demonstrate its effectiveness - and potential value.

**ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION - BOATS
AND MOTORS SALE
*Aboriginal Community***

655. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Water Resources:

With regard to the sale of two boats and motors to an Aboriginal community in the Kimberley through the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission -

- (1) Which community was it?
- (2) Who originally approached the water authority in Derby?
- (3) What was the age and the specific details of all equipment that was sold to ATSIC?
- (4) Who did the valuation on this equipment?
- (5) Did any groups or individuals indicate interest at any time with regard to purchasing this equipment?
- (6) How much did ATSIC pay for the equipment?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Water Resources has provided the following response -

(1) The Djawarrada Community.

(2) No official approach was made in Derby. A letter was received from Mr D.P. D'Antoine representing the Djawarrada Community at the office of the Minister for Water Resources, Mr Ernie Bridge. This was forwarded to the authority in the usual manner.

(3) Two x 5.2 metre aluminium work boats complete with trailers were purchased in December 1980.

One x 30 horsepower Johnson outboard was purchased in November 1989 - fleet No 6686.

One x 35 horsepower Johnson outboard was purchased in February 1984 - fleet No 6722.

Two x 35 horsepower Johnson outboard motors were purchased in June 1985 - fleet Nos 11675 and 11676.

- (4) The Kimberley staff mechanical supervisor provided a condition report on each item, from which a minimum reserve value was set by the assistant manager, vehicle and plant management, at the authority's Perth office.
- (5) To my knowledge, no other formal inquiries or approaches were made to the authority.
- (6) \$1 600.

STATE ENERGY COMMISSION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - CORAL BAY
POWER SUPPLY
Takeover Review

656. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is the Government reviewing its decision not to take over the supply of power to Coral Bay?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

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

- (1) No.
- (2) It cannot be economically justified.

ROADS - LAVERTON-WARBURTON-GILES ROAD
Transit Vehicle Travel Permits - Aboriginal Reserves Agreement

658. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that residents of the central desert have agreed to waive the requirement for transit vehicles to have permits to travel through Aboriginal reserves on the Laverton-Warburton-Giles road?
- (2) What steps has the Aboriginal Planning Authority taken to assist this decision and to make it law?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has provided the following reply -

- (1) No. However, the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority is currently undertaking discussions with Ngaanyatjarra Council Aboriginal Corporation regarding the existing permit requirement for tourists transiting through the central reserves.
- (2) Not applicable.

DOBSON, MR MAL - IMPRISONMENT COMPENSATION

660. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Attorney General:

- (1) What steps are being taken to compensate Mr Mal Dobson former Manager of the Swan Building Society for his imprisonment which was overturned by the Court of Appeal?
- (2) Were the charges instigated by the Crown?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) None. This is in keeping with the long established practice of not providing compensation except in extremely exceptional circumstances.
- (2) The charges were laid by police. The trial in the District Court took place after a committal for trial by a magistrate on an indictment presented by the Crown.

QUARANTINE CHECKPOINTS - NORSEMAN QUARANTINE CHECKPOINT

Eucla Transfer Consideration

664. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is consideration being given to shifting the quarantine inspection depot from Norseman to Eucla?
- (2) If not, what steps are being taken to protect the pastoral properties between Norseman and Eucla from unwanted disease and pests from interstate?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Agriculture has provided the following reply -

- (1) No. Priority is being given to establishing a permanent quarantine checkpoint in the north, near Kununurra.
- (2) Agriculture Protection Board District Officers regularly inspect pastoral properties and verges along the Eyre Highway for declared plants. Department of Agriculture animal health technical officers are in regular contact with owners of pastoral properties, and arrangements are made to inspect imported stock at the point of disembarkation. Road signs and leaflets available from service stations are used to inform travellers of quarantine requirements.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT - SANDSTONE, CUE, MT MAGNET SHIRES

Amalgamation Consideration

671. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is the Government considering the amalgamation of the Sandstone, Cue, Mt Magnet shires?
- (2) If not, is any consideration being given to amalgamation of any shires in Western Australia?
- (3) If so, which shires?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Local Government has provided the following reply -

- (1)-(2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT - WARD BOUNDARIES

Review

672. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What are the names of the shires in Western Australia that have been specifically directed to alter their shire ward boundaries?
- (2) Which shires have complied?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Local Government has provided the following reply -

- (1) The Minister for Local Government has recently written to a number of local governments proposing that they review their ward boundaries and representation in keeping with the Government's policies. No decisions have been made by the Minister in particular cases since these letters were sent.
- (2) Not applicable.

**ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION - ROAD
MAINTENANCE, ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES**
Shire Funding

675. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Is the Government aware of any discussions being undertaken with the Aboriginal Torres Strait Island Commission with a view to ATSIC providing funds to assist shires with road maintenance to Aboriginal communities?
- (2) If so, which shires are involved?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes, the Main Roads Department, the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority, and the Aboriginal Torres Strait Island Commission are involved in an exercise to update information concerning access roads to remote Aboriginal communities. The exercise will involve development of a feasible strategy on the provision and maintenance of road infrastructure to remote Aboriginal communities. Recommendations from the Working Party to the Minister for Transport will concern funding for upgrading and maintenance of these roads.
- (2) During the study, relevant information and data pertaining to remote Aboriginal communities will be collected by regional centres and agencies together with liaison with local authorities in the regions of Kimberley, Pilbara and the Goldfields.

**ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION - ROAD
MAINTENANCE, ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES**
Derby-West Kimberley Shire Funding

676. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is the Government aware of the desire by the Shire of Derby-West Kimberley for the Aboriginal Torres Strait Island Commission to assist with funding to provide maintenance to remote communities in their shire?
- (2) If so, does the Government support this stance?
- (3) Have any discussions taken place at a Federal level concerning the Shire of Derby-West Kimberley proposal?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Local Government has provided the following reply -

- (1) No.
- (2) The Government will be reviewing such issues in the light of the recently released report of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority: "Inquiry into Service and Resource Provision to Remote Aboriginal Communities in Western Australia (May, 1991)".
- (3) The Minister for Local Government is not aware of any such discussions.

SHARK BAY SALT - USELESS LOOP SALT PROJECT EXTENSIONS
Denham Fishermen's Association Objection

681. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Is the Government aware that the Denham Fishermen's Association objects to the Environmental Protection Authority's decision to allow extensions to Shark Bay Salt's operation at Useless Loop?

- (2) If so, what steps are being taken to compensate the fishermen for loss of breeding and fishing grounds?
- (3) Are discussions with the Denham Fishermen's Association contemplated?
- (4) If not, why not?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for the Environment has provided the following reply -

(1)-(4)

I have not received an appeal from the Denham Fishermen's Association in regard to the Environmental Protection Authority's report and recommendations to me on the proposal to extend Shark Bay Salt's operation at Useless Loop; nor have I received a letter of objection from the association to this date. I have, however, discussed the matter by telephone with representatives of the association, and I am aware of their position. I have offered to meet with them if necessary.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION BILL - PROCLAMATION DATE

423. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Attorney General:

- (1) When will the Guardianship and Administration Bill be proclaimed and brought into operation?
- (2) Why has it taken so long for this legislation to be enacted?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

I will be in a position to indicate a firm date within the next few days.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL (No 2) - REGULATIONS

424. Hon MURIEL PATTERSON to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When will the Education Amendment Bill (No 2) be proclaimed?
- (2) Have the regulations relating to this legislation yet been completed?
- (3) If so, which groups or people have been consulted in the process of formulating those regulations?
- (4) If the regulations have yet to be completed, who will be consulted prior to those regulations being tabled in the Parliament?
- (5) When is it anticipated that the regulations will be tabled?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1),(2) and (5)

It is intended to gazette the regulations governing school decision making groups within the next month. They will be tabled in Parliament immediately thereafter.

- (3) The Western Australian Council of State School Organisations was consulted in the formulation of the policy on which the regulations are based. WACSSO was represented on the working party which developed the policy document "School Decision Making: Policy and Guidelines". This document includes recommended amendments to the regulations. WACSSO representatives participated in frequent, regular and extensive discussions concerning the policy with the Chief Executive Officer and the Executive Director (Schools Operations) of the Ministry of Education.
- (4) Not applicable.

TAFE - STATE SCHOOL TEACHERS UNION
Teaching Funds - Non-Teaching Positions Transfer

425. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Education:

I refer the Minister to the open letter addressed to the Premier by the State School Teachers Union concerning the Department of Technical and Further Education's latest crisis and ask why the Minister is directing funds from teaching into non-teaching positions at TAFE?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

This question perhaps gives me an opportunity to make a statement on the TAFE dispute. In fact, the dispute is about 36 -

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question does not give the Minister an opportunity to make a statement; she should answer the question.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I will not make a statement, I will explain the situation.

Hon P.G. Pendal: Set a precedent and answer the question.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Even Hon Phillip Pendal's colleague sitting on his left gave him a thump for that. The TAFE dispute is about 36 promotional directors' positions in the academic area. The creation of these positions is a very important development within the TAFE structure in that it provides a career structure in the TAFE system. I suspect that that matter has resulted in the allegation to which Hon Phillip Pendal referred. A great deal of consultation has taken place about these positions, and the parties involved in those discussions do not know why the union representatives will not proceed with negotiations to establish these important positions. Following prolonged negotiations and some delay, a decision was made to advertise the positions and implement the structure. The industrial action has resulted from the advertisement of those positions. In my view there can be no argument about the need for those positions and, although it could be said that they are not direct teaching positions, it is important for the structure of TAFE that staff be available to assess and supervise the teaching staff. I am very disappointed with the position taken by the State School Teachers Union on this matter.

TAFE - CLUSTER SYSTEM
Duplication and Wastage

426. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Education:

Why is the Government persisting with the failed cluster system which has resulted in the need for five mini-TAFEs with massive duplication of resources and overblown bureaucracies?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I would be very interested to hear Hon Phillip Pendal substantiate the statement he has made.

Hon P.G. Pendal: It has come from the union.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Since when has the union been a friend of Hon Phillip Pendal's?

Hon P.G. Pendal: We are very good friends.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: A very interesting liaison has developed; people are concerned about a certain section of the union and if they knew that Hon Phillip Pendal was joining forces with the union they would be even more concerned.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That has nothing to do with the question.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I have forgotten the question.

Hon P.G. Pendal: It referred to massive duplication of resources.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is supposed to be a serious time in the Parliament and I ask members to refrain from the frivolity.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The human heart does have a light side.

Hon W.N. Stretch: It does not cover ignorance.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Presiding over the Chamber is always difficult and at times it requires an herculean effort on my part, but question time is the worst time of all. That is because people are sometimes frivolous in the questions they ask and some of the answers are equally frivolous. If we are to have a serious question without notice session, everybody must recognise it as a very important part of our Westminster style of parliamentary democracy; that is, they are entitled to ask questions and they are entitled to expect the Minister to answer them. We have always had a very good arrangement in this House but of late it has become the part of the day to which I least look forward. I ask the Minister to answer the question.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The allegation about the system of college administration is something that has come to my attention in a pamphlet put out by the State School Teachers Union. When I have met with the union, never has it raised with me any wastage by this administrative structure. In the time I have been Minister, which is now something like six months, that has never come up as a concern from either the union or the administrators of TAFE. When I announced that there would be an amalgamation of TAFE and the Department of Employment and Training, no-one said to me, "Will you please consider rearranging the multi-campus TAFE colleges?" Nobody from the Opposition has said that, and nobody from the State School Teachers Union has said it. Members opposite know nothing about it; they have picked it up from a piece of paper without making any inquiries. If it is a fact that there is some wastage in the system - and I have yet to have it brought to my attention, but I shall make inquiries about it - I will move on that. Nobody, not even somebody responsible, has brought it to my attention.

Hon P.G. Pendal: It has been brought to your attention today.

TAFE - STATE SCHOOL TEACHERS UNION
Promotions, Travel Changes

427. Hon E.J. CHARLTON to the Minister for Education:

Bearing in mind the last answer, has the Minister ever brought to the attention of the State School Teachers Union matters such as the formula for promotions within the Ministry of Education travel changes and so forth? Has the Minister ever approached the union about wastage encouraged by the unions' attitude to those things?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Members can be assured that when I meet with the State School Teachers Union I bring to it my concerns if I think what it is proposing is not in the best interests of education. The fact is that those sorts of matters are dealt with by a committee system. Issues such as promotion or staff to student ratios are very complex and they become the subject of quite extensive negotiation. They are then presented in the form of a recommended agreement, or in the case of no agreement they may end up in the Industrial Relations Commission and be arbitrated on.

TAFE - STATE SCHOOL TEACHERS UNION
Record Unemployment Levels - Course Reduction Reason

428. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Minister accept the assertion of the State School Teachers Union that her Government has achieved record unemployment of 11.2 per cent and record youth unemployment of 26.8 per cent?
- (2) If she does, can she answer the question posed by the State School Teachers Union: Why is the Government in these circumstances reducing the courses at TAFE colleges?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

It is a sad fact that we have record high unemployment. We have high youth unemployment, although last month youth unemployment did come back somewhat.

Hon George Cash: By how much?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I pointed out -

Hon P.G. Pendal: By 0.4 per cent of one per cent.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: That is significant for the individuals affected.

Hon George Cash: What about the tens of thousands who do not have jobs?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: There are not tens of thousands of young people without jobs. I can give those members seriously involved in question time a little more information about youth unemployment figures. Youth unemployment, which I think last month was 26.8 per cent, is a serious matter, but members should keep it in mind that most young people in the age group included in that category are in education, ongoing higher education, or training.

Hon Murray Montgomery: They would not be there if they could get a job.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Some would and some would not. It is important to remember that when the figures for surveys are collected many young people say they want part time employment because they are in education. What they want is part time employment, and they are included in the statistics as being in the work force and unemployed. It is not true to say that all those people are unemployed, because most of them are in education or training. As a result the figure comes down to something like eight per cent. Perhaps members do not want to hear that, but that is the youth unemployment figure.

With regard to TAFE, changes are going on. From here on in TAFE will be in a state of continual change because we are in a period of award restructuring and there is a new thrust on the training agenda in this State and nationally. Training is to be serviced by TAFE, and it will be much more responsive to industry than it has been in the past. Some courses have been discontinued because there are no jobs at the end of the training for those people, and it is a rational and sensible decision to discontinue those courses and put the resources into other opportunities which are responding more to the demands of industry.

Hon George Cash: You have five Ministers arguing over the same project.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Can the member wait for the next five minutes and ask his own question? That is part of the unsettled state of TAFE as well. It is going through quite a period of change and has enormous responsibilities and challenges facing it. This will be part of an ongoing agenda for TAFE.

UNEMPLOYMENT - YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

429. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that youth unemployment is currently standing at 26.8 per cent and has not been lower than 25.1 per cent all year?
- (2) Can she tell the House when, if ever in Western Australia's history, the figure has previously been higher?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

The unemployment situation in Western Australia is quite serious, as I have indicated. That is the position not only in Western Australia but nationwide, and also internationally, as is the very serious recession which is the cause of this. The recession is across the nation and across the western world. Goodness knows what is happening in some of the eastern bloc countries.

Several members interjected.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Our State has some peculiarities.

Hon Murray Montgomery: You are the Government.

Hon George Cash: You have the highest level of unemployment in the nation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the Minister answer the question.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I would not want the Opposition to be frivolous about unemployment, and I would not want to accuse members opposite of that. We are very dependent, as some members will appreciate, on overseas commodity prices. That is a characteristic of our economy, therefore a great volatility, apart from the recession, is impacting heavily on our State. Two years ago we had the best record for employment in Australia, yet now we have this very high unemployment. That shows the volatility of our economy. Members should keep that in mind.

Hon George Cash: Is that an excuse? Tell that to the unemployed.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am giving the facts.

**R & I BANK OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA LTD - CAPITAL
INJECTION \$70 MILLION
*Youth Unemployment Elimination***

430. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Employment and Training:

In her joint role of Minister for Employment and Training and Minister for Education, does the Minister acknowledge that the \$70 million to be injected by the Government into R & I Bank Ltd is indeed \$70 million which could have been used to virtually eliminate the 26.8 per cent youth unemployment rate in Western Australia?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

This is a matter for the Premier. However, when the Premier made her announcement about the injection of \$70 million to the R & I Bank she stated that it was a special loan arrangement for a specific purpose. It was not a general loan from funding for any of our other services or activities which we have been able to undertake. The loan is solely to assist in a special situation, and it would not have been agreed to by the Commonwealth Government otherwise. The question can be regarded as a red herring; perhaps it was unintentional -

Hon P.G. Pendal: Does the Minister say that this situation does not impact on people?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The loan is for a specific purpose, and the question can be regarded as a red herring.

**UNIVERSITIES - COURSES
*Accreditation Authority***

431. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it necessary for all courses at Australian universities to be accredited?
- (2) If so, who carries out the accreditation?
- (3) I refer to clause 5 of the Post-Secondary Educational Institutions (Title and Degrees) Bill, now before the House, which refers to courses accredited by the Minister or by a person authorised to do so by the Minister. Can the Minister tell me who that person authorised by the Minister is likely to be?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(3)

Courses carried out by universities are accredited by a national body. I presume the Minister will refer matters to accredited bodies in order to get approval, as the Act indicates the Minister will be empowered to do.

**COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND - PORT
HEDLAND SHIRE**
Allocation \$2 million

432. Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

My question relates to an answer received yesterday regarding the community sporting and recreation facilities fund and an allocation of \$2 million to the Port Hedland Shire. The Minister indicated yesterday that the amount had been carried over in the last two financial years. Is that \$2 million part of the \$5 million that the Premier indicated would be provided for the CSRFF, or is it an amount that will be carried over allowing the \$5 million to remain completely separate?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I am not sure. The details of the CSRFF proposal are still being worked out so I am not in a position to tell the member whether the \$2 million is part of the \$5 million or indeed whether the \$5 million will be the final figure.

UNEMPLOYMENT - EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES
Government Initiatives

433. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Employment and Training:

Given the unsurpassed record unemployment for both youth and adults across the board in Western Australia, why are the previously announced Government initiatives on employment opportunities not working?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I am not sure to which initiatives the member refers. The Government has experienced a severe downturn in income from rural products particularly, as everyone understands. Additionally, the effects of the recession are being felt, as are the downward demands in our economy, which have reduced markedly the income that the Government derives from taxes, charges, and stamp duty. Everyone knows, even the Opposition, that State Governments have few sources from which to raise revenue. The available sources for States have been markedly reduced by the effects of the recession. We conduct programs in order to assist people in the very competitive job market. Where people avail themselves of those services, even when the market is tight, they have greater success in securing jobs - to the extent that employers have the capacity to take on people. Employers are watching and waiting to see how the economy goes; but when someone is personally referred to them and they have the capacity to take on a person they are doing so. In some cases, employers take on these people rather than advertise and become deluged with hundreds of job applications and the paperwork that involves.

I do not know whether the member wants me to go through the details of the Government's moves to boost the home building industry and to explain that those moves are having a beneficial effect on the home building industry and other associated industries.

Hon George Cash: Why do we have a record unemployment rate? The schemes obviously are not working.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The injection of funds into the home building industry is working. When we have lower power costs and we can diversify our economy - which the Opposition did not do in its long years in Government - we will have a greater capacity to deal with the rise and fall in international commodity markets.

UNEMPLOYMENT - GOVERNMENT EXCUSES
Major Projects Assistance

434. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Employment and Training:

Is the Minister aware that many of the unemployed people in Western

Australia are sick and tired of the pathetic excuses that she offers for their remaining unemployed, given the fact that Ministers of the Government do not appear to be able to get together and agree on major projects that could be started if only the Government were prepared to assist some of the large companies involved in those projects?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

There is no misunderstanding on the part of the Government of the very serious effect on people's lives that unemployment brings. I charge Opposition members with an inability ever to understand the effect of unemployment on people. When the Opposition was in Government we heard stories about dole bludgers, and if it were in Government now we would hear the same sorts of unsavoury stories. Movement has been made on major projects; to some extent the criticism -

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is attempting to answer the question. Hon Eric Charlton wants to ask a question and we are running out of time.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The Government has experienced difficulties, and I presume members understand some of them. The Government has made concerted efforts both regarding Yakabindie and Marandoo - if that is what the Opposition is referring to. I am not sure what the question referred to. I am asked to be specific; however, the Opposition does not have the courage to be specific with questions because the Minister responsible is not in this House to answer questions directly. I take a question as a general question; however, when I give a general answer the Opposition should cop it too.

UNEMPLOYMENT - EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS *New Social Security Regulations Impact*

435. Hon E.J. CHARLTON to the Minister for Education:

What effect will the new Commonwealth regulations on social security for youth have on employment and training programs in this State?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Hon Eric Charlton should be asking that question in the Senate, because the Federal Government has put money into its Budget to look particularly at the needs of long-term unemployed.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Is the State involved in that?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: It is a Federal Government initiative and that Government is implementing it in its agencies. Some of that funding may flow over, but most of it appears to be going through the Federal Government's SkillShare program, the Commonwealth Employment Service and the Department of Social Security. It is those Government agencies which will benefit in the main.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The State has no involvement at all?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I cannot say we will not, because there may be some interlocking effects, but the Federal Government is conducting its own programs. There are negotiations about whether we have any duplicated services; that is part of our whole program of not wanting duplicated projects and working at a complementary level with local communities. Certainly the funding in this week's Federal Budget has tended to focus on the long-term unemployed.

CRIME - STATISTICS

436. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Police:

For the period 30 June 1990 to 1 July 1991 what are the total number of offences reported in the following categories -

- (a) Homicide;
- (b) Indecent assault (excluding sexual/aggravated assault);
- (c) Aggravated sexual assault;
- (d) Sexual assault;
- (e) Breaking and entering;
- (f) Robbery;
- (g) Serious assault;
- (h) Assault of Police;
- (i) Stealing;
- (j) Motor vehicle theft;
- (k) Fraud;
- (l) Damage - over \$200;
- (m) Damage - \$200 or less;
- (n) Arson;
- (o) Unlawfully on curtilage premises;
- (p) Drugs;
- (q) Other indictable offences; and
- (r) Bomb hoaxes.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I thank the member for notice of the question. However, in the time available I have not been able to supply all of the information, and other information was unable to be retrieved at the cut-off time. I have the information on the following four categories: Breaking and entering, 54 777; motor vehicle theft, 19 841; assaults on police, 857; and assault, 7 254.

I have also asked my office to respond to another question on which Hon George Cash sought some information, so he should have that today.
