

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 17 May 1990

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett) took the Chair at 10.00 am, and read prayers.

## PETITION - FOOD ADDITIVES

### *Supermarkets and Food Outlets - Code Chart Display*

MR KIERATH (Riverton) [10.02 am]: I have a petition in the following terms -

To: The Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned hereby petition that the Government require all supermarkets and food outlets to display clearly a chart detailing the coding used in food additives, thereby allowing the consumer to know which chemicals are used in the product. The consumer can then exercise freedom of choice in deciding whether or not to use the product. The chart should also warn of the possible harmful effects of food colourings, especially red E123, and yellow E102 - carmoisine and tartrazine - until it has been proven that these additives are not injurious to health.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 16 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 27.]

## PETITION - RENAL DIALYSIS UNIT

### *Fremantle Hospital*

MR KIERATH (Riverton) [10.03 am]: I present the following petition -

To: The Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned hereby petition that a renal dialysis unit be established at Fremantle Hospital, thereby allowing patients ready access to extra life-saving medical services. The Unit centred at Shenton Park is not easily accessible to patients south of the Swan River.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears seven signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 28.]

## THE REFERENDUMS (REPEAL OF ACTS, AND REGULATIONS) BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Mensaros, and read a first time.

## MOTION - SELECT COMMITTEE ON PAROLE

### *Council's Message*

On motion by Mr D.L. Smith (Minister for Justice), resolved -

That the Assembly accept the invitation of the Legislative Council to appoint a Select Committee for the purposes set out in the Council's Message No 2 and concur with parts (1) to (6) of the Council's resolutions.

## MOTION - SELECT COMMITTEE ON PAROLE

### *Appointment*

On motion by Mr D.L. Smith (Minister for Justice), resolved -

That the following members be appointed to serve on the Select Committee - the member for Marangaroo (Mr Cunningham), the member for Cottesloe (Mr Hassell), and the member for Avon (Mr Trenorden).

That the Assembly Committee shall have power to meet and confer jointly with the Council Committee and may pass resolutions or take evidence with a quorum of two, and so much of the Standing Orders as necessary are suspended accordingly.

## WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MRS BEGGS (Whitford - Minister for Transport) [10.09 am]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has a number of objectives. However, there are four main areas in which the Western Australian Marine Act is significantly amended. Firstly, the Bill seeks to abolish the Western Australian Marine Manning Committee. When formed in 1973, it was intended that this committee would provide a more flexible approach to setting manning levels for certain commercial vessels. Prior to the establishment of the committee, manning levels were rigidly fixed by regulation.

However, instances occurred whereby, due to special circumstances - for example, the duration of a particular voyage, area of operation, etc - the manning levels set out in the regulations became unreasonable. Despite the good intention of the legislation in establishing the committee, the reality is that it has met only spasmodically over the past 17 years and prior to the last meeting in mid-1988 had not met for nearly three years. It has become apparent that the committee is no longer meeting its original objectives, but is being used merely as a lever by parties to industrial disputes.

On the only occasion when the committee convened between December 1984 and August 1988 the three representatives of the respective unions and the Merchant Services Guild boycotted the meeting. The resolution of industrial disputes should properly be resolved in the various industrial tribunals, not in a forum designed to establish minimum safety manning levels. The proposed amendments will replace the committee with a consultative process whereby, having sought advice from interested parties, the executive director will be able to make a determination in respect of specific vessels, and for specific voyages. This system will provide the flexibility intended when the committee was established, while streamlining the administrative process. The existing appeal provision to the Minister, against a determination by the executive director, will remain in the legislation.

Secondly, the Bill seeks to protect the passengers and crew of vessels by placing an onus on a ship's master to ensure that a vessel is safe to put to sea. The proposed amendment will create an offence where a master puts to sea in circumstances which endanger the safety of those on board the vessel. Over recent times concern has been expressed about the excessive use of Government resources in the investigation of false distress signals. Whenever a distress signal is received by authorities, they must assume that it is genuine, and as a consequence mount sea search and rescue operations. The Bill will make the operator of any vessel, who deliberately causes or allows the sending of a false signal, responsible for the costs incurred as a consequence of that action.

Since the introduction of the Act in 1982 a variety of water related activities have developed which have a direct impact on the navigation of small vessels in our rivers. Often these activities, as with parafling, involve the use of vessels; however, the existing regulatory powers under the Act do not allow for the making of specific regulations to control their activities. The Bill will extend the regulatory powers under the Act to include any activity which may impact on the safety of those individuals using our waterways.

Additionally, the Bill seeks to overcome certain administrative difficulties which have been identified with the current Act. In particular, the title of permanent head of the department

has been amended in line with the current provisions of the Public Service Act. The procedures in relation to the appointment of marine inspectors and marine surveyors have been streamlined.

An amendment is proposed to the definition of "ship" or "vessel" to exclude structures such as floating jetties. The definition of "trading vessel" has been extended to include vessels operated by the State Government and enables the executive director to approve the conducting of sea trials for vessels not the subject of either a current survey or registration; allow for the permanent closure of certain navigable waters; require alleged offenders to give their names and addresses to marine inspectors; extend the time for the payment of infringement notices and the time during which complaints may be made; and allow for delegation of certain administrative functions from the executive director to his senior staff.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Court (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - NINTH DAY

#### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 16 May.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [10.13 am]: I take the opportunity presented by my Address-in-Reply remarks of congratulating the Premier on her election to the office of Premier and the Deputy Premier on his election to the office of Deputy Premier. I assure them that we support them in having a long reign as leader and deputy leader of the Labor Party, and a very short reign as Premier and Deputy Premier.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr HASSELL: My remarks in this Address-in-Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech are directed to consideration of the Port Kennedy development proposals. Mr Speaker, this is a matter in which you may have some interest. I hope the Premier will be able either to listen to my remarks or look at them afterwards because they are directed very much to the responsibilities and direction of her Government.

The essence of the matter can be summarised very briefly but it is in fact a long and complex story. A valuable piece of Government real estate, a valuable Government asset, exists in the form of Crown land at Port Kennedy. Rights in respect of that land were granted to a private company, which then obtained the involvement of the Western Australian Development Corporation. There have been no performance guarantees in relation to those rights; or none which have been exercised. The proposed project was huge, reportedly in the order of \$370 million, but the grantee of the rights, Fleuris Pty Ltd, was not suitable in size or experience to do the job. The grantee obtained the involvement of WADC, and it appears from the public evidence that WADC may have funded the project to date.

The grantee and WADC joint venture managed to obtain planning approval for the project, apparently with relative ease, because it was, after all, a project which had Government approval. They obtained environmental approval very late - this year, in fact - under some difficulty, with a lot of opposition, and with real environmental doubts remaining. The two project partners now want to sell their interest in the project. This will provide the opportunity to make a huge windfall profit; in the same way that the people who were granted the mandate for the petrochemical project got a huge windfall profit.

This is a long, detailed and complex story, and it is difficult to cover all the ground. The member for Applecross will add to my remarks when, at their conclusion, I move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. Port Kennedy is an area south of Rockingham, on the south side of Wambro Sound, opposite Safety Bay. I understand it is a unique area, not simply because it is in your electorate, Mr Speaker, but also for other reasons. First, it is an unspoiled area of coastal land, only about 45 minutes' travelling time from the central City. Second, like very few areas of coast in Western Australia, it has a northerly aspect and, therefore, fronts waters which are protected from the prevailing south westerly winds. They are protected also because of shoal and reef formations. Third, the area will be immensely valuable if developed in the right way.

The land in the whole area is to a large extent Crown land. The Port Kennedy development land is not, and never has been, privately owned. It has always been Crown land. What has happened in recent years in relation to this land raises very serious questions about Government administration. Those questions are relevant to the past, the present and the future. Hence my speech is directed very much to the Premier, who has responsibility for the direction of Government in this State. She cannot dismiss the issues as being relevant only to what has happened previously; the issues require examination, actions and decisions now before apparent wrongdoings or maladministration are fixed in place.

The summary of the situation is as follows. In 1985-86 - I cannot pinpoint the exact date - following up a 1978 initial consideration, the Burke Government decided, for reasons not known, to release the land for development as a recreation-tourist facility. The State Planning Commission handled the matter, again for reasons not known, given that such development of land is not its usual role. A "development brief" was issued, and an assessing body, called an "interim management committee" was appointed, of which you, Mr Speaker, were a member, I think, according to the questions answered in this House.

The SPEAKER: I was the chairman.

Mr HASSELL: Applications were received, and an award was made. It is important to understand that the award was on the basis that a developer who carried on the work of development would be given, free of charge, 25 hectares of this immensely valuable piece of land, plus further rights to leasehold in the first and second stages. The full details of the project have been kept secret, and I emphasise that to the Premier. In September 1989, less than a year ago, the Premier's predecessor issued a booklet entitled *"Investing for the Future - Financial Guidelines for Development - A White Paper"*. That document emphasised that, in future, details of Government deals would be made public, and if they could not withstand public scrutiny they would not be proceeded with.

I asked some questions relating to energy and the Premier agreed to make public everything relating to energy costs. Her refusal to answer questions in relation to this deal on the grounds of commercial confidentiality are not consistent with the policy laid down by her predecessor in this House less than a year ago.

The awardee, Fleuris Pty Ltd, is a company about which major questions remain unanswered in terms of its size, its track record and its capacity to do the job. Fleuris Pty Ltd is involved with the Western Australian Development Corporation, which paid money to become involved. Up to date the WADC appears to be the only body funding Fleuris Pty Ltd and such of the development preparation as has taken place. It is possible that Fleuris Pty Ltd has put up \$187 000 towards the deal, but it may be that WADC provided this amount as well.

No development of the kind contemplated by the Government in 1986 is under way. Indeed, no development is under way. It is apparent, but not provable on the published facts, that finance for the project which won Fleuris its award for the project has not been obtained, and I suspect it cannot be obtained. No equity financing appears to be involved at all. In other words the company wants to borrow the whole lot and the Government has said it will be on a non-recourse basis. Given the published papers it is doubtful whether the Fleuris development proposal is or ever was viable. That may not be the fault of Fleuris because the Government laid down the basis of the development proposal, but it is an important issue. What is important in particular is the present situation. The development is not proceeding, and WADC is to be closed down. Its share is to be sold, and Fleuris may be the buyer; Fleuris, or the joint venture - WADC and Fleuris - may be selling out from the whole project.

It follows from an examination of all the known facts that, firstly, in exchange for a promise of freehold of an immensely valuable piece of Crown land the Crown has nothing of what it wanted some three, four or five years ago. Secondly, planning and environmental approvals granted by the Crown only this year have greatly increased the initial immense value of the land because those approvals allow someone to carry out a development some time, perhaps in a modified form.

Thirdly, Fleuris Pty Ltd and/or WADC, having failed to perform and with no known prospect of performing, are either themselves or, in the case of Fleuris, its proprietors, now seeking to receive a rich reward in the form of a sale price for rights over valuable Crown land,

including rights to eventual freehold for which they have paid nothing. Fourthly, this case is parallel to the ill-fated petrochemical project where the awardees of planning approvals and preliminary studies were sold by the original awardees of Government, Dempster and Connell, to the Government/Bond partnership for \$400 million.

This is the same deal, though on a smaller scale. If any member doubts that the project is for sale, let me tell him that I have confirmed as late as yesterday that it is for sale, and one of those involved in seeking a sale, although it is supposedly not officially on the market, is a Mr David Kennedy of Richard Ellis. The property has been on the market for some time, going back to last year, and what is being sought is a profit without performance.

The key question now is, will the Lawrence Government allow this to happen again? Are we to have another petrochemical type of deal?

I turn to some details. The statements made today are from the public record. These papers about a foot high relate to the deal. I have here the documents relating to the joint venture as published, including the ERMP. I have the reports of the WADC, the various Press cuttings and all the documents which I have been able to obtain.

Mr Pearce: That makes the point that it has been an open and very public exercise, not secret.

Mr HASSELL: Except that the joint venture deal and the structure have not been made public. The Leader of the House might like to explain this document to the House. It is called the "Port Kennedy Project Agreement" drafted on 30 March 1989, an agreement with the State of Western Australia. It has at the end "The Hon Robert John Pearce", with "Minister for Transport" crossed out and "Minister for Lands" and "Port Kennedy Management Pty Ltd" put in. That is a company we had never heard of until the last few days when I received that document.

Mr Pearce: Am I supposed to have signed that as Minister for Lands?

Mr HASSELL: All the answers are by no means complete and all the facts are not known. These are some of the facts. The development brief was issued in 1986. It called for submissions and stated that, pursuant to a 1978 MRPA proposal for recreational development approved by State Cabinet and the Government in 1985, it "invited suitably qualified applicants to register an interest." After considering these a development brief was compiled so that "potential developers could respond in more detailed and definite terms."

The development brief stated objectives, and said that it was proposed that the development of Port Kennedy should occur as a well planned, year round tourist and recreational facility available primarily to middle and lower income families and groups, as well as to whatever other market sectors were selected by the developer, and must be compatible with similar nearby developments.

We do not know what is meant by similar nearby developments, because the only nearby development is a standard subdivision by Peet and Co. This project was certainly not meant to be like that. The document states that in principle it is proposed that a parcel of Crown land be made available for development of a resort centre in return for a developer carrying out at least the first stage of development containing holiday, recreational, sporting and leisure facilities.

This development brief was issued in the epoch of the Burke Government's four on the floor policy of private sector development. Section 3.4 of the development brief is vintage WA Inc. Under the heading "Government Assistance", it points out that the WA Tourism Commission is able to participate in financial aspects of tourism development by facilitating loans, by guaranteeing loans, and by equity arrangements. It goes on to give details by saying -

A Government guarantee may be made available to approved applicants to borrow their capital needs, including working capital, where the proposal has not been able to attract finance from normal sources.

Does this sound familiar? It becomes even more familiar. The WA Tourism Commission, under the chairmanship of the then recently appointed John Osborn, appeared eager to do all the fast track facilitating of the project it could. John Osborn had just been appointed a director of - members may have guessed it - the WADC! There he was in the Tourism

Commission which was to do all the guaranteeing of finance, and he was on the board of the WADC which was a joint venture partner with Fleuris. He was appointed to the WADC board in May 1986, according to its annual report. The development brief from the State Planning Commission referring to the Tourism Commission support in this document was issued early in 1986. Interestingly a letter to the Leader of the Opposition from the Tourism Commission was signed by John Osborn, the chairman, and it is dated 23 June 1989. The letter promoted the Port Kennedy project, along with others, and included was a glossy document entitled "Port Kennedy Marina Tourist Resort Project". There were map references and all the rest of it, inviting various levels of funding into the \$160 million first stage development.

Perhaps those levels of funding would have been with the Tourism Commission. It appears from claims by the successful proponents that Fleuris was the only one of some 20 applicants which complied with the specifications of the development brief.

That should have rung alarm bells immediately. Given the buoyant conditions prior to the 1987 stock market crash and before interest rates hit record levels, why was no experienced real estate developer or even a high flying entrepreneurial developer able to comply with the terms of reference? Was the development brief viable? Fleuris Pty Ltd was a two dollar company that had not traded since it was formed in 1982. How did Fleuris comply with the Government's brief for a \$370 million development proposal? A newspaper cutting from *The West Australian* of 6 November 1986 tells the story that a five-man Perth syndicate was heading a \$370 million plan to develop Port Kennedy, south of Rockingham. How could a two dollar company be expected to manage a \$370 million development? It is an important question which has not been answered. I do not want to attack any individual of that company but, on the available evidence, that company was never qualified financially or in terms of expertise to handle the development. Fleuris had been formed in 1982 and had operated as a trustee company for a family trust. It had been on-sold and then used in this deal. Fleuris' principals, Richard Lukin and Gary Sheehan, do not appear to have any established reputation, let alone any expertise in resort development. The former Premier, Mr Dowding, stated that he understood the Opposition had been approached; it had been, and the response was that the Opposition always supported a good development but would not support any Western Australian Development Corporation involvement. For reasons which remain unexplained Fleuris was awarded the development. According to Mr Dowding's answer to question 1645 of 14 November 1989, Fleuris entered into a joint venture with WADC and was paid an up-front fee of \$200 000. At this time Fleuris' paid up capital was increased to \$187 000. How could an organisation with paid up capital of two dollars - or even \$187 000 - develop a \$370 million project or even build the first stage?

Other companies which became shareholders in Fleuris were Indowest Finance Pty Ltd, Caspian Holdings Pty Ltd, House of Audace Pty Ltd and Viewhurst Pty Ltd. It appears from the records that Messrs Sheehan and Lukin retained effectively an 85 per cent equity in Fleuris. Why would a non-trading company have a flurry of sibling companies join it? What was the Government doing with taxpayers' hard earned dollars? The big question is: Why did WADC, the development corporation of the Government which was put in place to maximise Government assets, have to buy into a project involving land which the Government had granted to a two dollar company?

Mr Lewis: Not one responsible Minister is present listening to this terrible scandal.

Mrs Beggs: I am listening.

Mr HASSELL: I have asked the Premier to listen and I hope she is. In response to questions asked in this House about the joint venture the Opposition found the development was to be on a 50:50 basis after the up-front WADC entry fee. The agreement was drawn up by Robinson Cox which not only was represented on the WADC board but also, subsequently, became well known for drafting the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd agreements and for sending a representative to Columbo with Dallas Dempster to assist with that other mystery company, Gofair Investments Ltd. I understand that Peter Young of Robinson Cox assisted in drafting the Port Kennedy agreement, which has not been made public. Practically no information on the deal between Fleuris and WADC is available to the public. Certainly nothing is available which justifies the Government's promises on accountability in its business dealings which are outlined in the White Paper on guidelines for development. This

resulted from the famous Burt Commission on Accountability and helped the Government win the 1989 election. On page 24 of WADC's annual report for 1989 the allocation to Port Kennedy is \$200 000 in 1987-88 and \$730 059 in 1988-89. However, it is not clear whether the total outlay is \$930 059 or \$730 059 because the latter figure is shown as an investment in property and the \$200 000 may well have been considered an entry fee to the joint venture to enable the Government to regain access in order to share in the development of its own property. Conflicting answers in relation to this matter have been given by different Premiers.

I will not have time to deal with all the issues set out in my notes. It is interesting that WADC has contributed, in round figures, \$1 000 000 to the project; the only cash invested in the project. I might be doing Fleuris an injustice and it may have contributed some money. From the accounts of WADC it can be seen that a sizeable proportion of the money invested has not gone into Port Kennedy but into the purchase of an adjacent piece of land, known as lot 605 Wambro, from the Catholic Church. Fleuris paid over \$800 000 for that property, which is adjacent to a proposed golf course. Money that has been invested in this project has not benefited the taxpayer, but has been used to purchase lot 605 for \$820 000 including costs. That is a development which will ride on the back of the Port Kennedy deal. Nothing is wrong with that, if there is a proper and full performance of the obligations to the taxpayer.

This project is very doubtful because of the way it has been operated and managed, and the Government has been keeping things quiet. I will just give this summary, and then move an amendment so the matter can be debated further -

1. The terms of reference of the development brief describe a very unusual real estate development deal. Government offers financial guarantees, grants and rights to acquire freehold land plus right to leasehold, without any up front payment.
2. No developer of substance could comply with the terms of reference.
3. The company awarded the mandate goes into a flurry of strange share issues to other companies owned by Lukin and Sheehan, which do not appear to make any material contribution to the project. Were these deals with unknown third parties approved by the Government or just accepted because WADC was involved?
4. Fleuris is capitalised to nearly \$200 000 at the time WADC enters into the joint venture, suggesting perhaps that WADC is really the only body putting up the money. That could be wrong, as I have said.
5. The network links between WADC and the Tourism Commission are strong and it is the Tourism Commission that is prepared to participate in the financial enhancement of the project.
6. The Minister for the Environment and the Environmental Protection Authority go to considerable effort to enable approvals. The Minister will not release findings of his appeals committee. However, members should note that one of the vital approvals was given only this year when it was known that WADC wanted to get out, and it seems that that approval had something to do with enhancement of value, both for the project and for sale.
7. The Premier will not release the joint venture and other agreement details even though it is difficult to determine how disclosure would contravene commercial confidentiality.
8. The Premier, despite her commitment to open Government, is just as intent on covering up this shoddy Burke deal as were Dowding, Parker, Grill and Berinson.
9. We need to know the full extent of the deal; that is, the conditions and agreements for obtaining leasehold of Crown land, why they bought the extra land, and the extent and conditions that will apply to the second stage - that is, will it be largely residential?
10. Even though we can get no worthwhile answers or openness from Government, the very limited facts available from the public record indicate that, while the amount of money involved is less, the deal has all the hallmarks of another petrochemical deal; that is, the windfall profit after getting some approvals and doing some preliminary work.

*Amendment to Motion*

Mr HASSELL: I move -

That the following words be added to the motion -

But regret to inform Your Excellency that the Western Australian Government has failed to:

- (a) publish details of the Port Kennedy development involving as it does extremely valuable and unique Crown land;
- (b) ensure that some four years after starting the process a viable, fundable project is proceeding;
- (c) ensure that, in parallel with the ill-fated petrochemical project, large windfall profits are not made by developers who, with a tiny outlay relative to the project's size, have received a Government mandate and obtained Government approvals and are now seeking to sell out of the project without proceeding to construction.

And that the whole process of the Port Kennedy development reeks of the procedures and methods of WA Inc, and is continuing in that way.

Whereas the Government should end the mandate in respect of the Crown land, compensate the developer for provable, bona fide expenditures made pursuant to the contractual obligations of the developer, and begin again according to open, acceptable and viable procedures and plans.

The SPEAKER: Order! Could I ask for the cooperation of members in respect of this? When an amendment is moved, only one copy is given to us up here, which is then taken off to be photocopied and I am left without a copy for several minutes.

Mr Hassell: I have several copies here, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: If we could be given two or three copies each time a motion or an amendment is moved it would be very helpful, as we could send one off to be copied and still have copies here to refer to.

MR LEWIS (Applecross) [10.44 am]: The Opposition, by moving this amendment, is not necessarily criticising the Government but is drawing its attention to a situation that has run down the same track as many other disastrous deals associated with WA Inc.

This deal had its genesis in 1985-86 when all these smart corporate State deals were done, and it has just rambled on for the last four or five years, seemingly with very little overview from responsible or Executive Government. It has rambled on under the supposed stewardship, on the Government's behalf, of the Western Australian Development Corporation. That in itself should be the danger signal to the Government to examine what is going on and to do something about it before another huge scandal breaks over it. Has the Government not yet learnt? We have another disaster on our hands. It is a classic situation whereby the Government gave a developer a preferred right to do something, and it is interesting that in answer to a question put to the Premier as to who were the other proponents to register an interest with WADC in the joint venture development of the Government's land at Port Kennedy, she replied "None". There was a single participant with WADC to do a smart deal, to create paper profits - false profits - without any capital commitment as to tangible works. Not one sod of earth has been turned, not one brick has been put on the land, yet this project is on the market for up to \$15 million.

Mr Pearce: Do you understand that we are winding down WADC and it has to sell its assets?

Mr LEWIS: A question on the Notice Paper about this matter has been answered, and as of yesterday, on inquiry to one of the big real estate groups in town, the project is on the market for up to \$15 million.

Mr Pearce: The whole project?

Mr LEWIS: Yes.

Mr Pearce: So WADC is selling its proportion and Fleuris wants to sell its proportion of it?

Mr LEWIS: Yes.



Mr Pearce: Do you understand that WADC has to sell all of its assets because it is being wound up?

Mr LEWIS: I understand that, but that is the point the Opposition is making.

Mr Pearce: But you wanted WADC to be wound up. You wanted it to sell its assets.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, we did.

Mr Pearce: Well, what are you complaining about?

Mr LEWIS: We are complaining about the scam part of the deal - the deal that has been credit-enhanced or capital-enhanced by virtue of Government rights and guarantees being given to someone, the ability to finance the deal being undertaken by the Government, the Government's putting equity capital into the deal, the promise of rights and access being facilitated by the Government, the Government's ability to influence local authority approval, and the Government's being able to influence Environmental Protection Authority approval and town planning approval.

Mr Pearce: That last one is very unfair.

Mr LEWIS: I am not criticising the approval; I am saying "the Government's ability to facilitate those approvals". Will the Minister for the Environment deny that if the Government is in a deal with WADC that corporation has some sort of conduit to Government to facilitate those deals?

Mr Pearce: It has been going on for four years and it is not yet finalised.

Mr LEWIS: Is the Minister trying to deny that because the Government is in it, it does not have an easy road to those approvals?

Mr Pearce: Yes, I do deny it. The environmental approvals took more than a year.

Mr Hassell: It was common knowledge that people went into partnership with the Western Australian Development Corporation because that was the way to get Government approvals.

Mr LEWIS: That is exactly right.

Mr Pearce: It did not prove to be right in this case. Not only did the Environmental Protection Authority give recommendations to me which would have allowed the project to go ahead relatively easily, but I then set up an approvals appeal committee.

Mr LEWIS: The Opposition is not arguing that; it is arguing about this deal. I defy any member of the Government or the Executive to deny that if the Government were in on the deal, it would have an easier road to get those approvals; the conduits would be opened. Deny that. That is what the Opposition is saying.

Mr MacKinnon: There is not one word of denial coming forward.

Mr LEWIS: The other thing which should be of absolute concern not only to this Parliament but to the people of Western Australia is the secrecy involved in the deal. A question was put to the Premier on 6 December as follows -

- (1) Will the Government provide a copy of the joint-venture agreement between Fleuris Pty Ltd and the Western Australian Development Corporation, for the Port Kennedy Project?

The answer was no. Why was the answer no?

Mr Pearce: Who was the question addressed to?

Mr LEWIS: The Premier.

Mr Pearce: Unless you are proposing to promote me, I am not in a position to answer that. You should ask the question of the Premier.

Mr LEWIS: The Premier never answers questions. The Minister for the Environment is not the responsible Minister. Exposing this issue is what the Opposition is all about. When my colleague, the member for Cottesloe, stood and started to talk about the deal at Port Kennedy, or Long Point as it used to be known, four Ministers were sitting on the Government benches. The Premier said something to the Minister for the Environment, and the Minister for the Environment said something to the Minister for Fuel and Energy; he then spoke to the Deputy Premier, who then spoke to the Minister for Racing and Gaming, representing the

Minister for Planning in this Chamber. However, not one of the Ministers knew anything about it.

Mr Pearce: Yes we do.

Mr LEWIS: It is a crying shame that should be so. It is why the terrible scandals of WA Inc were perpetrated because the Executive of the Government was not aware of what was being done by all those little underlings in their positions in the sort that was WA Inc. They were not aware of the smart little deals; the responsible Ministers of the Crown were not aware of what was happening.

Mr Pearce: The general line of argument from your side was that we were aware. Make up your minds.

Mrs Beggs: So much of the information given is incorrect anyway. You lot over there just make these things up as you go along.

Mr LEWIS: I have not made up a single thing. The Opposition is giving the Government a warning that it is now time to take some accountability. Now is the time to look at this project and at a small \$2 company which may have spent \$150 000 to \$200 000 on environmental reports to the EPA and consultancy fees; yet on the sale of the project, the company will walk away with \$7 million. However, the WADC will also receive \$7 million profit. The Premier will rise and say that the WADC made another great profit; the Government shuffled some papers, but not a brick was laid or a hole dug.

The Opposition is saying that the false profits created by virtue of project enhancement by Government approvals are not tangible; they are paper shuffling. These profits are like the scams that went into some share dealing operations in the town. Let us look at what has happened. This report gives an overview of what is to happen: Twenty-five hectares of freehold land - a grant - is to be given to the proponents of the deal. They will also have a 21 year lease, with a 21 year option to renew, of another 40 hectares ancillary to the town site. The ancillary uses are for tourism facilities, chalets and that type of thing. Accompanying that is a further commitment of the Government to give long-term leases for land for a public golf course and a private golf course attached to a 220-room hotel which is supposed to be built and which is stage 1 of the development. Without a brick being laid or a spade going into the ground, people could walk away with \$7 million, without any performance other than being in bed with the Government to create false paper up front profits of \$15 million.

Mr Pearce: My understanding is that the project is not for sale in the way you are saying. You are saying that the people who work in the development industry do not in fact earn their living. This project has been going for four years.

Mr LEWIS: That is a nonsense comment.

Mr Hassell: You want to be very careful about saying the project is not up for sale. I know what Mr Lukin has said.

Mr MacKinnon: The Deputy Premier was caught out telling pork pies to this Parliament yesterday.

Mr Taylor: When?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not appropriate to interject by saying that one person or another has been caught out in the way suggested. It is improper, does not do anything for this House and certainly is not helping this debate.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Let me give a very simple analogy to what has happened. The Government now admits that the petrochemical deal whereby a company with \$13 million or \$14 million-worth of debts, with not one single asset - not even a block of land - except an idea and a right given to it by the Government, which was a licence to pursue a petrochemical industry in Western Australia, was sold for \$400 million. The Government had a half share, or a 44 per cent share, of that. That is on the macro scale. The Government has now admitted the project was a disaster. The Government was done; it was an absolute scam and in fact was the biggest scam ever pulled in Australia. The Government has admitted it was the patsy and was taken for a sucker on the deal. This is an identical deal

on a micro scale. It is a deal whereby the proponents have shuffled a bit of paper, have hung in there and spent maybe \$200 000 or \$300 000 getting the deal off the ground in consultancy fees. Incidentally the fees were paid for by the Government because the entry fee of the WADC into the deal was payment of the first \$200 000 of all up costs of consultancy to the deal. The entrance fee was paid by the WADC to get its half share. The proponents have paid virtually nothing and are in for nothing; they were paid \$200 000 for giving the WADC something the Government could have had for nothing anyway, and they will try to flick out and make a profit of \$7 million.

It is an incredible deal; it is exactly the same as what happened with the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd deal. The Government sits bewildered; it does not know what is going on. Government members look at each other and say, "Ring someone up and find out." The Executive does not know what is going on.

When I had the misfortune - if that is the word - to sit on a Select Committee which inquired into the Midland abattoirs deal it was brought home to me the way in which deals are done, the way the lower level wheeler-dealers within the bureaucracy or Government agencies move.

Mr Court: The Premier should listen because she was on that committee.

Mr LEWIS: I know. The middle level bureaucrats are the only ones who know anything about the deal. When Cabinet reshuffles occur, the Ministers change portfolios and confusion reigns. It is beyond the capabilities of Ministers, or indeed anyone, to carry the knowledge across - as well as try to remind colleagues that a deal needs to be watched. Members and Ministers lose track of what is going on.

Mr Pearce: That is the first time I have heard the Opposition recognise the difficulties of Government. Things that happened years ago are thrown back at the Government.

Mr LEWIS: We understand that. Ministers lose track of what is going on through Cabinet reshuffles. The little entrepreneurial bureaucrat sitting in his office knows something about what is going on. He is at a low level; he is asked what is going on. He may be in the pocket - I am not suggesting that he is - of the entrepreneur, and a smart little deal is being done on the side.

Several members interjected.

Mr LEWIS: I have not said that; I have said that he may be.

Mr Taylor: What a ridiculous statement.

Mr Pearce: Where is your evidence?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I sat on the Midland abattoirs committee; I know what happens.

Dr Gallop: You have no evidence of that! You made a minority report. Why does the member say these things?

Mr LEWIS: The Minister should be ashamed to speak about this matter; he was part of that deceit.

Mr Court: It will come back and haunt him!

Dr Gallop: Why did the Opposition not debate the topic? It did not have the guts or the information to do so.

Mr LEWIS: The Government would not let us!

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us proceed with debate.

Mr LEWIS: Unfortunately, only two people end up knowing what a deal is about; that is, the proponent who has his hand on the deal from day one, and the little bureaucrat involved. The proponent wishes to maximise his profit. If there is not any caveat on performance - and that is the point because no caveat is in place - he can make a huge up-front profit with very little capital risk. That person creams off the profits. The bureaucrat does not know what to do; he is in the middle. No-one is driving the project any more. The little bureaucrat is then transferred to another department and no-one knows what is going on. The whole project becomes an absolute lemon.

To save Western Australia a lot of money, the Government should put a caveat of performance on the project. The Government should not let the paper shufflers bail out, taking a huge profit. The Government should bring back some accountability to the Port Kennedy deal; it should disclose the conditions of the deal to Parliament and remain accountable. Otherwise Western Australia will have another disaster on its hands - albeit a micro situation as far as the PICL deal goes - because the same ramifications of loss apply.

**MR PEARCE** (Armadale - Minister for the Environment) [11.03 am]: One of the difficulties of responding to a motion of this kind, as an amendment to the Address-in-Reply where a number of Ministers are involved, is getting the information together quickly -

**Mr MacKinnon**: It is hard to know what they have all been up to.

**Mr PEARCE**: Not at all. Both members have claimed that the project is currently for sale. The Western Australian Development Corporation is indeed proposing to sell its half of the project as it has to do with all its projects; WADC is being wound up in accordance with the Government's position. The potential purchaser of the WADC half of the project is the other half of the project; that is, Fleuris Pty Ltd.

**Mr Hassell**: The project should have no value.

**Mr PEARCE**: Fleuris is buying out its joint venture partner. Given the circumstances that the joint venture is winding up, it would seem perfectly reasonable that the other half of the project should take over.

**Mr Lewis**: Where are the performance guarantees?

**The SPEAKER**: Order! I will not tolerate those sorts of interjections, for two major reasons. First, I am particularly interested in this subject, and in getting to the bottom of the matter properly. Second, the interjections are unparliamentary.

**Mr PEARCE**: Fleuris has denied to the interim management committee of the project that it is proposing to sell out. We have no knowledge of its seeking to do that. Irrespective of whether it is or not, it does not really matter; the Government's intention is to ensure that a useful project proceeds in this location.

To recap the circumstances under which the Port Kennedy development was set up: As one of a range of initiatives taken by the Government in the early years it was determined to build up an alternative venue for holidaymakers on the coast as an alternative to Rottnest. The level of applications by tourists and local people to stay at Rottnest was becoming far beyond Rottnest's capacity to handle; some kind of alternative destination was preferable because we did not want an overdevelopment of Rottnest. The Port Kennedy area was chosen as a potential area to develop. On the other hand, we did not want Port Kennedy to become a rich person's development or a huge facility to be put there and a piece of beach denied to Western Australians. We did not wish to spend huge sums of Government money to set up a recreational facility, so we hit upon the idea of taking an area, such as Port Kennedy, and placing an expensive development on a small area to subsidise low-key/low-cost recreational facilities - mostly of a residential kind - for holidaymakers from Western Australia. That is, at no cost to the Government, we will have a top quality resort in a small area to be used to fund alternatives to Rottnest for lower income earners. That seemed a reasonable project.

**Mr Hassell**: That might be a good idea, but why did the Government give the project to a two-dollar-company?

**Mr PEARCE**: It was an excellent idea. We set up an interim management committee. We cast around for talent which might be appointed to that committee and hit upon the Speaker of this House as an estimable person to chair the committee. He has done that with great distinction. The interim management committee worked up a brief for the setting up of the project, and advertisements were placed in newspapers calling for expressions of interest in the project. Fleuris Pty Ltd was the successful responder. My colleague, the Deputy Premier, will cover the WADC side of the project when he responds to this debate. Once the project was set up, planning and environmental approval was sought. It has taken four years to reach this stage, but environmental approval has not been given. I am in the process of setting conditions. The environmental approval process has taken at least 18 months which is an unacceptable length of time, in my view, for any developer to face. I do not know of any developer who has faced -

Mr Court: That is your fast track.

Mr PEARCE: That is the point I make - it is not fast. The point the Opposition was making was that the project was receiving fast track development and environmental approval because the people involved were in bed with the Government.

Mr Court: That only cropped up when the Government said that WADC was to sell its half of the project. The Government thought it had better put some value into the project.

Mr PEARCE: That is simply untrue. If that is what we were doing, I would have followed a different course as the Minister for Environment from the one I did. The proponents put development proposals before the Environmental Protection Authority, and the authority took some time to consider them and report to me. The report stated that the project could go ahead very much on the grounds laid down by the developer. However, a range of people outside the project objected to that. But instead of following precedents and accepting the EPA's conditions which would have added value to the project some time last year, I took a different course. I took advice from a range of people, including people from the EPA. I could have dealt with the appeals quickly and reported in a matter of days following the EPA report if that is what I wanted to do.

Mr Lewis: We are talking about a scam.

Mr PEARCE: Members opposite are changing ground; a minute ago they were saying that this was a proposal to sell this project quickly and that the Government acted to give approval to put value into the project. That is not true; in fact, the reverse is true. Instead of acting quickly to deal with the environmental process, I set up a separate committee to deal with the appeals.

Mr Lewis: You are filling in time in which to receive more information.

Mr PEARCE: I am not. I am explaining to the House that the Opposition claims that this project was fast-tracked in order to fraudulently give people a windfall profit is not true. I am explaining the facts refuting those assertions. The Opposition is quick to come into this House and throw in claims of this kind, yet it does not want to hear the facts which rebut the claims. I suppose it is embarrassing for members opposite. The environment appeal committee I established had the effect of slowing down the environmental approval process by at least six months, and probably nine months in the end.

Mr Lewis: That suits the proponents.

Mr PEARCE: That is not what they tell me, and that is not what the member has been saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us get to the bottom of this once and for all so that we can get on with the debate.

Mr PEARCE: The proponents are claiming bitterly that they have not received environmental approval. The member for Cottesloe quoted from a draft agreement and quoted my name as a signatory to this document. I scratched my head - I accept the point made by the member for Applecross - as I have been a Minister for seven and a half years and I have signed hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of documents in that time. It is difficult to recall a document one might have signed a year, two years or three years ago. I did not recall having signed or seen that document, so I went and checked. The situation is that nobody has signed that document. It has not been put before me. A draft was prepared for a range of people, including the management committee, and the draft has not been finalised for presentation to the Minister.

Mr Hassell: Who is the Port Kennedy Management Pty Ltd?

Mr PEARCE: The Deputy Premier will explain the financial arrangements later.

Mr Hassell: Who is the Port Kennedy Management Pty Ltd; it was never publicly announced that it was involved in any way.

Mr PEARCE: I have not been involved in the company structure aspect of this. The member for Cottesloe quoted from a draft agreement.

Mr Hassell: I said that it was a draft agreement.

Mr PEARCE: I asked the member whether it was signed. The agreement has not been signed and it has not been agreed to.

Mr Hassell: What is going on?

Mr PEARCE: The member for Cortesloe has been in law and business long enough to know the processes by which these things operate.

Mr Hassell: This joint venture was formed in 1987 to carry out a \$370 million project involving Government land and you are telling me that all this time later the terms and conditions in which they are fiddling with the land and offering it for sale on the Terrace through Richard Ellis have not been sorted out in the agreement.

Mr PEARCE: I am saying that it has not been agreed. That makes a lie of the proposal put forward by members opposite; they are saying that the Government is pushing things through quickly to allow it to be sold without the work being done, yet all the evidence opposes that proposition. I understand that the project is not for sale in the way the member states.

Mr Hassell: That is wrong.

Mr PEARCE: What is the member's evidence for stating that it is wrong?

Mr Hassell: I have been given advice by Fleuris.

Mr PEARCE: Fleuris says that it is not for sale.

Mr Hassell: I know that Fleuris is saying that it is not for sale. The reality is that it is for sale - Fleuris wants to sell it. It has neither the capital background nor the borrowings to carry out the project. We are saying that you should not let a company fiddle around for year after year with a valuable State asset. In truth the only way it will be developed is if Fleuris sells out. It will make a vast profit just like the petrochemical partners did.

Mr PEARCE: I have two comments -

Mr Lewis: WADC is selling its share in the project; it is talking to a third party about the sale of the project. This was stated in an answer by the Premier.

Mr PEARCE: I am repeating information given to me in the course of the last few minutes: I understand that an interim management committee has been established.

Mr Hassell: It is simple; they will sell the shares in Fleuris. Fleuris will say that it is not selling and when the time comes it will sell the shares.

Mr PEARCE: I am having trouble with the point the member is making. If he is saying that the people involved in this matter should not be allowed to sell out of the development before the end of the development stage as a matter of principle, that seems a strange proposition.

Mr Lewis: You should not let them take an up-front profit of \$7 million without any capital input or tangible assets.

Mr PEARCE: Is the member saying that anybody who seeks to set up a development -

Mr Lewis: It is Government land!

Mr PEARCE: A huge amount of land is Government land.

Mr Hassell: They did not buy the land - they got it for nothing. That is the point. You were involved in the whole deal.

Mr PEARCE: That is where the member misunderstands the whole arrangement. He believes that it is a matter of a deal involving a small block of land. One of the things protracting the arrangement is that we have set up an interim management committee which has the job of overseeing the whole project. What members opposite are trying to say is built so much on shifting ground that they are unable to prove their point. Members opposite stated that the Government had participated in this deal by speeding up the process, and that it was in bed with the developer as part of a plot or a scam to give the group a windfall profit for some unstated motive. None of the facts presented in the debate by the Opposition proves that at all. Environmental approval has been particularly slow in coming and has not yet been finalised. The agreement, as discussed by the partners and the interim management committee, has not been finalised as they cannot agree on details. If it were a question of a quick up-front profit, the deal would have been finalised years ago and the profits taken at that point. The Government wants to make sure that this is a viable project, as is called for in this amendment to the Address-in-Reply, and the Government wants to ensure that, as a result of it, ordinary Western Australians will have a relatively cheap holiday destination on the coast other than Rottnest.

Mr Hassell: Do you say that four years later you do not know whether the project is viable?

Mr PEARCE: I give members an indication of the extent to which I have gone to balance a viable project against preserving the environment in the area.

Mr Lewis: You are taken as a sucker! Do you not know that? The same as David Parker was taken as a sucker!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Applecross was listened to in relative silence and the Leader of the House should be extended the same courtesy.

Mr PEARCE: Maybe I am a sucker or the soft touch the Premier called me yesterday when I allowed the National Party to suspend Standing Orders to discuss the wool crisis. I like to hear all the points of argument and know all the facts so that I may try to resolve matters in a way that will suit everybody. A key factor in this project, both environmentally and economically, is the placement of the marina walls, which was the subject of a great deal of environmental debate. Equally, one cannot resolve this matter by knowing the environmental aspects while not knowing the economic aspects. I proposed a meeting of the proponents of the project with the Fisheries Department, and other advisers, in order to look at the environmental and economic factors involved in placing the marina in different places. As a result, I made a decision on the appeals which is designed to take into account both the economic and the environmental factors. That is the normal way in which the Government operates. Nothing abnormal is being done in this circumstance to assist the joint venture even though one of the partners was the WADC.

Mr Hassell: Was. Has it sold out?

Mr PEARCE: It is about not to be one of the partners because it is proposing to sell its share.

Mr Hassell: Where will Fleuris get the money to buy out WADC?

Mr PEARCE: That is up to Fleuris. This project was set up because the Government wanted to have something for its people in a certain area. Because an independent Government agency, the WADC, became involved in the project, does not mean that the Government is also responsible for other companies that get involved. Fleuris is not a Government agency; it is private enterprise. Members opposite are supposed to be supporters of private enterprise. However, in these circumstances, they want the Government to say to a private enterprise company, "If you get into a project, you can't sell out half way through".

Mr Hassell: No, there should be performance.

Mr PEARCE: Do members want us to say to these people, "We want to treat you as if you are a Government agency and direct you in the things you do."

Mr Hassell: If you are giving concessions in relation to Government property, you should not allow the private company to trade in approvals. It is not performing.

Mr PEARCE: The Government does not believe it is doing that, but the Deputy Premier will handle the financial aspects of this debate in a moment.

Mr Lewis: I am sure that the Deputy Premier is aware of what we are talking about; you may not be.

Mr PEARCE: We are all aware of what the member is talking about. As a former Minister for Planning for four years, I can say that trading approvals are a significant part of the development industry in this State and in other places. The member for Applecross would have traded in approvals in his previous incarnation before he became a member of this Parliament and he would have been involved with people who traded in approvals.

Mr Lewis: But it was my land. You are trading in Government land with no performance.

Mr PEARCE: He admits it.

In conclusion, the Government would not be pleased if Fleuris were seeking to sell out of the development in the way alleged by the Opposition because it is our view -

Mr Hassell: It is, make no mistake about that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: - that having picked up the project, it should be prepared to see it through. Equally, because approvals and agreements are not in place, the Government could probably

control what would happen if Fleuris sought to sell out in that way and the Opposition would be proved wrong in relation to windfall profits because the Government would ensure that the ongoing nature of the project meant that anyone getting out would not be able to take huge profits and leave the Government or somebody else holding the baby. Because the Government controls so much of the process, it is within its capacity to do that. The Government is happy to present to the Parliament a full report on the Port Kennedy development including many of the issues raised by the Opposition.

Mr Lewis: Will you also table a report?

Mr PEARCE: We have no difficulty with presenting a report to the Parliament.

However, despite the relative lack of notice on this matter, the Government is able to respond to the issues raised in a way that demonstrates that the claims by the Opposition do not have a good grounding in substance. Nevertheless, the issues raised are important and are worthy of further discussion and investigation. For that reason, I offer, on behalf of the Government, to submit to the Parliament in the near future a full report on Port Kennedy and the way the project has developed, where it is now, and what its future holds.

MR TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie - Deputy Premier) [11.25 am]: I endorse the final remarks made by the Minister for the Environment. I have no problems with giving both the members who have concerns about this matter a briefing on the issues and putting a report before Parliament. I will take responsibility for doing that as the Minister responsible for the Western Australian Development Corporation.

Mr Lewis: Could you also ensure that there is some performance.

Mr TAYLOR: I will come to that.

Mr Wiese: Will you arrange a briefing?

Mr TAYLOR: Absolutely, the member can have a briefing.

Mr Pearce: The agreement has not been finalised. You have to understand that.

Mr Hassell: Do you mean there is no agreement.

Mr TAYLOR: Of course there is an agreement.

This week, I took a Bill relating to the winding up of the WADC to the parliamentary Labor Party. The intent of the Bill is to appoint the WADC Liquidator, the name of the body appointed under the legislation. The WADC Liquidator will comprise two officers of the State Treasury Department appointed by me as Minister whose prime duties will be to bring the operations of the WADC to a proper, timely and effective conclusion. I hope to put that legislation before the House when we return after the forthcoming recess. I hope that this House and the other place will deal with it expeditiously. One of the commitments we made on the change of leadership of this Government was to wind up the WADC as quickly as possible.

I have received background notes on the Port Kennedy project. It is not a proposed \$370 million development as the member for Cottesloe said, but a \$200 million development.

Mr Hassell: No, it is a \$370 million development.

Mr TAYLOR: The figure I have is \$200 million. If it is \$370 million, well and good.

Mr Hassell: It is quoted in *The West Australian*.

Mr TAYLOR: If it is \$370 million, well and good, because anybody would welcome a project with that sort of expenditure in Western Australia as long as it abides by the various environmental guidelines laid down by the Minister for the Environment and the Environmental Protection Authority.

In October last year, Mr MacKinnon asked the former Premier, Mr Peter Dowding -

Is the Western Australian Development Corporation to undertake a multi-million dollar beach resort development south of Rockingham in a joint venture with Fleuris Pty Ltd?

The former Premier replied -



The WADC is a joint venture partner with Fleuris Pty Ltd to establish a resort development at Port Kennedy, south of Rockingham.

There is no secret about that, as the member for Cottesloe pointed out. The Leader of the Opposition then asked -

If so, what is the general nature of that development?

The former Premier replied -

The proposal was subject to approval from the Environmental Protection Authority for the development to include a marina, town centre, hotel, golf course and ancillary works.

On 28 November 1989, Mr MacKinnon asked the former Premier -

Further to my question 1645 of 1989, would the Premier detail for me the total expenditure made to date by the Western Australian Development Corporation on its share of the Port Kennedy development?

Mr Dowding replied -

The corporation has paid 50 per cent of the cost of land purchased by the joint venture for \$801 000. With legal costs, the corporation's payment was \$420 089. In addition, WADC has paid \$330 000 in project development costs.

That is on the record back in 1989.

Mr Lewis: How much did Fleuris pay?

Mr TAYLOR: I do not know. It was a joint venturer. I assume it paid part of the amount.

On 14 November 1989, Mr MacKinnon asked the former Premier -

- (1) When did the Western Australian Development Corporation enter into the joint venture with Fleuris Pty Ltd to establish a resort development at Port Kennedy . . .
- (2) What was the cost to the WADC for entering into the joint venture?

The answer was -

- (1) The joint venture between Fleuris Pty Ltd and Western Australian Development Corporation to establish a resort development at Port Kennedy was formed on 20 November 1987.
- (2) No initial cost was involved but WADC was required to contribute from the date of execution of the agreement the first \$200 000 in respect of project development . . .

Mr Lewis: Do you understand what you just said?

Mr TAYLOR: I will come to that. The member for Cottesloe and the member for Applecross made much of the suggestion that Fleuris would get 25 hectares of freehold land for nothing. My understanding is that, as part of the agreement and the understanding of the issues, it would get only that freehold if 75 per cent of the project had been completed. The Port Kennedy area required for the project included areas of freehold and leasehold land, with the 25 hectare freehold being assigned by the Government on completion of 75 per cent of the project.

Mr Lewis: That is not what the Opposition is talking about.

Mr TAYLOR: The Opposition cannot suggest that Fleuris is able at any time to put on the market 25 hectares of freehold land.

Mr Lewis: But the shareholders of Fleuris can flick out millions of dollars of profit.

Mr TAYLOR: Fleuris can go ahead with 75 per cent of the project.

Mr Lewis: The Opposition understands that.

Mr Wiese: But they will not be able to transfer the land without having done improvements. You cannot transfer conditional purchase.

Mr TAYLOR: Fleuris will not obtain the freehold of the land unless it completes 75 per cent

of the project. That will involve either 75 per cent of \$370 million or 75 per cent of \$200 million. The Government is still to determine what it will do with the remaining freehold and leasehold land. As the Minister responsible for the liquidation of Western Australian Development Corporation I advise that if the Government obtains a reasonable price for the land the Government will sell it. The member for Applecross is right when he says that Fleuris has a pre-emptive right in the agreement.

Mr Hassell: No provision in the agreement states that Fleuris and its shareholders cannot sell their shares before it performs. In other words, the set-up allows those people to trade in approvals.

Mr TAYLOR: The member for Cottesloe has suggested that Fleuris will sell the freehold land. It is not able to do that. I have no doubt that it can sell, but it is not in the business of holding freehold land in that sense.

Mr Court: It eventually becomes freehold land.

Mr TAYLOR: It will become freehold land if Fleuris spends 75 per cent of the total cost of the development on project costs. Whoever becomes involved in this project will be required to spend either 75 per cent of \$200 million or 75 per cent of \$370 million. If it means Western Australia ends up with a development at Port Kennedy - along the lines expressed by the Minister for the Environment - with which people feel comfortable, it will provide an alternative to Rottnest Island, which has immense pressures on it, and it would give people ready access to that area.

Mr Lewis: No problem.

Mr TAYLOR: If the member for Applecross has no problem with that, why is he in the business of damning the deal by suggesting that the people involved will receive a windfall? Money will have to be spent to get the project to work. That is my understanding of it.

Mr Wiese: Who is ultimately going to spend a few million dollars on the project?

Mr TAYLOR: I will be pleased if anybody spends either \$150 million or approximately \$300 million for the benefit of the people of Western Australia.

Mr Wiese: But the Government has given away land.

Mr TAYLOR: It has not given away any land. It has only provided a company with land for a development. Occasionally the Government must consider its involvement in major developments in Western Australia.

Mr Lewis: How can you say there is no land when it is going to be transferred?

Mr TAYLOR: The rights will be transferred, not the freehold land.

Mr Lewis: It is trading the rights.

Mr TAYLOR: The member for Applecross is trying to suggest that the Government will transfer the land freehold. The Government is not in the business of allowing people in these circumstances to hold freehold land without doing the work to which I have referred. That is the key to the issue. Fleuris will have to do the work. Fleuris has an interest in purchasing land which WADC may sell. Under the terms of the agreement Fleuris has a pre-emptive right to purchase the land from WADC. If it purchases it, well and good. However, if it does not, I hope that whoever does will take up the challenge of trying to get this development off the ground.

Mr Hassell: Let us start again with someone who can cope with it.

Mr TAYLOR: The member for Cottesloe is again saying that the Government is attacking the people involved in this development. I do not know the names of the people involved in this company.

Mr Hassell: The company is not qualified to deal with it. Should a two dollar company be involved in a \$370 million project? Over four years Fleuris has shown no evidence of any substantial financial backing.

Mr TAYLOR: The Opposition said that Fleuris had received special attention from the Government. The member for Cottesloe now says that it has taken four years to get this far, and is that not a bad situation. I wish the member would make up his mind. It is either bad

that it has come this far or it is bad that the Government has given special allowances. As the Minister for the Environment pointed out, the Government has not made any special arrangements for environmental matters for the project. The Government believes it can hand over the project to private enterprise to let it get on with the job and let WADC get out of it. The Government is not giving anything away. I expect a fair return on the investment that was made in this project. There are no secrets about this project. Documents will be available to members who have spoken on the issue. I will give the member for Applecross and the member for Wagin personal briefings on this issue so that they know what has happened and in what direction the Government is heading. If those members want me to report to this Parliament I have no problem with that. The Premier has announced that this Government is concerned with open and accountable Government. I hope that in the end the Opposition will see its way clear to supporting a development which could be of great benefit to Western Australia.

**MR MENSAROS (Floreat) [11.38 am]:** I would like to deal with only one aspect of this matter. I do not want to criticise the Government directly in any way but I will deal with the issue in a positive way. My advice may be taken as an example of the way in which a responsible Opposition should act in the interest of the community.

The Liberal Government had a unique system for encouraging and assisting development, not only in mineral development, but in all types of development. It did this through a system of State agreements. When a State agreement was written between the developer and the State it had enormous advantages for both the State and the developer. The advantages were spelt out clearly, stating the responsibilities to and the obligations of both parties. The Deputy Premier said he will report on this matter to the Parliament. Had the Government followed the custom which the Liberal Party very successfully exercised during its term in Government, and had it in this case, and many other cases, including PICL, written a State agreement, it would not have been a question of reporting later to the Parliament and the community; but, from the very beginning there would have been a very clear-cut picture of what was going on and there would have been absolutely no question about what could possibly be behind it.

I will briefly illustrate to the House the specific advantages of that custom. If the developers were genuine - I think the Liberal Government dealt only with genuine developers and not with fly-by-night people who wanted to make a quick profit - they had better access to finance because they were backed up by a Statute of the sovereign State of Western Australia, setting out the obligations of each party. Also, a developer had absolute security at the other end of the scale in that there was no fear of a change of Government to an extreme Government which might want to nationalise the developer's assets. That is not a joke because many of the projects we were able to develop in Western Australia occurred from the consideration of developers who burned not only their fingers but much more in other countries. I refer to the Reynolds minerals group and the fact that Western Australia would not have had this large bauxite-alumina development, had it not been for that company's experience in Jamaica when its investment was expropriated.

When a State agreement was made the result was that all conditions were set out in a Statute and the developers could be told that they were in no danger of losing anything because, if a change of Government took place, one would have to be enormously pessimistic to anticipate that independent judicial authorities would no longer exist in the State. If the developer's assets were expropriated by way of nationalisation, he could go to the court and the Government would be required to pay a substantial amount of damages, from which the developer could recoup the investment he had made. That system worked very well.

The correct comparison was made between this project and the PICL project, and the same problems exist. It was an industrial project and when members of the Opposition were first briefed in Dallas Dempster's office about the type of project, I remember very distinctly asking Mr Dempster why a State agreement would not be drawn up. He dismissed the idea and said he did not want a State agreement because it could be done on a commercial basis. Having had several years of experience, when I heard that comment I felt sure he did not want to develop the project and had no intention of doing so. Mr Dempster wanted to make a fast profit.

**Mr Hassell:** The Secret Harbour project was part of a State agreement.

Mr MENSAROS: That is precisely what I wanted to say. If a State agreement is in place, besides giving security to the developer, it provides security for the State because it sets out what is to be done. It is not a vague agreement but a precise agreement on what is to be done now, in five years', and in 10 years' time. There are advantages for both sides, particularly for the Government from undertakings of future additional development, and for the developer from rebate of royalties if it is a mineral development, or payroll tax if it is a simple industrial development. It is all of some worth to the State. The matter is discussed in the Parliament and everything is absolutely open.

Of course, these agreements also include how and under what circumstances the ownership of the project can be transferred to a new owner. That provides security because it is necessary for an amendment to be made to the agreement and that must be approved by Parliament. If it had been necessary for the PICL agreement to come before the Parliament before the Dempster and Connell ownership was transferred to Bond Corporation and the Government, through WA Government Holdings Ltd, would Parliament have agreed to that transfer? Of course it would not have done so and the Government would have saved itself the problems that followed. A similar situation applies with this project. If the Government were genuine it should have followed the example of the Liberal Party when in Government and prepared a State agreement, as we did with the Secret Harbour project which began during the time of a Liberal Government. A State agreement was quite rightly drawn up, and if the project does not succeed provision is made for that in the agreement. However, at least the whole matter is made public and the Parliament must approve any change of ownership.

I wanted to touch on only that one aspect and to tell the Government that if it genuinely wants to be accountable and to do business with serious developers, and not fly-by-night developers, it should revert to the custom of State agreements with these companies. If these arrangements are brought before this House, it will not be necessary for the Government to brag about accountability because the whole situation will be entirely open and freely discussed. In that way, although the Opposition will not take equal responsibility, it will take some responsibility for the decisions made because during discussion it should advise the Government if it feels something is not right in the agreement and that things should have been done in another way.

It has been the practice of Liberal Governments to sign the agreements before bringing them before the Parliament. A Labor Premier, John Tonkin, reversed that procedure and, although he may have been criticised for the lengthier process involved, he was trying to be accountable by presenting the State agreement to the Parliament before it was signed. Of course, under that circumstance there was potential for Parliament to change the agreement.

That is precisely my recommendation to the Government. I listened with great interest to the exposé of the member for Cortesloe, and there is no doubt that even if one cannot claim that a scandal occurred or prove any such thing, a large degree of uncertainty remains, as was proved when Government members attempted to respond. Very few people knew anything about it and, more importantly, the public were not informed. In order to avoid this, and to prove that it is really genuine, I suggest that the Government revert to the system to which I have referred. How many State agreements have been presented in this Parliament in the last couple of years? Perhaps only one or two at the most. By comparison, the Liberal Government introduced on average one a week, not only because it was successful in encouraging development, but also because it used this system and the question of accountability did not arise. If the agreement contained a clause that was confidential, Parliament was advised. If a clause stated that the Government did not want to divulge the cost or price of oil because it was a confidential matter between the developer and the Government, the Parliament was aware of that. That is precisely what the Liberal Government did in line with the Burt commission recommendations, long before that commission was set up.

MR COURT (Nedlands - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.49 am]: It is a pity that more Ministers were not in the Chamber to listen to the comments of the member for Floreat. He clearly spelt out that some procedures have been established in the past through this Parliament which have worked very successfully in achieving developments for this State. The Labor Government has decided to set up its own rules for the games it plays before getting these projects off the ground.

Why did it want to change the rules? Why did it want to move away from what the member for Floreat mentioned? Because the Government saw those deals and thought it could make a profit! It looked at this so-called "window of opportunity" thinking it could be in this real estate deal and said, "This is terrific. Let us take half the action. There will be huge profits and we will be able to help taxpayers." We all know that over hundreds of years the track record of Governments involved in business has been appalling. The best example available, apart from WA Inc, is the communist countries of this world, which are in appalling shape. It is interesting that the two Ministers who are apparently responsible for this development - the Minister for the Environment and the Deputy Premier - have said a few words and shot through. That shows how seriously they take this matter. I wish they had been present to listen to what the member for Floreat said when he spelt out how this deal should have been done.

The Government has got itself into a deal which is not dissimilar from the petrochemical deal, or the Sentosa Underwater World deal in Singapore, or the Cable Beach Resort deal in Broome, which was fortunately sold on a break even basis.

Mr Read: There was a small profit.

Mr COURT: The so-called profit of \$800 000 involved the repayment of money over some years, so I think the member for Murray will find, if he checks, that it was a break even deal. As a result of the sort of deal the member for Cottesloe mentioned, we had a business starting to trade in Government approvals, because that is what it had to sell; it had an agreement with the Government and sought to sell that agreement. This project has been on the market since last year, and the Government is trying to get \$13 million for it.

Mr Hassell: It is trying to get \$10 million to \$15 million.

Mr COURT: Well, \$10 million to \$15 million. After four years, what is there to sell? The approval - the deal with the Government. As mentioned by other speakers, if the Government is serious about winding up WADC and getting out of deals of this type, it and its joint venture partners should work out a way whereby it can be properly compensated for what it has done and the commitment it has given so that it can start again. The Government should start again along the lines mentioned by the member for Floreat. If it wishes to undertake a development in such an area it should have an agreement Act prepared and bring it before the Parliament so that everyone knows that it is not a secret deal between certain members of the bureaucracy, or the Government, and others and that everything is on the table.

When I heard that WADC was to be wound up - I think for the fourth time earlier this year -

Mr Mensaros: I have had a question on the Notice Paper about this since the first sitting day to which I have not yet had a reply.

Mr COURT: Every time we have raised the matter of WADC we have been told it is to be wound up; the next thing we know, a couple of projects are under way, including Underwater World in Singapore. When I had the nerve to raise this matter in the House the response from the Government was, "Do not talk about it. We are trying to get out of it and you might upset the final deal." We want to know what the first deal was. We want to know about the commitment of \$20 million to \$30 million of taxpayers' money to build a tourist resort in another country. We thought it proper that the Parliament know what was happening.

If one talks of putting value into deals one can talk about the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd, which showed a profit of some \$10 million to \$15 million because the Government put value into it through a change to the shareholding allowance enshrined in legislation. One thing the entrepreneurs in this town have become good at - because they learn very quickly the rules that this Government works under - is recognising that once they get the Government committed to a deal which puts value into it they then have something to sell. That is the situation with this development. We are not disputing whether the area should be developed, as I think there should be development there. We are saying that it is a typical WADC development - the Government has gone into it because it can see itself making a deal, now it has run into so many disasters, which will help it. Instead of continuing with that deal it should come to an arrangement where the parties are compensated and we get back to the way Governments should do business.

The Minister said that the environmental approvals had not finally gone through. From details given to me about the Port Kennedy project, concerns are held which can easily be

remedied. What worries me is that when the Government is a joint venture partner in a development the question will always be raised whether environmental procedures are handled properly because the Government has the final say. I would be much happier if a private developer were handling the project and the Government were not both adjudicator and player in the game. I prefer those roles to be separate. This is the problem one runs into when involved with both sides of a deal. I am staggered that the Government seems to be taking such a soft line on this matter. In fact, the Government is so concerned that the responsible Ministers are still absent from the House.

What the member for Cottesloe raised today is a typical WADC type deal. It is typical of the way this Government wants to grab what it calls "a window of opportunity". It has wanted to be one of the players because it sees big profits in this project for the Government. Members of the Government have said that they will sell out of this development. We ask, what have they to sell? They have a commitment.

Mr Hassell: They have a mandate given by the Government in respect of land owned by the Government, so the Government is selling from its own agency something it already owns.

Mr COURT: Yes, and we were told that all of this would end.

The Government paid \$400 million for the mandate - which the Government had given to itself in the first place - to build a petrochemical project in the future; \$400 million for blue sky. We are seeing now a repeat of that situation - hopefully not to the tune of \$400 million - where what is being sold is the mandate which the Government had given to itself in the first place. If the Western Australian Development Corporation does manage to sell its interest in the project for a certain amount of money, because of certain approvals which have gone through, that sale will give value to a deal which at this stage does not have value.

I am appalled that the relevant Ministers have decided not to participate in the debate at this stage. It is the old story of everybody's business being nobody's business. I do not think the Government could work out who should handle this debate today. At one stage the Minister for Tourism was to have handled the debate, but she did not participate, and quietly left the Chamber. Now only five members of the Government remain in the House.

Mr Carr: You have already had comprehensive replies from two Ministers.

Mr COURT: I have listened to those so-called comprehensive replies, and no-one from the Government has said, "Yes, we have a problem with this particular deal." No-one from the Government has said, "Yes, perhaps the proper course of action would be to start again because we are getting nowhere with this particular arrangement." All they are saying is that the deal is in place; and I presume that once the approvals go through, the deal will just continue as it has been worked out. So much for the statements made in the House about the winding up of WADC.

Last week I tried to get to the bottom of the Underwater World development, and I was accused of sabotaging or torpedoing the Government's attempts to sell it. We still have not received any answers about that project. Yesterday the Premier said in Fremantle that the conditions at Fremantle Hospital are appalling; yet the Government is spending tens of millions of dollars to build a tourist attraction in Singapore. I cannot work out how this Government has prepared its list of priorities. I urge the House to support the amendment. It is an absolute disgrace that the Government is not participating properly in this debate.

MR WIESE (Wagin) [12.03 pm]: I had not intended to participate in this debate but a couple of things need to be said in support of the remarks made by the Opposition speakers. The public need to be made aware that the standards which appear to have been applied to this project are different from those which apply to other development projects. I have tried to get from the Deputy Premier some acknowledgement of the fact that different standards are being applied. This land, which is not yet freehold land but is the equivalent of a piece of conditional purchase land, is to be on-sold. Had this arrangement been entered into between the Government and a farmer, who had received from the Government some Crown land on conditional purchase, the farmer would have to perform certain functions before he could on-sell that land. He would have to clear it, fence it, get the poison out of it, and provide water supplies. The situation here is very different because the Government is allowing the developers, WADC and Fleuris Pty Ltd, to pass on that land when they have done absolutely nothing.

I draw another analogy which gets even closer to the ordinary man in the street's understanding of things. If this were a Crown block of land in Highbury, Kukerin or Katanning, which was released for sale by the Department of Land Administration, the purchaser of the land would have to fulfil certain agreements. He would have to build on the land within two years, otherwise the land would revert to the Crown. The Government is dealing with this land in a very different way from the circumstances which normally prevail when Crown land is made available to developers. Another matter which I tried to raise with the Deputy Premier, by way of interjection, and about which I was unable to get any sort of reassurance -

*Point of Order*

Mr BLAIKIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not invoke any obscure Standing Order because there is in fact a quorum present in the Chamber so there is no point of order.

*Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr WIESE: I wanted to ascertain from the Deputy Premier what will be the fate of the development. Do we actually have someone who will put a spade into the ground and turn a sod? Will the Government have any control over this project from here on? How on earth will the Government be able to ensure that a development eventually takes place? It would appear that the Government has lost complete control of the project and is at the mercy of the persons to whom the shares in Fleuris Pty Ltd will be on-sold. That is a very poor state of affairs in respect of what is a very important and valuable piece of property, which should by now have reverted to the control of the Crown so that the Government could renegotiate to get a genuine developer to do a development rather than to on-sell shares in what is really nothing at this stage.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (20)			
Mr Ainsworth	Mr Hassell	Mr Mensaros	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Kierath	Mr Minson	Dr Turnbull
Mr Court	Mr Lewis	Mr Nicholls	Mr Watt
Mr Cowan	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Omodei	Mr Wiese
Mrs Edwardes	Mr McNee	Mr Shave	Mr Blaikie (Teller)
Noes (24)			
Dr Alexander	Mr Donovan	Dr Lawrence	Mr Taylor
Mrs Beggs	Dr Gallop	Mr Pearce	Mr Thomas
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Graham	Mr Read	Mr Troy
Mr Carr	Mr Grill	Mr Ripper	Dr Watson
Mr Catania	Mrs Henderson	Mr D.L. Smith	Mr Wilson
Mr Cunningham	Mr Kobelke	Mr P.J. Smith	Mrs Watkins (Teller)
Pairs			
Mr Strickland		Mr Gordon Hill	
Mr House		Mr Leahy	
Mr Trenorden		Mr Bridge	
Mr Grayden		Mr Marlborough	

Amendment thus negatived.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed*

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley) [12.14 pm]: I take this opportunity to bring the House up to date with events in the Kingsley electorate. Before doing so, I wish to publicly congratulate the Premier, as I have done privately, on her appointment as the first woman Premier not only in this State, but also in Australia. I certainly applaud her achievement.

Mr Court: She is not here to listen to your congratulations.

Mrs EDWARDES: She has just arrived and can hear me now. I also publicly congratulate the member for Victoria Park, as I have done privately, on his elevation to the Ministry. Education plays a very important role in the community and will continue to do so for many years to come.

The Kingsley electorate is growing at a very fast rate. The suburbs of Kingsley and Woodvale, which fall within my electorate, are still growing rapidly despite the current downturn in housing development. A problem has arisen concerning the Government's policy on school crossings, which has a great impact on two schools in my electorate. The school crossing road safety committee approves applications for wardens for school crossings and since September 1989 applications for nine wardens have been approved by that committee. However, approval has not been given to fund these positions. Following the committee's approval, applications are forwarded to another committee or to the director of human resources to approve the allocation of finance. When the application is approved it is presented to the Cabinet Financial and Economic Development Committee for final approval. It costs \$5 000 to employ two wardens for the two schools in my electorate. North Woodvale Primary School is a new school near an extremely busy intersection and it is very important that a warden is assigned to that crossing.

Volunteer wardens are not reliable - they either have to attend to great aunts coming here from England or they become sick - and offer a variety of reasons for not being able to attend regularly. However, they have the best of intentions and do a wonderful job. The initial application for a warden at North Woodvale Primary School has been approved, but no-one has been employed to man the crossing. Warwick Senior High School has one warden but because it is along Erindale Road - a dual carriageway - it is vital that a second warden is assigned to the school. The initial application was approved as a result of an accident in September last year which involved a young girl who suffered severe injuries. However, the school has still not received the funding to employ an additional warden.

It is disgraceful that the Government cannot approve \$35 000 for nine school crossings when it has spent hundreds of millions of dollars on other projects. Our school children must not be involved in road accidents; it is not acceptable. Members opposite should be aware of those crossings in their areas which are not manned and I refer to Koongamia Primary - Clayton Street crossing; St Mary's - Port Drive, Broome; Christian Brothers College - Ellen Street, Fremantle; Illawarra Primary - Ballajura; Yidarra Catholic Primary School - Marsenga Road, Murdoch; Noranda Primary - Benara Road; Bellevue Primary - Clayton Street and both Warwick Senior High and North Woodvale Primary which I have mentioned. This matter is serious.

Mr Lewis: The Government is irresponsible.

Mrs EDWARDES: It is irresponsible and it must sort out its priorities. There should be no half-measures towards safety for school children. Changes to the system have occurred since July last year and the committee which approves applications for wardens, after having examined them in conjunction with the Police Department, still has to obtain approval for funding. So far funding has not been forthcoming and is delaying the appointment of wardens. It is absurd.

I refer also to the Anzac Day service held for the Wanneroo district at the Wanneroo showgrounds which I was pleased to facilitate and which was attended by the member for Wanneroo. Members will be aware that Anzac Day is now held during the first term school holidays. I acknowledge the tremendous help and support received from Douglas Bruce of the Wanneroo Returned Services League. The children conducted the service, carried out the introductions and organised the speakers who were World War I veteran, Bill Bevis, who went to Gallipoli, a World War II veteran and a Vietnam War veteran. It was extremely well received by all those in attendance. I have received a number of letters from schools and other groups and organisations which would be willing to participate in next year's event, which means that the event will continue and become bigger and better next year. It will be an important function for the school children in the district, because they will be able to recognise Anzac Day not for the war but for the peace. They will be able to celebrate it with their peers.

I brought to the attention of the House last year the youth in the Kingsley area. I mentioned last year that in the suburb of Greenwood we have proposals for dealing with the under age



drinking in which a number of the youth indulge. They meet in a park. It was not unusual to have 60 or 70 young people congregating, and by about 8.30 some of the young children would be well and truly gone. I find that distressing. Some of these youngsters are only 11 years of age.

I recognise the tremendous work done by the YMCA, in particular Del Jenkins, a social worker employed in Greenwood, where a mobile bus service goes around to the various parks. The children do not meet on the bus, but they attend it for videos, games, drinks, a hot dog or whatever else may be provided. There is also sporting equipment on the bus.

That bus was withdrawn last year as a result of the number of youths who were drinking. No young person is allowed to go onto that bus in an alcoholic state, so that bus was withdrawn when the youth in the area refused to cooperate and stop drinking. Since that time the youth have recognised the problem and several of them have got together to solve it. As a result the bus has now been reinstated. It has been very successful over the last few weeks, and I hope that it will continue.

A similar mobile bus has been introduced in the suburbs of Kingsley and Woodvale, using the Greenwood bus. This is also progressing very well, and 20 or 30 members of the youth attend on a Wednesday evening. These are the kids who usually hang around shopping centres. It enables them to talk to their peers, and if they have a problem they can liaise with or react to one of the social workers or the many volunteers who give their time to the youth.

I acknowledge also the wonderful work done by Mike Olda of the Kingsley/Woodvale Recreation Association.

Mr Graham: This is the member for Marangaroo's speech.

Mrs EDWARDES: Is this when one says, "Can I send a message to Auntie Mabel?"

Several members interjected.

Mrs EDWARDES: It is very important to recognise those people who give their time voluntarily to the community. It is important to bring to the attention of this House those people who do so. I acknowledge the wonderful work of the community policing division at Warwick Police Station, and in particular, Constable Mike O'Malley. The work which these people put into the youth in that area is very important, and without them those young people would not have those facilities. These are short term programs. The mobile bus went to Yanchep and Two Rocks last year but unfortunately it no longer does that. Some 60 or 70 children came along each time the bus went to Yanchep and Two Rocks, but this year no money is available so it does not go there any more. The money used to come from the Youth Affairs Bureau. It was in the vicinity of \$3 500. We asked for \$35 000 for school crossings which have been approved around the State, and now we are asking for the small sum of \$3 500 to allow a mobile bus to go one night a week to Yanchep and Two Rocks.

It is important that we should not allow our youth to be ignored. The community cannot ignore them, and I hope that the Government will not ignore the fact that there is a high concentration of young people in the northern suburbs and their needs must be acknowledged. They are entitled to receive proper support from this community. The community are giving them support with volunteer services, but they need some monetary support, and \$3 500 will see that that bus go back to Yanchep and Two Rocks. It is not a lot of money to provide for those kids.

I acknowledge also the continuation of the wonderful work presently being done by the member for Wanneroo by chairing the steering committee for Yellagonga Regional Park. Members may not realise this is the new name for the Kings Park of the north which was touted before the last State election. It will be a wonderful park; an area really needed for passive recreation among the lakes in the Wanneroo district. This park has been urgently needed for many years, and a number of people are giving their time to speak to the steering committee about how they think this regional park should be developed. These residents have been fighting to preserve those lakes for many years. They want those lakes and the surrounding bush to be preserved for passive recreation.

There are obviously times when some people would like to see sporting activities taking place on the lakes. I would not be agreeable to that because I think the sensitive nature of those lakes is such that some of the flora and fauna would be destroyed, but I welcome the

continuing contacts with the member for Wanneroo in getting that Yellagonga Regional Park up and running in order to provide passive recreation for those residents of the northern suburbs.

While talking about passive recreation, the land known as Hepburn Heights and Koondoola open space are two areas which are under attack from the Government's planned re-zoning. Hepburn Heights has been rezoned for small housing lots. A number of people in those suburbs have tried to stop that planning. In excess of 13 500 signatures on petitions have been tabled, not only in this House, but also in the City of Wanneroo. We hear enough about the environment not only of the State but of the world. We are talking about retaining that bushland to help with the greenhouse effect. A public meeting was held in March of this year concerned with the Koondoola open space, and Professor Phil Jennings of the Australia Conservation Council mentioned that the banksia bushland, which once covered 75 per cent of the coastal plain, was largely unprotected. He thought the bushland was worth fighting for and it ought to be fought for every inch of the way. This magnificent 135 hectares would stand as an important buffer zone between the industrial land of Malaga and the houses situated in Ballajura, Alexander Heights, Koondoola and Girrawheen.

The residents not only want it as a buffer zone between the Malaga industrial estate and the houses, but they want it as a buffer zone for the water treatment plant which, as a result of sulphides and other impurities, they can smell when the wind blows in a particular direction. They would like that area retained as a buffer zone, as it was intended to be.

Several members interjected.

Mrs EDWARDES: The member for Marangaroo assures me that it will be retained as a buffer zone, and I know that he and I, together with the Wanneroo City Council, are working together very hard to ensure that it will be.

I draw the attention of the House to the traffic problems in the northern suburbs, as I did on every opportunity I had to raise these problems last year. With the changes to Parliament's sitting times, I am caught in the same traffic queue on the Mitchell Freeway every morning as are many of my constituents.

Dr Gallop: How terrible!

Mrs EDWARDES: It is terrible, and I can now well and truly appreciate the problem.

Mr Shave: In East Germany they have a special lane for the politicians. When we are down to that situation we can put all the politicians in their right of way and the public can go to hell.

Mrs EDWARDES: Talking about a right of way, that is a very pertinent point. Last year I raised the need for a contra-flow bus lane, and the year before a member in another place raised the same issue. People who live in the northern suburbs cannot wait three, four or five years, or however many years away it is, for the Perth-Joondalup railway. We must do something about the congestion that is presently occurring on the freeway - a solution cannot wait. I am in that queue every morning, as are many of my constituents and many constituents of the members for Wanneroo, Marangaroo and Whitford. It is important for those three members, all on the Government side, to get the ear of the Minister for Transport and say, "It is not good enough, we must do something about it now." The member for Wanneroo is nodding her head in agreement. Perhaps we will get an air service in the northern suburbs before the freeway is fixed up.

Something else which is really needed is for Whitfords Avenue to be made a dual carriageway. The Main Roads Department and the City of Wanneroo are involved, and we have problems in the area between the suburbs of Woodvale and Kingsley. St Luke's Primary School is situated on the corner of Duffy Terrace and Whitfords Avenue and Duffy Terrace is the only road which leads to the Woodvale High School. The traffic problems are exacerbated by the fact that there is no through road from the other developed areas of Woodvale to those schools, so residents must come out of Woodvale onto Whitfords Avenue, turn left back into Woodvale and drop off their children. To get home they must turn right and do it all over again. That happens twice a day. A number of accidents occur there, and a number of children have been knocked off their bicycles. We must ensure that making Whitfords Avenue into a dual carriageway is a top priority of both the City of Wanneroo and the Main Roads Department.

Another matter I raised last year was the speech therapy service at the Wanneroo Hospital. I received a wonderful letter from the Minister for Health on 10 January 1990 wherein he stated that while there had been a problem there was no longer a problem. I know there is no longer a problem in terms of a waiting list, with people having to wait months for speech therapy at that hospital, because they have closed the waiting list.

Mr Shave: I thought you were going to say they had closed the hospital.

Mrs EDWARDES: That is probably next. Closing the waiting list is one way of not increasing the numbers on the list. I have asked the Minister for Health for an answer in respect of both speech therapy and physiotherapy services. I received an answer on physiotherapy services, which was obviously very easy to answer, saying the waiting list had not been closed; but I have not received an answer about the speech therapy services. The member for Wanneroo is shaking her head.

Mrs Watkins: The waiting list has been reduced quite considerably.

Mrs EDWARDES: I am pleased to hear that, because that is not what I am hearing from residents in my electorate. They have difficulty in getting onto the waiting list at the Wanneroo Hospital so I am waiting for the Minister for Health's advice on the situation.

Mrs Watkins: Are you talking about speech pathology?

Mrs EDWARDES: I am talking about speech therapy.

Mrs Watkins: They are the same thing. That waiting list certainly has been decreased. You must recognise that there always is a problem with numbers at the beginning of the year due to all the children starting school.

Mrs EDWARDES: I acknowledge that, and I realise that at times it is difficult, especially at the commencement of the school year when it is important that the needs of new students be identified because speech therapy does have an impact on their future as they progress in their first few years at school. I have been told that the waiting list is closed and that people cannot get on it, and I am hoping to hear from the Minister for Health that that is not the case. People want to get on that list, no matter how long they have to wait, so at least their children will eventually be seen.

I refer now to some comments made last week by members opposite when an amendment concerning education was moved to the Address-in-Reply. Those comments were along the lines that the Opposition had no education policy, no philosophy and no framework within which to assess the education system, and that its policy could be established only on the record of the time when the Opposition parties were in Government or by looking at the only Liberal Government in Australia, the New South Wales Government. I found it quite offensive that members opposite were attacking individual members on this side of the House, when we have an absolute right to bring to the attention of this place the concerns of our constituents. We have a fundamental right and responsibility to do so, and would be derogating from our duty if we did not bring to this House each specific problem relating to each of the schools in our electorates. I do not want to hear the sort of nonsense we heard from members opposite last week that we have no right to do that. I refer to the report of the Parliamentary Standards Committee where, on page 5, it talks about the role of Parliament, and I quote -

In terms of representing the people one aspect of the role of Parliament that is sometimes overlooked is that of providing a forum wherein the representatives of the people may ventilate matters of concern.

That is exactly what we were doing last week - we were bringing to this Parliament the concerns that have been raised with us by people in our electorates. Members opposite attacked each individual member for doing the job he or she ought to be doing, but it is really the fact that the members opposite are embarrassed, because each of those concerns in the electorates have a common thread. There is complaint in every electorate which is central to the whole of the State. Whether it relates to the poor physical condition of the schools, or the lack of vital resources, or the low morale among the teachers, or the lack of confidence by the community in the policy-makers - the Government - in respect of its education record, it is a fact that the Government has nothing to be proud of. Members opposite are embarrassed when we raise those individual concerns. I can understand that, because they have to

respond by saying, "Sorry, there will be no covered assembly area for your school this year, no new toilet block, no resource centre, because the Government has no money." That is why members opposite are embarrassed about members of the Opposition raising the vital concerns in their electorates which their constituents have asked them to raise - they are sensitive about it because they are members of a Government which has wasted \$850 million of taxpayers' money. Government members may find it parochial, but I encourage all members to bring every single concern of their constituents to this place, as is their right. It would be a derogation of their duty if they did not do so, because those concerns are representative not just of their electorates but of the whole State.

If members opposite want to talk about what the Opposition has in terms of an education policy and philosophy, they need not go back seven or eight years to when we were last in Government, nor even back to the Ark. They need go back only to the last State election when we put out a policy document that outlined our education policy; on the first page we outlined our philosophy of excellence in education. Members opposite may like to read that on some occasion. They ask, "What else are you saying about education today?" As shadow Minister for Education I issue policy statements on a regular basis, and they are available in the library at any time.

Some examples of the concerns that I have drawn to the attention of the community through the Liberal Party's education policy statements are: March, non-Government schools funding; February, specific learning disabilities -

Dr Gallop: What is your policy on that?

Mrs EDWARDES: I will send the Minister for Education a copy of it. It is too long for me -

Dr Gallop: This is a forum of Parliament. You tell us through this forum.

Mrs EDWARDES: No, the Government presided over the loss of money, because of which it can no longer provide the services and the resources necessary for those schools. I do not have to outline my policy in this place. I can bring to the attention of the House the policies of the Liberal Party, but I do not have the time in this Address-in-Reply debate to go fully into them. However, I am happy to bring to the attention of members the issues about which the Liberal Party is concerned, and the statements it has issued. I said: Non-government schools funding; specific learning difficulties - and the Minister for Education last week said that the Government had a "first steps program" to look after specific learning difficulties.

Dr Gallop: I did not say that.

Mrs EDWARDES: The Minister for Education is only a new Minister; I suggest he read *Hansard*. The Minister does not understand the program. Another one is voluntary student unionism. The Bill for that will be introduced into the upper House today. There are others: Special education funding; agricultural education and training and so on. That is only for the last couple of months. I did not bother going back over the policy statements I have issued over the past 16 months since I became a member of Parliament. While talking about literacy and numeracy, perhaps members might be interested in a letter of resignation brought to my attention last week. It was written by a student who has completed 12 years of education and who joined the Public Service as a clerk. He subsequently gave a letter of resignation after a matter of months. If members can understand that this is a letter of resignation, they are better than I. Let me read it -

Dr Gallop: How did you get that letter? You are showing no respect for this person's individuality whatsoever.

Mrs EDWARDES: I will give the Minister a copy of the letter; maybe he has several similar letters on file in his department. Perhaps the Minister should go down to the Human Resources Department and look at the quality of letters coming from some of those clerks. The letter reads as follows -

No the 11th May I will be leaving the Department for another job which suits my cappabilate. I xx am Great Fool for the oppotunite which I had. But unfortunatly it wasn't the job inwhich I wish to do as an xx job for the rest of my life.

That is complete with spelling mistakes. This clerk had 12 years of education and I think it is indicative of the sort of thing which is happening in our system of education. It is not just

to do with the resources needed; we must also look at the teaching practices which occur. I gave the teachers a pat on the back at the end of the graduation ceremonies last year; they are doing a wonderful job. It is the Government's program they cannot do much with.

**MR AINSWORTH (Roe)** [12.43 pm]: The first thing I have on my list of things to do is to give the new Minister for Education a pat on the back. I am really not doing so to change the tenor of the argument, but because it is the first point on my notes. Nevertheless, I congratulate him with a great deal of pleasure because it relates to something very dear to my heart and that is agricultural education. A front page article in *The Gnowangerup Star* deals with the appointment of a new agricultural education coordinator for the Ministry of Education, an appointment which I am sure country members will join with me in applauding because it is something we feel will be very beneficial. The article reads in part -

"The position of Agricultural Co-ordinator has been established to develop state wide policies on agricultural education," Dr. Gallop said.

That is an objective which the National Party would heartily endorse. The article continues -

Development of Tertiary Entrance Examination (TEE) level agricultural subjects which will be offered at a nominated agricultural school will also be given top priority.

Again that is something for which we have been asking for some time. Admittedly the article refers to the subjects being offered at only one nominated school, but it is the first step in the right direction. I am pleased to see it coming to fruition.

Having handed out the bouquets -

**Dr Gallop:** On to the covered assembly areas in Esperance?

**Mr AINSWORTH:** No, I am not mentioning them today. I turn to an issue which has concerned me for some time; that is, Government Employees' Housing Authority and Homeswest housing in country areas. I have received considerable correspondence from various parts of my electorate regarding both types of housing. I will start off with Government Employees' Housing Authority housing. Ravensthorpe is a classic example. It is a medium size town, but it certainly has a population which requires a considerable amount of Government housing. The Ravensthorpe District Hospital at present is concerned with the lack of housing for its staff. It is having some staff changes and is seeking to move three single nurses who are currently accommodated in a house to accommodation which is totally unsatisfactory. I quote a letter from the administrator of the hospital to the Regional Director of Health because it outlines the priority areas. It reads in part as follows -

The main priorities are:

- 1/ Accommodation for Sec./Administrator  
at present this is being covered by the existing Hospital House.  
The situation will change in the future as the Matron may retire and accommodation will be required for her replacement.

The letter continues -

- 2/ Duplex for Nurses Quarters:  
The declining availability of nursing staff in the district has been apparent.  
The aim of the Board is to have attractive accommodation to offer in recruitment of Nursing Staff to the area.  
  
Accommodation at present is provided by temporary G.E.H.A. housing which is allocated to the Education Department and may be recalled on two weeks notice if required.  
  
Staff quarters adjoining the Hospital building are fully occupied with overnight staff and are sub-standard for long term accommodation.

This letter was written last year. In fact the move is now on to take the nurses from the GEHA house and to move them into accommodation in the hospital itself. That accommodation has been deemed as suitable for only temporary accommodation for people who live outside the town and perhaps are on late night shift and want to sleep for an hour or two before they drive home. It is certainly not satisfactory accommodation for nurses to use

on a long term basis. The other possibility raised by the hospital board was that people who wanted to stay overnight prior to going back to their own housing should use the local hotel. I do not think that is suitable.

Housing for hospital employees is not the only type of Government housing required in Ravensthorpe. I have a letter from the Shire of Ravensthorpe dated November 1989 which outlines the organisations currently looking for housing in Ravensthorpe. The first is the Ravensthorpe District Hospital Board, to which I have just referred. The second is the Health Department which needs a house to locate a dentist. The Agriculture Protection Board is looking for a house in Ravensthorpe so it can provide services to the agricultural community by basing an officer in the town, rather than having him travel from Lake Grace. Since November last year the situation in respect of those cases has not altered, which means that the district is either having services provided to it from a distance or perhaps not at all, as in the case of the dentist. That area needs urgent attention. The situation in respect of GEHA housing in Ravensthorpe and in other country towns was acknowledged by the Minister for Health in the following letter to me written on 19 January this year -

The need for GEHA accommodation is acknowledged however the need is not restricted to one shire but is on a state wide basis. With the growth of state wide services, the demand for GEHA accommodation has been more than the Government Employees' Housing Association can supply. Like all government departments the Authority must work within the financial restraints in place at the moment.

While I agree that Government departments must work within financial restraints, those restraints have become worse over the past year or two and that is not something which satisfies me. The fact that country areas in particular are missing out as a result is shameful, to say the least.

Turning to Lake Grace, another major town in my electorate, I will now read a letter from the Department of Agriculture, signed by the Manager, Physical Resources Branch, and addressed to me which states -

Housing for departmental staff in many country centres is acutely short and the priorities for additional new housing have been arrived at after very careful consideration.

Approaches are constantly being made to secure additional G.E.H.A. housing. On May 30 that Authority was contacted regarding the department's need in Lake Grace. To date no reply has been received.

The Director General is very aware of the problems created by the lack of housing and shares your concern in this regard.

The lack of housing referred to relates to accommodation provided for officers of the Department of Agriculture, the officers who in turn are servicing extension needs and other needs of the department's clients; that is, the agricultural community. If these needs are not met, agricultural areas cannot progress at an acceptable rate. Therefore, the effect flows through both departments and also affects the income and wellbeing of the State. It is most important that these services are provided where and when needed.

I have another letter from Norman Halse, Director General of Agriculture, dealing with the same problem. The letter reads -

This Department has an urgent need for additional housing at Lake Grace to provide accommodation for two new advisers. From July 1, 1989, Mr. K.C. Chan requires married accommodation and Mr. P. Cartrell requires single accommodation. Existing houses in the town are fully occupied.

There is no alternative for these people. I am not sure how these officers are accommodated at the present time but it is not satisfactory for them to have to look for accommodation outside the town. The letter indicates that houses in the town are fully occupied.

After reading those letters to the House it is now interesting to read a further letter which I received earlier this year from the then Minister for Housing, Mrs Beggs. In part, that letter reads -

The Government Employees' Housing Authority provides accommodation in response to indicated requirement from its departments.

Nothing could be more clear as an indicated response from a client department than that letter from the Director General of Agriculture. The fact that the director general had to write in such terms clearly shows the response from GEHA is not as quick as it should be. That response was extremely slow.

Another area to which GEHA has been slow responding relates to housing owned by the shire in Lake Grace. Several years ago GEHA approached the shire and commenced negotiations to take over housing that it rented from the shire. Subsequently, negotiations did not proceed. Several letters from the shire to GEHA failed to elicit a response. A letter dated 18 April 1990 to the Minister for Housing called for immediate negotiations for the transfer of five properties into an arrangement where total control would be administered by GEHA. The five houses are currently occupied by staff of the Agriculture Protection Board, in two cases; staff of the Department of Agriculture, in one case; and Ministry for Education staff in the remaining two cases. Because negotiations have come to a grinding halt, the council has suspended general repairs to the buildings and is only undertaking emergency repairs and maintenance. Therefore, the quality of the buildings is deteriorating which is unsatisfactory to the occupants.

A total breakdown of communication between the shire and GEHA on this matter has occurred. Bearing in mind the original initiative was taken by GEHA and not the shire, the situation must be resolved very quickly because the quality of the housing is deteriorating. The shire has taken the correct action and saved ratepayers' money by not upgrading the housing which may be taken over by a Government department shortly.

My comments to this House a few days ago as part of my response to an amendment to the Address-in-Reply touched on the question of teacher housing at Newdegate. It is worth reiterating those points because this issue impinges greatly on the ability of teachers to provide a good service to the Newdegate school. Of the five staff at the school, two are housed in GEHA housing, and because of a lack of housing two teachers are housed some kilometres away in Government housing at the research station - some of which is now required for Department of Agriculture staff. One of the teachers must leave that unsatisfactory accommodation, in terms of location, and find other accommodation in the district. Absolutely no housing is available in the town, private or public.

Mr Trenorden: Is this in a declining rural sector?

Mr AINSWORTH: It is a rural sector which should not be in decline. Part of the reason for the decline is the lack of services in these towns where support industries are not given the chance to survive. Of course these areas are in a state of decline due to those pressures.

The situation has been brought to the ministry's attention over the years. I have received a letter from the Newdegate school council stating that the situation did not evolve overnight; however the situation has not been resolved. It is an appalling situation for teachers to come from the city to teach in the country without being assured of decent housing. In fact, they are not assured of housing of any sort in this case. No wonder teachers cannot wait to return to the city - I would feel the same in that situation.

The same situation applies in the Shire of Kent where the towns of Nyabing and Pingrup are experiencing problems with teacher housing. A deputation from the shire approached the then Minister for Education late last year. I was a member of that deputation and was happy to be part of it. The deputation outlined the situation in both towns relating to nine officers. Not one house in the shire is owned by GEHA. All housing used by teachers is leased to GEHA by the council, some of which is leased on a temporary basis. The houses have not been made available by the shire for a specific purpose. Some houses have been built for council employees, some of whom have their own housing, and the shire housing is not required at this time. It is more good luck than good management that the housing is available. If at any stage the shire needs that accommodation for its own staff - and I understand one house is needed at this stage - obviously the teachers will suffer due to lack of housing in the shire. No private housing is available for lease in those small towns. Again, education must suffer due to the dissatisfaction of teachers who have unsatisfactory accommodation or indeed, no housing at all.

Once again, I have covered my electorate; but it is important for the Government to hear that these situations do not apply only in the Roe electorate; if this were so, I would be even more

irate. The situation applies across the board and I am sure that other members in other electorates have similar cases brought to them.

*Point of Order*

Mr BLAIKIE: Mr Speaker, I am concerned that while the clock indicates the member for Roe has six minutes within which to conclude his remarks, perhaps the member has been allocated only 20 minutes instead of the 30 minute allowance on an Address-in-Reply speech. Can the time be checked to ensure the member receives his allocated time if an error has been made?

The SPEAKER: I will have the matter checked. I recall the approximate time the last speaker concluded. There may be some merit in what the member for Vasse says. It would be appropriate if the member seeks leave to continue his speech at a later stage.

*Debate Resumed*

*Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm*

[Questions without notice taken.]

Mr AINSWORTH: I wish to talk about Homeswest housing as it applies to country electorates. I was the subject of some censure from the new Minister for Housing, Mrs Henderson in the Press recently over a statement I made to the Press regarding the formula for country housing as far as Homeswest was concerned.

I wrote to the Minister in April outlining the difficulties in meeting the required number of applications in small towns, because of their size and the fact that many applicants were deterred from applying. I stated -

... a quick check locally would convince any prospective applicant of the futility of such an application in view of the length of time some applicants have waited already.

The letter continues -

While the current policy exists no smaller towns in WA will receive Homeswest housing unless applicant figures are falsified.

A review of guidelines for such towns is long overdue and I urge you to initiate such a review.

That letter formed the basis of a Press release and I was duly chastised by the Minister because of the suggestion to falsify applicant figures. That suggestion was made by an officer who supervises Homeswest housing, not by me. It was a solution offered by someone within the system to get around the bureaucratic impasse. The Shire of Lake Grace wrote to the Minister for Housing supporting my position as follows -

Council believes that the points raised by Mr. Ainsworth require something a little more than a standard response and requests your earnest consideration for a review on the guidelines.

I am not seeking to attack the Minister but to highlight the fact that for a long time a deficiency has existed in the formula for allocating Homeswest houses in smaller country towns and that something needs to be done. I will outline the case of a young woman, a sole parent, who lives in a caravan at Newdegate and who came to me some 18 months ago. She applied for a Homeswest home in November 1986 and has been on the waiting list since then. She is one of three people in Newdegate on what is now a permanent waiting list because no Homeswest homes are available. She does not want to move because she has a child at school, her parents live in the town and she has a part-time job. Homeswest has suggested that she would probably - not definitely - be allocated a home elsewhere. Homeswest has asked this girl not to look for Homeswest housing in her home town but to go somewhere else where she might be allocated a house. Her circumstances limit her choice of moving somewhere else.

When people seek accommodation in Newdegate they find no public housing available and are told that people have been on the list for several years and that their chances of getting a house are negligible. Persons who make a cursory inquiry when they arrive in the town are



forced, because of the circumstances, to apply elsewhere. People may want to set up a small business in a small town, for example, a mobile crutching contracting business which requires a small capital outlay. These people may not be in a position to own their home but nevertheless want to reside in a country town and own a small business. The process involved in applying for a Homeswest home takes far too long and in many instances prospective applicants do not apply for housing because they know they will not be successful. The method of assessing Homeswest applications should take into account the number of applicants and the population of the town. Sufficient applicants could be found for Homeswest housing in a town like Esperance because it is a large town and the number of applicants would be far greater which would meet Homeswest's criteria. Therefore, housing would be provided as funds became available.

For as long as that housing formula remains the smaller towns will languish and will not improve and increase in size. It is detrimental to country communities in which there is already a general downturn in population, given the amalgamation of farms, and such a formula helps to hasten the demise of some country towns. It is difficult for young people with limited income to obtain public housing in country areas. They may have been born and bred in the country, but they are forced to move to the city where housing is more readily available. This does nothing for country areas, nor does it do a great deal for the city because it adds to the number of people in the city who are unemployed and to the number of people requiring public housing.

The formula needs to be reconsidered because it clearly discriminates against people living in smaller country towns and it is not in line with the stated objectives of the Government; that is, to turn around the declining country population and implement a policy of decentralisation. In reality this policy does not exist and it is just another example of people moving from the country to the city which is totally opposite to a decentralisation and country revitalisation policy which is desperately needed in this State.

Another matter which concerns not only the country, but also the city is the issue of funding of universities. Perth has four tertiary institutions: Curtin University of Technology, Western Australian College of Advanced Education, Murdoch University and University of Western Australia. Collectively those institutions have this year budgeted \$12.25 million for the payment of payroll tax to the State Government. Effectively it means that \$12.25 million of Federal funding to those institutions is being transferred to the State Government by virtue of payroll tax. It does nothing to assist in the education of students. In fact it is taking money away from students and from the institutions and is reducing the number of places and services offered to students.

Federal money used to fund our universities is being transferred to State Government coffers. The situation applies in Victoria but the Victorian Government - another Labor Government - refunds the payroll tax collected, in the form of a rebate, to the universities. The Victorian Government does not use payroll tax as a method to syphon off Federal funds and it recognises it for what it is. This does not happen in Western Australia and the institutions here are losing \$12.25 million of Federal funds which could be used for tertiary education. At a time when funding for education is limited this is an area in which this Government could take a lead from its Victorian counterpart and refund this money to tertiary institutions. It would mean a great deal to those institutions and, more importantly, it would benefit the young people of this State who, as we have heard it said by the Government many times in this House, are of great importance to this State. I agree with the Government in that respect and it is a valid claim. The figure I have mentioned is being syphoned off into Treasury funds and it is time that this Government reversed its current policy and refunded that money as is done in other States of Australia.

I refer briefly to the staffing in some country police stations. Some of the small police stations in the country have only one or, in some cases, two members of staff. Yesterday it was drawn to my attention at a country shire meeting that the Ongerup Police Station was manned by two officers, and when one of the officers takes his annual leave the station staff is reduced by 50 per cent. The position is not always filled by a relief officer and the ability of the station to serve the needs of the people of the area, and the travelling public who are looked after by the country police, is diminished. Therefore, during some times of the year only one officer is in attendance. I would like to see more money made available for relief police officers.

I give the example of the Ongerup Police Station, but I am sure other members would be able to quote similar situations in other police stations. I hope the Minister for Police will examine this problem and find a solution. The lawlessness in our community is a real problem in country areas as well as in the city, and we cannot afford to have a downturn in the number of police in country stations - numbers should be increased, not decreased. When a temporary decrease in the number of staff at a country station occurs, obviously the person left in charge would be unable to fulfil his or her duties to the same extent as when the station is properly manned. So, some local populations are not being served in the manner which they are entitled to expect. I urge the Minister to look closely at this issue and to allocate funds to ensure that the situation is rectified.

**MR FRED TUBBY (Roleystone) [2.53 pm]:** I take this opportunity to congratulate the Premier and the Deputy Premier on their promotion; I wish them well for the benefit of our State. However, I hope they fulfil only a caretaker role, as it will not be long before the Premier makes a very important decision regarding whether she will be the Premier for the next two and a half months or for the next two and a half years. This will depend upon the parameters she sets when she makes a decision about a Royal Commission. I wish her well in those deliberations.

Australia has often been described as the lucky country, and Western Australia has been described as the lucky State within that lucky country. We have tremendous potential within our State. We have huge amounts of natural resources with a vast mineral base, our climate ranges from Mediterranean to subtropical and we have abundant energy resources; these are coal, gas, wind, plenty of sunshine for solar power, and the monstrous tidal variance in the north west. The land area is massive, and is fertile throughout most of the State. We have a huge water resource and although some of this is in remote areas, this resource can be tapped. With all these benefits we have a small population. Therefore, I find it alarming that our State is not in a better position than at present. Business and commerce is not encouraged to come into the State, and I sheet home the blame for this to the Government's lack of policy. I intend to examine some of our problems in the areas of industry and commerce and will suggest some alternatives to encourage business enterprises to the State - enterprises ranging from projects such as the Sarich engine and the submarine contract all the way through to small business.

During the last recess I had the pleasure of visiting Indonesia, and later I will comment on that country, and also on Canada which is a comparable country to Australia. Before doing so I refer to the status of business, industry and commerce in Western Australia. Despite Government propaganda to the contrary, business and commerce is not in good shape. We hear wonderful statements from time to time from Ministers and the Premier about the opportunities which exist in Western Australia. I do not deny that many opportunities exist; however the economic climate and the policies followed over the last few years have not allowed those opportunities to be taken.

**Mr Gordon Hill:** Which policies?

**Mr FRED TUBBY:** I will come to them in a moment; be patient, Minister.

During the first few months of this year Western Australia had the greatest number of bankruptcies in Australia - to be precise, 296 bankruptcies occurred. I realise that a few of those bankruptcies were private individuals not engaged in business and commerce, but the large majority was involved in business. Many businesses have closed their doors and people have had to walk away. Some businesses are closing their doors to employees and laying off staff. Unemployment is on the increase as businesses are cutting back. This is a serious situation for our State because over the past few years we have come to rely heavily on commodity prices - in particular the prices of wheat, wool and minerals. Across the board these commodity prices have not been so high for so long in the past. The reserve price for wool is coming down and a debate is taking place on this issue. If minerals and wheat started to drop in price, we would be in trouble as we do not have an industrial or commercial base and we cannot expect to develop one in the short term. I do not see anything on the horizon to encourage this business base to be established here. This debate involves three main areas: First, the promotion of business and commerce; second, the indirect ways in which the Government can help to facilitate business enterprises; and third, the Government's direct responsibility with business regarding legislation and the level of bureaucracy we suffer in this State.

Since early settlement people have proved to be self reliant, responsible and fiercely independent in the country and north west areas of this State - that is throughout the wheatbelt and the mining areas. These people are reliable and resourceful which was proved in the development of our agricultural, pastoral, mining and timber industries. The agricultural industry in Western Australia has probably produced more innovations than the industry in any other State in Australia, and probably more than in any other country; give those people a problem and they will come up with a practical solution. However, during the past 10 or 20 years there has been a change in this independent attitude. People have started to rely on others through handouts. They have started to rely on Government to solve their problems for them and to develop a welfare mentality. The tendency is for people to blame others for their difficulties rather than to accept responsibility and to find a way out of the problem for themselves. These people look to others to solve their personal and economic problems. Children come out of school and look around for a job. They demand that others provide the job as they believe a job is their right; they believe they have a right to a house and to be entertained. If this is not available, they do not do something about it for themselves; they look to the Government and others to do it for them. The Government can do a great deal about this as it is very adept at producing propaganda which is most effective in both the print and electronic media. This propaganda has been used to promote the Government's policies and ideas, and I would like to see some of this expertise directed towards the promotion of industry, business and private enterprises.

I refer briefly to the people of Indonesia. That country has a huge population of approximately 180 million, most of whom live on the island of Java. They have very few material possessions and I was quite depressed to see how poor the people are in that country. They live from hand to mouth, but nothing in that country is wasted. The people recycle almost everything in their economy over and over again. I noticed that in the main the Indonesians are happy, resourceful and independent people who do not rely on others to solve their problems. They know that there is no-one to solve their problems and that they must take the initiative themselves. They work hard to improve their standard of living. The workmanship in many of the places we visited was primitive, and the standard was certainly not as high as the workmanship expected in this country. However, I take my hat off to them for their efforts to improve their standard of living. There is a feeling of vitality in the air; the people know where they are going, and they know that things will improve in the future. They are doing everything they can to help themselves. We must introduce that feeling of vitality into Western Australia.

In the past 10 years Canada has adopted a national policy of focusing the attention of society on the importance of private enterprise for national growth and prosperity. They know that if private enterprise is not functioning well, the whole economy and the Government cannot function well. The Government goes out of its way to stimulate public awareness and to generate the idea that private enterprise is good and that people can do things for themselves. Educational initiatives in schools include developing new subjects, new teaching methods, and new courses to re-orient the emphasis in Canada's education system. It produces a video series on successful small businesses which is shown throughout secondary schools to plant the seed in the minds of secondary school students that they are capable of achieving certain things when they leave school. It gives them ideas about getting into a small business for themselves. The Government provides a goal and introduces the concept of starting at the bottom and working one's way through to the top. It provides a set of parameters and something for the children to aim for. It teaches the children not to expect everything to be handed to them on a plate when they leave school but to try to do things for themselves. It suggests that if they cannot find a job when they leave school they should consider creating a job for themselves in a short space of time.

These policies put into place by the Canadians are aimed at three target groups; those not yet in business who could be encouraged to go into business, those in business but who need assistance and - the most important of the groups - those who may never enter business but who should be made aware of the importance to their society of a strong private enterprise. That is a very important attitude that we must try to instil in our community, rather than the knocking that goes on and the attempts to drag down people who are successful. The situation in Canada is quite the reverse; when somebody succeeds other people think that if he can do it they can also and they have a go. That attitude is not prevalent in Australia,

particularly in Western Australia, where we try to drag people down. It is time the Government used its resources and skills in the propaganda area to direct a campaign to that sort of initiative.

Mr Carr: Are you asking the Government to direct propaganda towards changing the attitude of business?

Mr FRED TUBBY: I am asking the Government to try to change the attitude of people so that they appreciate that business and private enterprise is good and essential, and that without good, strong private enterprise this country will go backwards. The Government should encourage people not to rely on others, but to provide for themselves.

Mr Carr: Are you asking the Government to run a propaganda campaign to try to change the attitude of people in this State?

Mr FRED TUBBY: Just as the Government does with campaigns such as the Quit program. The Government should initiate a scheme in the media, including television, that promotes private enterprise. It should produce videos which indicate to students in secondary schools and colleges the progress of small businesses and their potential. That could sow seeds in the minds of the children about what can be done. For example, in the last couple of years universities have started running courses in horticulture. That is a field of the future in Western Australia, in which tremendous expansion can take place. However, no information has been provided on television, for example, to let young people know that this enterprise is up and running and a range of opportunities is available. The Government should perhaps be using taxpayers' money to promote those ideas and to encourage people to do things for themselves and to create employment opportunities.

Mr Carr: I can imagine what you would say if the Government spent more money on advertising campaigns trying to change people's attitudes.

Mr FRED TUBBY: The Government has used a lot of taxpayers' money to change people's attitudes towards it; it could also use money to promote positive attitudes towards private enterprise rather than towards the Government. It would be doing a much better job if it moved in that direction.

I turn now to facilitation: One of the first things that must be done to encourage industry and commerce to the State is to provide adequate, cheap, serviced industrial land. That is not being done very well at the moment. I refer to a situation involving an industrial park in Forrestdale and a letter written by the Industrial Lands Development Authority to the City of Armadale on 6 January 1989, from which I will quote -

Our current programme for this project indicates that, subject to obtaining State Planning approval, work on the first stage of subdivision should be commenced before the end of the financial year.

We look forward to a happy and successful relationship with the City Council throughout the life of this project, which we anticipate will significantly contribute to the expansion of employment opportunities in the area, and we shall ensure that close liaison is maintained with the City at all times.

The date on that letter of 6 January 1989 is significant, because it was almost four weeks before the State election. A great deal of fanfare took place about the establishment of this industrial park and indications were given that it would be commenced by the end of the year. The councils from Armadale and Gosnells encouraged industry to go into this industrial park. One of those enterprises was the locally designed, four-wheel drive Oka vehicle. This vehicle has potential not only for the mining industry and agricultural areas but also for areas around the world. It is completely designed and manufactured locally for the harsh local conditions, and most of the components are manufactured locally.

In October 1989 there was a huge fanfare with a blaze of publicity for Government Ministers Troy, Pearce and Hallahan in the local newspapers, but nothing happened. A bus manufacturer had also indicated his interest in the industrial park. Component manufacturers were interested in establishing their business in close proximity to the park. At the end of the year the council starting panicking and so did the vehicle manufacturers, who were being encouraged to go to the Eastern States. They contacted the Industrial Lands Development Authority with regard to the progress on the industrial land in Forrestdale. A letter to the

Economic Development Officer of the South East Economic Development Council dated 5 February 1990, almost one year after the original correspondence, stated -

I refer to my letter of 29 November 1989 concerning studies being undertaken by the Authority into the viability of commencing the development of a new industrial estate at Forrestdale. I advised you at the time that the studies would be available that week and the Authority should be in a position to make a decision on the project towards the end of December 1989.

In the light of the current depressed state of the industrial land market the Authority decided to defer commencement of this development. This decision is to be reviewed again in 3 months time in the light of changing market circumstances.

What a disaster.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr FRED TUBBY: Mr Deputy Speaker -

Several members interjected.

*Point of Order*

Mr BLAIKIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I find the remarks made by the member for Eyre offensive, and ask that they be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not believe there was any use of unparliamentary language. The member for Eyre was clearly out of order by interjecting from that location, and I have drawn his attention to that. The point of order is not upheld.

*Debate Resumed*

Mr FRED TUBBY: The former Minister is probably upset about the comments I made about ILDA; that is what made him a bit prickly when he walked into the Chamber.

This disaster at Forrestdale will do nothing to encourage industry and commerce to come to our State. Industry cannot afford to wait for another three months until ILDA decides that the state of the market is right and it can release more land. That is disgraceful, and something should be done to hurry up the process of releasing land onto the market so that private enterprise will have somewhere to set up its operations, and land must be released at a price which will induce industry to come to Western Australia.

The Government has been procrastinating for at least three years now in respect of building another power station in this State. It cannot continue to procrastinate. During last summer we experienced a couple of hot days, and the capacity of the State Energy Commission was at its maximum output. Had a turbine broken down at any of the power stations we would have had either a blackout or a brownout. During hot weather the SEC is working at its maximum capacity.

Mr Carr: That is not true.

Mr FRED TUBBY: The SEC cannot provide excess power to encourage large industries to come to this State. The Government has been sitting on its hands for three years. Every time it gets close to making a decision, somebody objects, and it has another review. The latest review committee is due to report back in December. If another large power station is not built before 1995 we will be in serious trouble in this State. What can we do to encourage large industry to come to Western Australia when we do not have the power?

Mr Carr: Get your facts right.

Mr FRED TUBBY: My facts are right. They are from the SEC.

Mr Carr: For a start, the SEC has a 2 200 megawatt capacity, and we have never had a demand above 1 800, so how can you say we are in danger of blackouts and brownouts?

Mr FRED TUBBY: There has been a lot of argument about whether to go for coal or gas. My option is gas. It is not right that we should sit on our hands and worry about whether we will find any other gas reserves in the Perth basin when we are exporting liquefied natural gas to Japan. Our supply of LNG to Japan provides 20 per cent of Japan's total energy requirements. Japan is much more heavily reliant on electricity than we are, yet our LNG can provide 20 per cent of its power. If we are able to ship our LNG to Japan to supply

power for its industries why can we not ship it down here to supply power for our industries? We could anchor a ship anywhere along our coast, and build a power station there. We do not even need to have a big container on shore. We could pipe in the LNG and have another ship going up and down the coast. We have plenty of ships, or we should be able to find some. That is one alternative which I suggest the Government look at. I do not know whether it will be too expensive, and I have not heard whether the Government has even looked at it, but if we can export LNG to Japan we certainly should be able to supply it to Perth.

My next point is about legislative bureaucracy, taxes and charges. The Premier announced just after she came into office that private enterprise would be taxed even more heavily to cover the losses incurred by the WA Inc disaster; that is on top of the increase in taxes and charges that was imposed last year. The State Taxation Department has been trying to get around the defeat last year of the proposed amendments to the Stamp Bill by increasing taxes on business via the back door; thankfully that was not successful. There is a tax for almost everything - payroll tax, stamp duties - and businesses are paying heavily. The only way that businesses will get out of paying a bit of payroll tax is to go broke and not make a profit. That is what the Premier promised on Tuesday in her statement.

Government departments are always asking business, commerce and industry to fill out ridiculous questionnaires and surveys. Much of this information is already available in either the Federal or State taxation departments. Why on earth can Government departments not go straight to the taxation departments without providing names or identifying information, to get the statistics they want? The Government should find a way of using the information that has already been collected and is available from other sources.

Legislation and regulation impinge heavily on private enterprise. The Premier made the point in her statement that the Government is trying to reduce the amount of red tape. For the last seven years we have heard the same statement. I remember that when Mr Bryce was Minister for Economic Development and Technology he cut a red tape at the beginning of Small Business Week one year to demonstrate the Government's intention to reduce red tape in Western Australia. We are still waiting for that to happen.

The same problem was being experienced in Canada, and the Canadian Government set out to do something about it. It set up a high level Cabinet subcommittee, and all Government departments which had anything to do with private enterprise had to submit an annual report to that subcommittee, describing how they had been able to reduce red tape in their areas. The departments had to provide an explanation if they failed to achieve their goals, and they had to outline the goals they were setting for the following year. If that were done in Western Australia we could say to Government departments, "Come to the Cabinet subcommittee and tell us how you will be able to reduce the imposition of bureaucracy on private enterprise by 50 per cent during the next 12 months." The following year the departments would have to account for their performance during the previous year, and identify how they could reduce bureaucracy by another 50 per cent in that year. If we did that for two or three years we would soon find that the bureaucracy would not be imposing anywhere near as much on private enterprise as it does at present.

Canada has also developed initiatives in respect of new legislation. Whenever new legislation is introduced into the Parliament, it has to be accompanied by a business impact statement which describes in great detail the implications of that legislation for business, commerce and industry. If we did that we would find exactly the same thing as they found in Canada; that is, that the need for legislation diminishes significantly and very little new legislation is brought in which will impact on business and commerce. Those are some initiatives that can be picked up and run with by this Government.

In conclusion I want to consider briefly the statement made by the Premier last Tuesday. She made what I presume was the second most important speech in her life; it contained a couple of good points but most of it was the drivel we have heard before. The \$100 million guarantee transferred from one section to the housing area was a very good initiative, and I agree entirely with the closing of the Department of Computing and Information Technology. I do not think we will save much immediately on that because those people will be transferred to other areas, but the saving will occur with the natural attrition of workers from the Public Service. I agree with those things; they are steps in the right direction, but

we have a very long way to go. Once again there were promises of a reduction in red tape but no initiative by which to achieve it; there was yet another promise of waterfront reform; there was more talk of reducing duplication by Government departments; yet one day before that speech the Premier, to great fanfare, introduced a seniors initiative to create a body to look after volunteers, when we already have numerous voluntary and Government funded bodies working in this area.

All in all the Premier's statement was a great deal of rhetoric but there was very little reality in what she had to say. Perhaps the best comment I can make on it is one which the Premier herself made. I heard her being interviewed when I was driving home that night. During the interview, when justifying this statement in regard to the coming by-elections, she said, "If we do not make statements such as this, it does not appear as though we are doing anything." In other words, "We have to make statements like this." The operative word in this statement is "appear". If we rephrase what the Premier said, it becomes "We have to make statements such as this so that it appears that we are doing something." That sums up, in the Premier's words, what that statement and all of the other statements over the last seven years have said.

Unless the Premier takes positive initiatives we will not be able to turn things around. We must develop programs in schools and in the public arena to actively promote private enterprise ideals and opportunities; we must provide an array of fully serviced, cheap industrial land; we must provide power, well in advance of requirements, as cheaply and as environmentally safe as possible; and we must reduce Government imposts on business by reducing and reforming business taxes and charges. We must cut bureaucratic impositions on private enterprise through: The use of taxation department records; annual reports from departments explaining how they will cut red tape in business; and by providing business impact statements with all future legislation. If we do not take initiatives such as these and diminish our reliance on agricultural, mining and oil and gas products, our State can look forward to a bleak future.

#### *Amendment to Motion*

Mr FRED TUBBY: I move -

That the following words be added to the motion -

But this Assembly regrets to inform Your Excellency that this Government has, through poor planning and procrastination, failed in its responsibility to ensure the availability of adequate, suitably priced industrial land and has failed to facilitate an economic environment beneficial for the growth and development of commerce and industry in Western Australia.

MR TRENORDEN (Avon) [3.23 pm]: After all the hassles we have had in the last few days, Mr Deputy Speaker, perhaps it would be a good idea if I spoke evenly and without any controversy so that you can have a quiet spell in the Chair for a while.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the member for Avon. I do not believe the amendment contains any words which transgress Standing Order No 132, but I accept his offer nonetheless.

Mr TRENORDEN: This is a very important amendment. The Government is failing to respond to the message constantly given to us by many economists in this nation, whether attached to Governments or in private enterprise. Even though some Federal Ministers are picking up the threads which have to be picked up in terms of turning this nation around, no action is occurring, and people are disappointed that it takes Governments so long to pick up initiatives.

The Federal Government is talking about value adding of agricultural and mining products, and in question time today we heard the Minister for Finance and Economic Development, quite rightly in my opinion, talking about value adding of gold into gold coins. That is a classic example of what this State should be doing. It is all very well to say, "What a wonderful example that is", but where is the follow-on? Where have we gone from this piece of success? I agree that it was an outstanding success, but what is the next step? Unfortunately these things are not being followed through.

In rural Western Australia a number of people wish to be involved in value adding in the agricultural and mining areas. I will direct most of my comments to agricultural areas

because that is what I know best as I live there, but people from my party have for some time been talking here about education and value adding, yet those messages are not being heard. The two most important areas after education are mining and agriculture and they are both at the bottom of the list in this State; that is the incredible fact. Some 30 per cent of our wealth comes from agriculture and a similar amount from mining, but what are we doing? We spend a fortune churning out doctors, dentists and so on - not that they are not important, but they are not as important as the economic structure of this State.

Three per cent of our constituents go into agricultural education and it is an absolute disgrace that agricultural education does not have extreme prominence in this State; neither does mining. The Minister for Goldfields has the Western Australian School of Mines (Kalgoorlie) in his electorate. It is an excellent institution but the Minister would have to admit that it does not get the support it requires. It is under funded at the moment.

Mr Taylor: It is not doing too badly, but if Curtin had its way, without a lot of leaning it would not do as well as it does.

Mr TRENORDEN: Precisely, and that institution is involved in trying to educate people in the value adding area. There is a massive argument surrounding the Muresk Institute of Agriculture, the University of Western Australia and the School of Agriculture, and that argument is way out of kilter. We should not be debating whether the agricultural arm of education in the tertiary area should be at UWA or Murdoch University. It should not be at either; it should be at Muresk. I have argued that in this place before and I will not spend time on it now, except to say that we will not back away from the argument because we believe the future of agricultural education hinges on establishing an institution at Muresk which sets a high priority on excellence in rural education, including agriculture.

I see that the member for Geraldton is taking some interest in this speech. There is some activity in Geraldton, but unfortunately some of it is misguided.

Mr Carr: What is misguided?

Mr TRENORDEN: The development authorities are hopeless, and I will talk about them in a little while.

Mr Carr: Our development authority is doing a great job. It announced a great new project yesterday.

Mr TRENORDEN: I am not talking about the people of Geraldton; they are moving towards generating some activity. However, one of the problems is that if someone comes to the country seeking to start some sort of activity they are absolutely stifled from doing so. Since we have been talking about establishing industrial sites within the Avon community, about a dozen people have come to us expressing an interest in starting enterprises in the Avon area. However, to be realistic, if the land and sites are not available it will take some two years before those people can start up their enterprises. Land must be selected and services delivered to it - power, rail, water, roads, telephone - and all those things take time. As well, Environmental Protection Authority approval must be obtained.

It is important that those things happen. I am not saying that they should, but when people come to an area, regardless of where it is, and say, "I wish to start an industry" and no land is available which has been given the major part of its approval for use by the Environmental Protection Authority, and which has services on site already, it is almost impossible to start an enterprise. It is all right for the very big companies. The Premier on many occasions over the past few weeks has said that Western Australia is small business driven. That is true and it will not change quickly. The problem is that too many barriers are being placed in front of small businesses. I could name - but I will not because the dealings were confidential - three organisations which came to my area and ended up going to the metropolitan area because they could not afford to wait several years to get a site. That is a fundamental flaw in the system. In fact this State is driving people away from the country areas and forcing them into the metropolitan area. Kewdale, Cockburn and other places in the metropolitan area are geared for industrial use; people can move onto a site and into operation more quickly than they can in other places. I am not saying that it is instantly possible, but it is substantially quicker than trying to establish a business in a place where there is no activity. That is a very important point. Small businesses do not have the capital to allow them to delay their activities. Once the idea and the capital are in place it is essential for small and



medium sized businesses to get on with the job quickly. Unfortunately Western Australia is putting barriers before people, preventing them from becoming involved in small business.

Only a few days ago I stood in this place and had a few words to say about the Avon Community Development Foundation. Unfortunately at that stage I did not know that a letter had already been sent from the Premier refusing funding to that organisation. That is an absolute disaster. The organisation has picked 1 100 acres of land, which is on a spur of rail, has power connected to it, is on the Great Eastern Highway and has a water pipeline running through it. The property is of poor value for farming, being quite rocky and broken country. It has several hundred acres of pristine bushland which could be kept for the community. The concept of the Avon Community Development Foundation is to use that land in an environmentally sound way. That is, the foundation would not use that site entirely for industry but would use only 200 acres of it for industrial purposes. The foundation would run the property as a showpiece - a showpiece farm and a showpiece industrial development. There would be trees and animals; the natural flora and fauna of the pristine bushland would be left intact. It is a concept the State Government should pick up. This State has always developed massive blocks of industrial development to which people object violently.

People in my electorate, some of whom are very close friends of mine, have said to me that I am wrong to advocate an industrial park in my area because what I am advocating is pollution. However I do not want pollution in my area. The last thing I want in the place I live is an industrial waste land of any type.

Mrs Buchanan: That is why people voted against it in the referendum.

Mr TRENORDEN: The results of the referendum were surprising because the vote was not entirely against the concept.

Mrs Buchanan: It was lost.

Mr TRENORDEN: Yes, it was lost but it would have been lost anyway because it was a local Government referendum and no local Government referendum in the Avon region has been carried over the past 20 years. However, the "yes" vote reached 42 per cent, which was amazing. In fact the Shire of York received such a shock at the vote that it is considering its point of view. Everyone expected a vote lower than 20 per cent in that referendum. It is important the community gets behind this type of development. When one looks at the south west one finds instances of people wanting to start some commercial activity and the community rebelling against it. In Tupelo, Lee County, Mississippi in the United States a scheme has been running for 40 years. I will not run through that again because I have done so before. However, the scheme has been highly successful; it is very simple and involves the community in decisions made in respect of the industrial development. If the community does not want any particular industry in that park, it rejects it. The park belongs to the community. That was the concept of the Avon Community Development Foundation because the foundation would be run by the community. The people who sit on the board of the foundation would be elected by the community. The land is not owned by the shire, the State Government or the Federal Government; it is owned by the people of the area.

It is remarkable that 11 shires in the area got together to work in unison. If one knows the history of local government in my area through several decades, one knows that they would not talk to each other for several decades. To have a brawl between towns like Northam, York and Toodyay was not very difficult. I was a councillor for a number of years. It is important that this cooperation is recognised. The communities which have not had empathy in the past are now striving to overcome the petty jealousies which destroyed their activities in the past. Those communities have now seen the error of their ways and are looking to work together. York is over 150 years old; Northam celebrated its sesquicentenary in 1979. In that period of time these communities worked as single entities trying to establish development in their areas. I have lived in Northam since 1970 and since that time Northam and the communities surrounding it have worked to establish development within their area. However a small community like the Shire of Northam, which has only 15 000 people, does not have the numbers to contribute to the cost of such development; it is beyond them. However when those 11 communities combine - as the Avon Community Development Foundation did - between them they have 26 000 people. That is a population the size of Geraldton's and that number means that these communities can achieve things. They can

and are working together; they are enthusiastic and that enthusiasm is magnificent. For the first time people are saying that they need to help each other. It is not happening only between Northam and York; shires such as Narrogin are saying that they must help the Shire of Moora, some 250 kilometres away; the Shire of Northam is saying that it must help Merredin in its endeavours. It has created a new attitude within the central wheatbelt area. It is healthy, alive and vibrant, but this Government wants to kill it. I cannot understand the reason for that. The Government has given these people nil support, it has knocked them back time after time.

I had my say on that a couple of days ago, and I do not intend to rerun that speech. I am beyond disappointment. It is incomprehensible to me that such an important part of the State and such a large number of people are ignored by this Government. How are we to turn around this nation, which needs an increase of four per cent productivity in items marketable overseas to get itself above the line the Treasurer talked about?

How are we to create those exports? Many people have identified already that it will happen at a mining and agricultural value added level. A total of \$1.5 billion worth of produce comes out of the agricultural region and less than one per cent is value added. We import into this State \$6 billion worth of produce. There alone is a market. However, we cannot get this Government to show any interest in getting people involved in that very essential activity.

This amendment addresses that item precisely. We urgently need an industrial site in the Avon region that has the available infrastructure so that people who want to go there and begin an activity in an agricultural area have the opportunity to do so. The opportunities are fantastic; in grains alone they are phenomenal.

I know the member for Geraldton is aware of these opportunities because I have heard him talk about them. I cannot understand why he is not fighting for these people. He does a good job fighting for his own and I have every opportunity to fight for mine. However, I cannot understand why there has been no response from the Government, not even a few words of encouragement.

Mrs Buchanan: You could not say that about the Premier's letter.

Mr TRENORDEN: I am. I read her letter this morning.

Mrs Buchanan: There was some encouragement in there.

Mr TRENORDEN: She reaffirmed a promise that was made a year ago; that is all she did. The rest of it was bad news. I will not pick on the Premier personally because she gave those people a very good hearing. However, those people have a letter from her saying that she cannot help them. She is helping the Fremantle Hospital to the tune of \$1 million a couple of weeks before an election. I can go through a list to show that money is going everywhere, but not to this region.

The Minister for no economic development or no regional development may interject from time to time, but she cannot tell us that she is doing anything for this area because she has done nothing in the time she has been a Minister. I admit that she has been a Minister for only a few months and I will give her some time to prove herself. However, she is on notice, not only from me, but also from 70 000 people, to do something to help the people in those regions.

The National Party has a great deal of empathy with the amendment. I believe that if this House were sensible, all parties would vote for it.

MR LEWIS (Applecross) [3.43 pm]: I strongly support the amendment to the Address-in-Reply. The crux of the amendment relates to the poor planning by this Government and its failure to ensure the availability of industrial land. Fundamental to all human enterprise is an availability of land. Early man marked out his land and his land was sacred to him. Land is an absolute necessity for the promotion of industry and for it to flourish. In Western Australia and throughout the world we must have an adequate supply of suitable serviced industrial land to encourage industry.

Unfortunately, this Government, in its time in office, has failed in its duty to provide that land. It has no vision of land use or of how important the process of planning is to Western Australia. It has no idea of how important it is for people to have somewhere to live and for

industry to have somewhere to go with suitable communications corridors. It is the Government's job to provide for the future population of Western Australia and its needs.

The Government has been dilatory. It has allowed the Metropolitan Region Planning Scheme to become obsolete so that the scheme that is now in place does not identify where the major urban corridors will go or where future industrial lands will be located for the next 30 or 40 years. It has not identified where dormitory suburbs will be placed or where urban areas will go. Unless reasonably priced industrial land is made available, industry will not be encouraged.

The member for Roleystone suggested that industry will be encouraged, firstly, by the availability of land; secondly, by a cheap source of energy; and, thirdly, by the location of the land near efficient communications corridors; that is, transport corridors and corridors which allow the produce to be delivered to the docks or to the community. Industry also needs to be able to draw on an adequate supply of labour to service it.

In the last half a dozen years or so, our planning system has run down. We have had no forethought or initiative about what will be required. There has been no lateral thinking on the needs of industry. Therefore, when someone wants to set up an industry, where does one go? There is nowhere to go. The Kwinana area has been embargoed. I sat on the former Metropolitan Region Planning Authority eight years ago. An extensive air pollution study was carried out into fallout from the many chimney stacks in the Kwinana area and that pollution being carried to residential areas by the prevailing south westerly winds. The recommendation was that scrubbers be used in the chimney systems of those industries and certain embargoes be placed on the types of industries located in that area. Running in tandem with that was the recommendation for an embargo on any industrial land being available for noxious industries in the Coogee-Cockburn area. I accept that had to happen. However, the disaster is that no-one had thought about where to put the noxious industries, whether they cause grit, smells, chemical pollution or noise pollution. No-one has suggested where we should put major industries, including a petrochemical plant. That just happened to be a place that suited the previous proponents. No study was made of whether it was the right place and, if the nonsense of the cost of labour in the Pilbara had been sorted out, it would have been logical for the petrochemical plant to be located at the pipe head rather than at the end of the pipe.

I remember sitting in this Parliament last year when the Government was promoting the petrochemical deal and telling us how great it would be for this State. The Government ridiculed the Opposition's proposals. It was not logical to propose putting this plant at the end of a pipeline in an area which had already reached maximum capacity with regard to the supply of gas. I recall the then Minister for Mines and Energy, with some embarrassment, saying that it was not true and there was enough gas to provide the energy and by-products necessary for the petrochemical plant. The cold, hard facts are that there was not enough gas coming through the pipeline to provide the feedstock or energy for that petrochemical plant.

Mr Carr: The pipe can be increased in capacity.

Mr LEWIS: I accept that, because the original plan, formulated under Sir Charles Court's Government, provided for a dual pipeline. Accepting the economics of the day and perhaps that the resources were not available at the time to spend \$650 million, Sir Charles Court had the courage to put in the pipeline. The great thrust of industrial development that has occurred in that area over the last four or five years is the result of the construction of that gas pipeline.

I heard the former Premier and former Deputy Premier lambast the decision of the Court Government, and say that the pipeline should not have been constructed.

Mr Carr: We did not say that.

Mr LEWIS: Yes the Government did, and it criticised the decision.

Mr Carr: We said that it was expensive, but not that it was wrong.

Mr LEWIS: Of course it was expensive and so was the construction of C.Y. O'Connor's water supply line to Kalgoorlie. If it were not for that water supply, the electorate of Kalgoorlie would not exist. Governments must have foresight and vision, and unfortunately this Government has neither. It does not have the foresight to realise that it must plan for the

future. It must do some lateral thinking in its planning. It must consider where the noxious industries will be located. Whether we like it or not all industry is noxious in some shape or form; by its emissions, noise, transport, and so on. Therefore, it is necessary to consider all aspects when formulating plans for the location of industry. It is a great shame that this Government has made no plans for industrial development. It has no regional plan outlining where the people who will service this secondary enhancement industry will live. That is part of the reason for the present planning crisis. Environmentalists and conservationists are opposing urban development; therefore, what chance is there for industrial development?

As a result of Sir Charles Court's Government's vision for the Pilbara, this State has developed Karratha, Port Hedland and other towns in the north, and it has one of the biggest iron ore operations in the world.

Mr Carr: What rubbish.

Mr LEWIS: If the iron ore producers in the north of the State were combined, I am sure their output would be among the largest in the world.

Mr Carr: You said it would not have happened if it were not for Sir Charles Court. A Labor Minister, John Tonkin, was trying to find markets for that iron ore, but Menzies stopped him from doing that.

Mr LEWIS: We have heard so much rhetoric from this Government but the Court Government made things happen. Members of the Labor Party should be big enough to admit that Sir Charles Court did great things for this State. I know that they privately agree with that statement.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Donovan): If the member for Applecross addresses his remarks to the Chair, two outcomes will be seen: Firstly, there will be fewer interjections and, secondly, it will not be necessary for him to shout.

Mr LEWIS: I am trying to convey to the Parliament that the Government has been dilatory. It has not recognised the need for long-term planning, either on the industrial side or the urban side, and the two go hand in hand. Planning is fundamental to any enterprise and without a plan nothing happens. Western Australia has no such plan at the moment. The Government has wild dreams, and it has set up regional development councils around the State. We hear a great deal of rhetoric, but little of substance. The Government cannot expect to plan for the future by creating an industrial park and expecting business people to establish their businesses in it. It will be necessary to discount the cost of the industrial land to offset the high cost of other commodities in this State, such as industrial electricity. Industry will not be established in this State if business people must pay top prices for land, energy and labour. The Government must give something to industry. I suggest that the Government cut the rhetoric, sit down with people who can plan for the future, consider the problems of noxious and heavy industries, and develop a plan. It should give consideration to the salt, gas, iron ore, and every other commodity needed for industry which is available in the Pilbara. At the moment this State merely digs holes in the ground and exports its raw materials. Further processing should be taking place in the Pilbara.

Mr Taylor: I cannot believe my ears; your Government allowed it to happen.

Mr LEWIS: The Labor Party has been in Government for seven years and it had plans to build a petrochemical plant at Kwinana, the last place it should be located. This Government must get off its backside, and cut out the rhetoric and the feel-good policies it is feeding to the community. It should do something about this matter; it should perform rather than talk.

MR TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie - Deputy Premier) [4.00 pm]: I will respond to a couple of points relating to regional development and industrial land.

I do not think that any Government for a long time has more properly, accurately and determinedly addressed the issue of regional development than has this Government. It started in 1983 with the Bunbury 2000 plan and has continued since with Ministers for Regional Development and Ministers responsible for various other areas. I have no doubt in my mind that what was suggested for Bunbury 2000 and what was put in place there has been a great regional development success. For the first time we have actually seen regional areas of Western Australia starting to grow as fast as, and in some cases faster than, the

metropolitan area of Perth. In purely economic terms, that has to be of benefit to Western Australia. If members do their sums they will find that an additional person moving into or being part of the metropolitan area is far more expensive to maintain in terms of economic and social infrastructure than people who move into regional areas of the State.

I will deal with some of the issues raised, the first by the member for Avon, who is not present in the Chamber and who referred to the Avon Development Association. I understand that association comes from within that community and has approached the Government to support it in finding sites for light industry in the Avon area over a period of about 20 years. The difficulty of finding those sites is no better illustrated than in the example mentioned by the member for Avon; that is, that the proposal to establish an industrial site, I think at Meenar Park, resulted in a local government referendum where large numbers of people turned out and voted overwhelmingly that they did not want that industrial site. That is the crux of the problem throughout the State. If an attempt is made to set up an industry site, more often than not the local people decide that it is a good idea but, "I do not want it here." That is a problem this Government has faced for some time.

Nowadays it is impossible to say, "That is where it is going, like it or lump it." One must be sufficiently patient to work through a process where people are consulted and have an opportunity to change their minds and where the Government has an opportunity to change its mind either in relation to the project or its various aspects. Unless one is prepared to go through that sort of process the project will never get off the ground. At the moment the Industrial Lands Development Authority in Western Australia is considering alternative sites for heavy industry in this State. It is considering, in particular, one site in Kalgoorlie and another at Geraldton. I have only recently agreed to the authority taking that matter further to ascertain whether it is worth pursuing either of those sites. I hope it may be possible.

When it comes to the issue of alternative sites for industry we always face the problem of the local people being up in arms. There is no better example of this in the metropolitan area than the proposed Improvement Plan No 14 for Kwinana East/Rockingham area which suggests it should be an extension of the Kwinana heavy industry area. As one would expect, some of the people living in that area are upset by the idea that this could be a site for heavy industry. On that basis the Government now has a responsibility to address the concerns of local people. We also have a responsibility to the wider economic issues of the day; that is, that in that Kwinana industry area there is probably billions of dollars worth of economic infrastructure and to repeat that elsewhere would be an enormously expensive exercise for the Government, so what we have to do is ensure that any industry that goes into that area is acceptable to the local community.

As the member for Applecross mentioned, most people find it difficult to accept industries these days, one way or another, whether in terms of emissions from those industries or the waste stream. They have difficulty accepting those industries in the sense that they are perhaps ones that do not meet the various needs of people in the area. With that in mind we must be able to say to people in that area that we will take that into account in relation to whatever industry goes there and ensure that they are as clean as possible.

In relation to the issue of sites, the Industrial Land Development Authority resource has set up "Enterprise Park" which is potentially the largest project undertaken by ILDA. It involves the development of a major employment focus for the northern suburbs of Perth located in the Wangara/Landsdale, that is, the City of Wanneroo area. Ultimately it could comprise 600 hectares of land and is one of the first industrial parks in Australia. It will include a number of special features such as high standard environmental treatment, requirements for high quality building developments and ongoing management by ILDA until it is fully developed. The concept is based on American models. If it is done well in that sort of area the same can be done in other areas.

I am pleased to say in relation to the Avon area that ILDA is also investigating the feasibility of establishing a special industry park at Bakers Hill in the Northam Shire, 59 kilometres east of Midland, to identify and make available sites for special industry; that is, noxious industries typically engaged in animal product processing such as tanneries, abattoirs, meat rendering works, wool scourers, skin dryers and the like. A special characteristic of this sort of industry is that it generates liquid effluent and odours.

Mr Troy: Which the member for Avon has not fully supported.

Mr TAYLOR: Despite his protestations about that sort of area, as the Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations has said, the member for Avon has not fully supported the proposal to establish the Bakers Hill special industry park. We are anxious to get that park off the ground for Western Australia.

Mr Fred Tubby: What about Forrest Park?

Mr TAYLOR: I will deal with that now. ILDA owns approximately 100 hectares of industrial zoned land in Ranford Road, Forrestdale which was purchased originally to provide a light industry employment area to serve the expanding subregional centre of Armadale as the population grew and industrial land on that side of the city was exhausted. Preliminary studies have been carried out for a master plan of the area which will constitute a new industrial estate and plans have also been drawn up for the implementation of the first stage of the subdivision which has either been submitted, or may have to be submitted to the Department of Planning and Urban Development for approval. I am hopeful that will be approved and ILDA will be able to develop that. At the same time people have to bear in mind that it is not just a matter of developing the land and hoping industry will turn up. That is a bit of wish and hope philosophy. People have to be aware that in the metropolitan area there is an excess of industrial land for that sort of industry and rather than develop the land and hope that over the next four to 10 years industry will move in there, we want to be assured there is opportunity for industry to move in, so it is not necessarily the sort of magic wand that some people hoped it would be for that area.

Mr Fred Tubby: The council went out and found two industries ready to go there and the component manufacturers, but now they are gone.

Mr TAYLOR: I am told that of those two industries, one was perhaps interested and the other has expressed interest to a number of local authorities in the metropolitan area.

Mr Fred Tubby: Which one.

Mr TAYLOR: I do not want to be unfair by mentioning that industry. It said it would go there, given the opportunity, so it has feelers out all over the place. People have to be wary of that sort of thing.

Mr Fred Tubby: We must get employment out there as there are all those new houses and Homeswest owns a thousand broad acres there and is building houses on the whole lot.

Mr TAYLOR: I agree.

Mr Watt: Did the Minister mention the Down Road site in Albany?

Mr TAYLOR: I am not aware of that site, so perhaps the member can give a speech on it at some time.

Mr Watt: I asked because it has turned out to be a fizzer. The land was purchased with good intentions and supported by both parties but by the time the Environmental Protection Authority imposed its conditions the estimated cost of establishing a business there more than doubled, so they went home. That was the problem.

Mr TAYLOR: Is it an area with residences or people around it?

Mr Watt: No, it is not. I think Max Hipkins did a study on what was regarded as all the suitable sites around Albany for this purpose and that was regarded as the best. Everybody was reasonably confident that it would go but by the time people went to use it it turned out to be unacceptable.

Mr TAYLOR: That is one of the problems with an independent Environmental Protection Authority: It sets those sort of provisions and the Government is not left with much of a choice.

The Government is addressing the question of the availability of industrial land in Western Australia. I hope that during the course of this year some sites will be available for new major industries in Western Australia. The Government also supports the efforts to which the member for Albany has referred.

MR COURT (Nedlands - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.11 pm]: The Opposition will not let the Deputy Premier get away with 10 minutes of drivel about what the Government is doing to find industrial sites in Western Australia. The Government has been

in power for seven and a half years and it has not been able to provide the type of industrial land required for industry in this State. It cannot even consider properly the proposal to establish a tannery in the south west without using some kind of ad hoc process. The Deputy Premier might be happy to make a quick speech and then leave the House, but I think the problems associated with industrial land are enormous. The best the Government has been able to do over the last seven and a half years is set up committees to find suitable land for industrial development.

When the current Premier - the Premier from the "C" team - came into office earlier this year she announced that the Government had to deal with the problem of siting a tannery in the south west. She announced that the Government would appoint a committee to investigate that problem. At the same time the Government appointed consultants to carry out a 15 month study to find suitable industrial sites for development in regional centres and in the metropolitan area. Why does the Government, after seven and a half years, still have to call on consultants for advice? Why does the Government have to work out a policy on industrial land after it has been in power for so long? Government departments and their bureaucrats are supposed to be responsible for industrial land. The Government set up regional development authorities to find industrial land. However, this is not working and the Government cannot find land on which a new industrial development can be located. It does not matter where one goes in Western Australia problems exist in finding suitable land for industrial development.

The former Liberal Government can be proud it looked ahead. It tried to find suitable sites for industrial expansion. Kwinana was established as an industrial area in the 1950s when it was an isolated part of the metropolitan area. However, the metropolitan area has since expanded around Kwinana. The Liberal Government in the 1970s made a conscious decision to limit Kwinana's expansion and find more suitable sites. The member for Floreat knows this only too well because he was part of that decision making process. The Liberal Government told Alcoa that it could not expand its alumina refinery at Kwinana, and Alcoa was encouraged to go to Pinjarra and Wagerup. Western Mining was told that it could not build a further smelter at Kwinana and it moved to Kambalda. At the same time money was spent in Bunbury to upgrade the port facilities and to build a deep water port to encourage more industries to ship from and locate in that area. The Kemerton site was set aside at that time for the aluminium smelter and it is now being used as an industrial estate. Industrial development in the Pilbara region was encouraged by the Liberal Government. These decisions were made 15 to 20 years ago. However, in the past seven and a half years this Government has had trouble trying to provide even the most basic requirement, industrial land.

The member for Applecross was correct in saying that this Government lacks vision because it cannot envisage that the next major phase of industrial expansion should be in the Pilbara; it has energy, water and a skilled work force.

Mrs Buchanan: Why did the Liberal Party decide to build a gas pipeline if it thought industry should be established in the Pilbara?

Mr COURT: It was built for two reasons: Firstly, to ensure domestic users a supply of clean, natural gas in the metropolitan area once the supplies from Dongara ran out and, secondly, to provide energy to industries such as Alcoa which had its alumina refineries in the south of the State.

Mrs Buchanan: The Opposition used the resources, it did not have a plan.

Mr COURT: That occurred 15 years ago; I am talking about 1990 and the future. When the Opposition said a petrochemical industry should be located in the Pilbara the member for Ashburton, now the Minister for Regional Development, said it would be too expensive to build a petrochemical plant there.

Mrs Buchanan: I did not say that.

Mr COURT: Who said it?

Mrs Buchanan: The people who were interested in building the plant said that.

Mr COURT: The Minister claimed on radio and television that the Opposition's proposal for industry in the Pilbara was stupid and that it was environmentally unsound.

Mrs Buchanan: I did not; you are misquoting me.

Mr COURT: The member cannot have it both ways. Does she now support a petrochemical industry in the Pilbara?

Mrs Buchanan: I said that any industry which was established in the Pilbara would have to meet the same stringent environmental criteria which are applied to the rest of the State.

Mr COURT: It goes without saying that the environmental standards would be the same in the north as in the south, because this State has only one set of environmental standards. The Opposition was ridiculed for promoting industry in the Pilbara but it will continue to promote industry in that region. If the Minister for Regional Development had any thought of political survival she would support the Opposition's moves for more industry in that region. It does not matter whether a company wanted to build a petrochemical plant or an aluminium smelter, or whether the company was big or small, it would have difficulty because no industrial land is available.

For example, the Minister knows that in the Pilbara small companies have been attempting to buy waterfront land for industrial purposes. They have had to fight for many years for a site to be approved at Dampier.

Mrs Buchanan: What is wrong with that?

Mr COURT: What is wrong with the fact that companies have to fight for years and years before obtaining land?

Mrs Buchanan: They do not have to fight - a planning process exists.

Mr COURT: The Minister has not been listening to these companies. They service the offshore exploration industry and they want a shore facility where they can refuel their boats. They have had to fight this Government to get suitable land. The Pilbara is an industrial area which is going ahead and the Government should be looking after the small industries as well as the big ones.

Mrs Buchanan: The Government is doing that.

Mr COURT: It is imperative that, as the metropolitan area expands, land is set aside for light industrial use such as enterprise parks and industrial parks. People seem to ignore the need for light industrial zonings. In my own area there is such a shortage of light industrial zonings that the land that is zoned for that use has exorbitant rentals and prices attached to it. It is important that we ensure that land is set aside; but, at the same time, instead of its being an eyesore it is important that we satisfy very high standards so that the modern industrial parks and the old industrial parks that are currently in use are made aesthetically acceptable in our community. If we are to have these industrial estates in the metropolitan area it is important that we lift their standard. It is tremendous to see the developments that are taking place in this regard in different parts of the world.

I want to leave time for the Minister to respond further, so I will summarise by saying that after seven and a half years in office this Government is in chaos when it comes to industrial zonings. It cannot attract industries to this State easily because the first obstacle is getting a suitable site for industry. I was part of a delegation that visited Indonesia recently. Over there they are screaming out for products that we could supply, many of them from agricultural industries. It is imperative that we move further into the value added processing of our minerals and agricultural goods. We will never manage to encourage that value added processing until we can offer land, electricity, a fair price, and the other forms of infrastructure that are required. When it comes to industrial land this Government has a bad case of the staggers. It is about time it showed some vision and put more emphasis on encouraging industry instead of adopting the attitude it seems to have, which makes it extremely difficult for industry to get off the ground.

MR CARR (Geraldton - Minister for Mines) [4.23 pm]: I want to comment briefly on some of the comments made on this amendment moved by the Opposition. The amendment really does present itself as a mishmash of different ideas and clichés, and some rather strange attitudes were expressed during the course of the debate. I will not spend much time on the industrial land issue because that was only one aspect of the debate and it was covered adequately by the Deputy Premier. However, in the context of available industrial land I have been associated very recently with two excellent examples of new projects being



brought about. They have both been in my own area of Geraldton, they have both involved the Geraldton Mid-West Development Authority playing a very positive role - in spite of what some critics of that authority might say - and they have both involved value adding of local products; so in those senses they are very much desirable projects.

One was announced a little while ago and involves a tannery to process sheepskins to bring them to a stage where they can be turned into leather in Thailand. The other, which was announced last Tuesday, involves the processing of garnet into a final product, nonslip paint and concrete additive for use in the Japanese market. They are just two relatively small projects but they are very valuable, value added projects. They have in each case been able to identify suitable land very quickly and in each case the development authority - that so much maligned development authority - has been central to the arrangements being made for these two projects to proceed.

The member for Roleystone, in moving this amendment, spoke at some length about the attitudes existing in the community, and in particular in the business community. I thought he said two quite contradictory things. First of all, he maligned the attitude that exists at the present time in the community. He spoke about, and I quote, "the resourceful attitude being lost." That is a terrible indictment of the business community of this State, which has a very positive attitude. Quite frankly, I believe his comments were quite misplaced. He then attempted to contrast that and to criticise the Government for talking up the economy; so he said this resourceful attitude had been lost but the Government was trying to overcome that by talking up the economy. Then he turned around and said with his very next breath, "What the Government should be doing is embarking upon a propaganda campaign" - and that was his word - "to turn around the attitude of the business community."

Mr Fred Tubby: Not the business community, the community of Western Australia.

Mr CARR: I really think the member is quite confused because there is a very positive attitude in the community, and there is strong support in the Government for that positive attitude which exists in the business community. That is not to pretend that there are not some overall national economic trends relating to interest rates and the general slowdown of the economy. No-one is ignoring that; but, notwithstanding that, there is a very positive attitude about Western Australia's progress and growth and development in the general community and the business community. We are largely being insulated from a lot of the effects in the south east corner of Australia because, as everyone here knows, the out-States, as they like to call us in Canberra, have an economy based on world commodity prices whereas the south east corner is very much more reliant on manufacturing industry and that is one of the major reasons this State's economy is performing better than the economies in other parts of the country. However, it is wrong to start talking about the need for us to have a propaganda campaign to turn around attitudes because a very positive attitude already exists.

The same member also pointed to bankruptcies as being a barometer of the business community, referring to the high number of bankruptcies - which occurred in the first quarter of this year. I acknowledge the high number of bankruptcies in that first quarter but it is important to put bankruptcies in context. Reports in the small business sector have indicated that over a lengthy period of time something like 50 per cent of new small businesses fail in their first year and something like 75 per cent fail in the first three years. Once businesses get through those first three years or so they are likely to be in a position to join the 70 000 small businesses in this State which operate, by and large, very effectively. So it can be misleading to say the number of bankruptcies is higher in one quarter than another, because that does not necessarily reflect the strength of the great bulk of the small business community. In most cases it reflects the fact that people have gone into business ill-prepared and have not thought it all through and been well equipped.

Mr Fred Tubby: But a lot of established businesses are also going to the wall, or closing down or cutting back.

Mr CARR: Nobody is saying there are not difficulties; nobody, for example, is turning a blind eye to interest rates as a major cause of it. However, it is important to get that development in context. We have established the Small Business Development Corporation, which has played a major role in being available to give advice to small businesses both before they go into business - advising them as to how to go into business, and in some cases

advising them not to go into business - and providing the management and skills advice for established businesses.

Mr Fred Tubby: Do you think you provide enough resources there?

Mr CARR: One could always say more resources would be better, but the Small Business Development Corporation has done a quite outstanding job, given that it is a fairly lean organisation.

I refer also, in a similar context, to the community employment development programs which are operating in a number of places. While these started under the Department of Employment and Training as employment generators, they have in fact played a role as small business advisers. Figures available to me indicate that businesses that have come through that process and received preliminary advice have had a much higher survival rate.

Mr Trenorden: Then tell us why the one at Northam could not get funding and had to shut down. It had been going for a decade and was probably the first one in the State.

Mr CARR: I am not familiar with the details of the Northam program but I would be happy to look at those details.

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of background conversations is far too high.

Mr CARR: I would have liked to spend a little time speaking about the power situation and to deal at some length with some of the issues raised.

Mr Fred Tubby: That is all you ever do about the power situation - talk about it.

Mr CARR: In view of that interjection I will take a couple of minutes beyond the 4.30 pm finishing time to talk about power.

I am sick and tired of the complaints about a decision not being made regarding the next base load power station. We do not need to make that decision yet. It would be irresponsible to rush in and say, "Let us grab the option we think is best today and put it into place."

Mr Fred Tubby: How long does it take to establish a power station?

Mr CARR: We are looking at five years and a power station will be required by late 1995 so a decision will have to be made late this year. Therefore, this is a good time to consider our position.

Mr Court: Why is industry leaving?

Mr CARR: It is not leaving. The situation is that industry can consider the various options and may locate here or there. Industry would consider all the issues involved including location costs, power and land. A good share of industry is locating here at the present time. Certainly, some industries are playing one State against the other by going to Queensland and saying that they can receive power at a certain price in another State and then coming here and saying that they can receive power at a certain price in Queensland.

Mr Fred Tubby: Our power is too expensive.

Mr CARR: Power is expensive in this State due to some historical factors. I will be happy to go through them at some other time - I do not have time this afternoon - but they include things such as the gas pipeline. It is not inconsistent to say that that is a visionary project which has done good things for the State, while acknowledging that one of consequences of the project has been its impact on power prices.

Mr Fred Tubby: Have you thought about an LPG power plant?

Mr CARR: I was going to raise that issue. Discussions have taken place on the availability of gas. At the moment we are meeting with four different suppliers of gas who are making recommendations to us concerning their capacity to supply. It is too early to have a clear or complete picture or to refer to the quantity, the type or the price of that gas. These issues must be discussed as we go through the process. We have time to assess the options. If we rush in and build what appears best today, we might find in the future that we chose the wrong option. The reality is that we have time and a panic statement such as the one made earlier by the member for Roleystone about the power system being beyond capacity does not help the situation. There is no doubt about SECWA having the capacity to meet the demands of this State - I am unequivocal about that. It is wrong to state that that is not the

case. I would like to have spoken at greater length in reply to some of the points raised, but I conclude at this point.

**MR THOMPSON** (Darling Range) [4.37 pm]: I understand that there is an arrangement for the House to rise at 4.30 pm, or as soon as possible thereafter; however, I wish to speak on the amendment. I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage.

**Mr Carr**: How long will it take?

**Mr THOMPSON**: About 15 minutes.

[Leave denied.]

**Mr THOMPSON**: In view of the fact that leave has not been granted, I have the right to speak. Unless there is a Standing Order which precludes me from doing so, I again suggest to the House that it would be more appropriate to allow me to speak on this matter when the House next sits. Again I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage.

**Mr Carr**: Why do you not speak for five or 10 minutes now? That would be fair to everybody.

[Leave denied.]

**Mr THOMPSON**: It was not my intention to speak at this time because members have commitments after 4.30 pm. It is unreasonable for the Government to prevent me from speaking at a later stage. What would be lost if we come back to the Address-in-Reply and I am given the call so I have an opportunity to speak to the amendment?

**Mr Carr**: We want the amendment to be dealt with so that we can deal with the other parts of the Address-in-Reply.

**Mr THOMPSON**: I suggest to the Government and the Opposition that when making arrangements for debates like this, they talk to every interested member in this House.

**Mr MacKinnon**: We expected to finish at 4.30 pm.

**The SPEAKER**: Order! There is no Standing Order which states that the House must rise at 4.30 pm.

**Mr THOMPSON**: There is no Standing Order stating that restriction, but I do not intend to disadvantage the many members of this House who have commitments when this House rises at 4.30 pm, so I will not speak to the amendment. However, I make the point strongly that members should not expect me to be as cooperative in the future.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

---

Ayes (22)			
Mr Ainsworth	Mr Hassell	Mr Minson	Dr Turnbull
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Kierath	Mr Nicholls	Mr Watt
Mr Clarko	Mr Lewis	Mr Strickland	Mr Wiese
Mr Court	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Thompson	Mr Blaikie ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mr Cowan	Mr McNee	Mr Trenorden	
Mrs Edwardes	Mr Mensaros	Mr Fred Tubby	
Noes (24)			
Dr Alexander	Mr Donovan	Mr Kobelke	Mr Taylor
Mrs Beggs	Dr Gallop	Dr Lawrence	Mr Thomas
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Graham	Mr Read	Mr Troy
Mr Carr	Mr Grill	Mr Ripper	Dr Watson
Mr Catania	Mrs Henderson	Mr D.L. Smith	Mr Wilson
Mr Cunningham	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr P.J. Smith	Mrs Watkins ( <i>Teller</i> )

---

Pairs

Mr Grayden  
Mr House  
Mr Shave  
Mr Omodei

Mr Bridge  
Mr Leahy  
Mr Marlborough  
Mr Pearce

Amendment thus negatived.

*Motion Resumed*

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Blaikie.

**ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE • SPECIAL**

On motion by Mr Carr (Minister for Mines), resolved -

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 29 May at 2.00 pm.

*House adjourned at 4.41 pm*

---

# QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## SCHAFFER, MR - WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MEAT COMMISSION

### *Crown Land, Robb Jetty*

6. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is Mr Schaffer, a member of the Western Australian Meat Commission, the Minister's appointment to the commission?
- (2) Is he the same Mr Schaffer that is being offered Crown land in the Robb Jetty area?
- (3) If yes to (1) and (2), to what extent did Mr Schaffer participate in the decision by the Western Australian Meat Commission to agree to the offering of prime industrial land under its control to the Schaffer Corporation?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) No. Mr John Schaffer is a member of the Meat Marketing Corporation.
- (2) The Schaffer Corporation has been offered Robb Jetty land to relocate the GOSH tannery under conditions outlined in the reply to question 1663 of 14 November 1989.
- (3) Not applicable.

## TANNERY - CROWN LAND, ROBB JETTY

### *Schaffer Corporation Ltd - City of Cockburn Support*

8. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Does the City of Cockburn support the transfer of Crown land at Robb Jetty to the Schaffer Corporation?
- (2) Does the City of Cockburn support the proposal by the Schaffer Corporation for the establishment of a tannery and/or associated industries on land at Robb Jetty that is, or was formerly, vested in the Western Australian Meat Commission?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

(1)-(2)

The Minister for Local Government is not aware of the council's position on this matter. The member may like to direct his question to the City of Cockburn for a response.

## SCHAFFER CORPORATION LTD - CROWN LAND, ROBB JETTY

### *Zoning*

9. Mr HOUSE to the Minister representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) What is the current zoning of the land at Robb Jetty that is being offered to the Schaffer Corporation?
- (2) When did that zoning last change?
- (3) Has any undertaking been given to anybody that the zoning will be altered to accommodate the establishment of a tannery and/or associated industries by the Schaffer Corporation?
- (4) Can the Minister assure the House that no decision has been or will be made in relation to the Schaffer Corporation's proposal that conflicts with the long term plan to relocate noxious industries out of the Coogee and surrounding districts?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) The subject land is zoned "special industry" in the metropolitan region scheme, and "public use reserve" in the City of Cockburn town planning scheme No 1. These zonings have been in place since 1963 and 1972 respectively.

- (2) Refer to (1).
- (3) No. The Coogee redevelopment plan provides for the development of the land for special industry use, which is consistent with the metropolitan region scheme.
- (4) Refer to (3).

**WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MEAT COMMISSION - CROWN LAND, ROBB JETTY**  
*Schaffer Corporation Ltd*

11. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Will the Minister be seeking parliamentary approval for the transfer of Crown land in the Robb Jetty area from the Western Australian Meat Commission to the Schaffer Corporation?
- (2) If yes to (1), will it be before any firm offer is made to the Schaffer Corporation?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

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

**LAND - CROWN LAND, ROBB JETTY**  
*Schaffer Corporation Ltd - Valuation*

12. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the valuation of the land at Robb Jetty that the State Government is offering to the Schaffer Corporation?
- (2) How much will the Schaffer Corporation be paying for it under the terms of the Government's offer?
- (3) What is the area of the land and where precisely is it located?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) According to an assessed valuation by the Stamp Office for the purposes of determining stamp duty - \$1.425 million.
- (2) Nil - as indicated in answer to question 1663 of 14 November 1989.
- (3) Total land area is 10.2174 ha - comprising lot 2058, 4.2204 ha, and lot 2059 5.9970 ha - located on the south side of Rollinson Road at the corner of Cockburn Road, Hamilton Hill.

**PETROCHEMICAL PROJECT - ENGINEERS**  
*Outstanding Payments*

48. Mr COURT to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:

- (1) How many engineers who were working on the petrochemical project are still owed money for their services rendered.
- (2) How many of these engineers are from within Australia and overseas?
- (3) What is the total sum still in dispute?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) WA Government Holdings Ltd accepted all offers to assign claims against Petrochemical Industries Ltd for engineering and administrative services rendered by contract personnel. I am advised that on information available to WAGH the only remaining claim in this category is a debt owned by PIL of \$3 000. However, despite indicating its willingness to accept an appropriate offer in relation to this debt, WAGH has not received one.
- (2) I am advised that all offers accepted by WAGH were in relation to claims for engineering and administrative services provided by PIL contract personnel in Australia.

- (3) I am not aware of any dispute in relation to the claims referred to in (1) and (2) above.

#### MINISTERIAL STANDARDS - CODE OF ETHICS

64. Mr COWAN to the Premier:

- (1) What is the position of the Government under the Premier's leadership in relation to Ministers who mislead the House?
- (2) Has the Premier laid down any guidelines for Ministers?
- (3) If yes to (2), is the Premier prepared to publish them and indicate the consequences for Ministers who do not comply?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(3)

The Government's attitude towards ministerial standards is set out in the code of ethics which I have tabled today. Some of the details are in line with pecuniary interests legislation for members of Parliament which, to date, the Opposition has not seen fit to support.

#### CHARITIES - INQUIRIES

235. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What investigations are being made in relation to charities in Western Australia?
- (2) How many charities are involved?
- (3) Who is carrying out the investigations?
- (4) What is the progress of the investigations?
- (5) What enactment applies?
- (6) When will investigations be completed?
- (7) Has any charity or person been charged?
- (8) Is it likely that charges will be laid?
- (9) What action is the Minister taking to improve the situation and clear the name of charities doing valuable work in the community?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

(1)-(4), (6)-(8)

From time to time the charitable collections advisory committee carries out investigations and examinations in the course of its duties. Some of these are still current. However, as I have indicated on previous occasions, questions of this nature are improper. Inquiries and investigations, whether by the committee, the police or any other investigatory authority, are inappropriate for public comment unless proceedings are initiated, or, when proceedings are not initiated, the matter is the subject of official report.

- (5) The Charitable Collections Act 1946.
- (9) Cabinet has recently approved the drafting of legislation to establish a Public Collections Act with a board responsible for the regulation of all public collections, with certain exceptions. The changes will make those involved in public fundraising more accountable and therefore restore public confidence.

#### EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING - JOBLINK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS *Funding Reduction*

293. Mr COURT to the Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations:

- (1) How many training programs similar to the Nedlands Joblink scheme have had their funding stopped or reduced during the past year?
- (2) What other schemes have been supported to take their place?

Mr TROY replied:

(1)-(2)

In 1989 the Joblink, Jobmate and employment development scheme programs were reviewed by the Department of Employment and Training as a consequence of changing labour market circumstances.

A new program was introduced known as the employment equity program (EEP), which essentially involved an amalgamation of the three previous schemes. Guidelines for the employment equity program were developed after extensive consultation with community groups and local business organisations. The new guidelines place a greater emphasis on equity issues, skills training, more effective targeting of services and closer collaboration with Commonwealth programs.

Six projects were not refunded in 1990 as they did not effectively meet the new guidelines. These were -

Rainbow Coast Employment Project  
Wembley Jobmate  
Nedlands Joblink  
Clontarf Joblink  
Manjimup Joblink  
Bridging-the-Gap Osborne Park.

The Nedlands Joblink was not refunded because it is not in an area of high unemployment. In fact, in the most recent figures available for local government areas, June 1989, the City of Nedlands had the lowest unemployment rate in the metropolitan area of 2.5 per cent.

(2) The employment equity program and the skills for work program.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION - WORK RELATED INJURIES**  
*Occupational Hazard Categories*

319. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations:

Are there any occupational categories in which certain work related injuries are considered to be occupational hazards and thereby not claimable through workers' compensation?

Mr TROY replied:

The provisions of the Workers' Compensation and Assistance Act apply to all workers as defined in the Act regardless of the type of occupation and provides for compensation to be paid on a no-fault basis.

**OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE**  
**DEPARTMENT - FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT ACT**  
*Breach of Section 53*

320. Mr COWAN to the Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Department of Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare breached section 53 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act in 1988-89?
- (2)
  - (a) What was the purpose of the expenditure that the department committed itself to prior to obtaining the necessary Treasurer's approval;
  - (b) how much was that expenditure?
- (3) What appropriations was this expenditure charged to before it was finally approved?
- (4) Why was this done and on whose authority?
- (5) When did the Minister become aware of this breach of the Act and what action has he taken against those allegedly responsible for the breach?



Mr TROY replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) (i) Refund of prepaid registration fees in factories and shops and construction safety following the State Government's abolition of these fees from 1 July 1988.
- (ii) Payment of motor vehicle allowances award increases.
- (iii) Distribution of information concerning changes the Retail Trading Act proclaimed on 1 September 1988 and establishment of computer and information systems to meet the legislative changes.
- (b) (i) \$51 700
- (ii) \$18 400
- (iii) \$83 000
- \$153 100
- (3) (i) Management services.
- (ii) Machinery safety.
- (iii) Management services.
- (4) This expenditure was to ensure the prompt payment of outstanding accounts, not foreseeable at the time of appropriation, and was authorised by the principal accounting officer.
- (5) This matter was brought to my attention on 6 November 1989. I am satisfied the department has adequate and efficient procedures in place to ensure that planned commitments are controlled.

**TRADING HOURS - BELDON SHOPPING CENTRE DELICATESSEN**  
*Restrictions*

412. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of trading restrictions which have been placed on the Beldon delicatessen in the Beldon shopping centre?
- (2) Is the Minister going to use the authority granted to the Minister under section 5(1) of the Retail Trading Hours Act to ensure that the population of Beldon does not lose the after hours service of its only delicatessen?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Yes. The owner does not qualify for a small shops certificate under existing legislation. It is proposed to introduce a Bill amending these provisions in this session of Parliament.
- (2) The proprietor has already been given a permit to trade extended hours pending parliamentary consideration of the amendment Bill.
- (3) Not applicable.

**RSI (REPETITIVE STRAIN INJURY) - ASSESSMENT**

425. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations:

- (1) What is the current assessment of the problem of repetitive strain injury (RSI)?
- (2) What treatments are available for this problem?
- (3) What support is available to the sufferers of this complaint?
- (4) Have any surveys been carried out to see how widespread the problem is?
- (5) If so, what were the results?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) A continuing problem which is slowly declining as prevention strategies take effect.
- (2) Medical, paramedical.
- (3) Workers' compensation and rehabilitation and support organisations such as the Overuse Injury Association of WA.
- (4)-(5) Industrial accidents data from claims collected under the Workers' Compensation and Assistance Act are monitored for trends. The number of claims where the medical practitioners have diagnosed and written "occupational overuse syndrome" or "RSI" are as follows -

Total Cases -	1985-86	635
	1986-87	563
	1987-88	493
	1988-89	446

#### PARLIAMENT HOUSE - FLAGS

455. Mr COURT to the Speaker:

- (1) Who is responsible for the flying of flags at Parliament House?
- (2) Can assurances be given that the flags will be flown on important days such as Anzac Day?
- (3) Can the flags be flown at half mast on the days when condolences are being given to past members?

The SPEAKER replied:

- (1) The Presiding Officers.
- (2) The Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet advises when it is appropriate to fly flags at half mast.
- (3) These matters will be discussed by the Joint House Committee to determine whether a satisfactory solution can be achieved.

#### SEAFOOD - IMPORTS

##### *Marketing and Labelling Standards*

462. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) What are the current standards regarding the marketing and labelling of imported seafood?
- (2) Is the Minister considering reviewing these standards to make it clear to consumers when they are buying imported seafood and not the local product, given the importance of supporting our local industries?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) The labelling of seafoods is regulated under the Health Act. The WA Health (Food Standards) Regulations require that the country of origin must be specified on the package, but not at the point of sale for unpackaged seafoods.
- (2) The Minister for Health, on the recommendation of the WA food advisory committee, has agreed to change the regulations to require labelling of imported seafood at the point of sale. The amendments will come into effect shortly. The change will allow consumers to make an informed choice when purchasing seafood.

#### QUESTIONS - UNANSWERED

*Nos 1933-36, 1989*

475. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations:

When can I expect an answer to questions -

- (a) 1933 of 1989;
- (b) 1934 of 1989;
- (c) 1935 of 1989;
- (d) 1936 of 1989?

Mr TROY replied:

It is my understanding I answered these questions in December last year. I regret that the member did not receive my replies and will therefore forward them for the member's information.

#### TAFE - PRINCIPALS AND DEPUTY PRINCIPALS

##### *Resignations*

476. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister assisting the Minister for Education with TAFE:
- (1) How many principals and deputy principals have resigned since October 1989?
  - (2) How many have retired since October 1989?
  - (3) How many have received redundancy payments?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) None.
- (2)-(3) One.

#### TAFE - PRINCIPALS AND DEPUTY PRINCIPALS

##### *Redundancy Payments*

477. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister assisting the Minister for Education with TAFE:
- (1) Will the Minister advise if redundancy payments have been made to Messrs -
    - (a) Costello, former Principal of Carlisle TAFE College;
    - (b) Farrow, former Principal of Technical Extension Service;
    - (c) Brennan, former Principal of Thornlie TAFE College;
    - (d) Bailey, former deputy Principal of Fremantle TAFE College?
  - (2) If so, under what basis were the redundancy payments made and what is the total amount in dollars?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b)-(d) No.
- (2) Payment was made in accordance with the Government employees redeployment, retraining and redundancy general order.

#### TOBACCO - CONFISCATED AND FORFEITED PRODUCTS

##### *Sale Moneys*

489. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:
- (1) How much money did the Government receive from the sale of confiscated and forfeited tobacco products.
  - (2) Into what account or accounts has that money been placed.

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- |                              |               |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| (1) Proceeds from auctions - | \$            |
| 21 June 1988                 | 1 550         |
| 5 April 1990                 | <u>9 160</u>  |
| Total Received               | <u>10 710</u> |

- (2) Proceeds were paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund as departmental revenue "Taxation".

**NORTH WEST SHELF PROJECT - GOODWYN A PLATFORM**

*Woodside Offshore Petroleum - Contracts/Orders List Tabling*

500. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Would the Minister please table a complete list of contracts/orders directly or indirectly related to the Goodwyn A platform and awarded by Woodside Offshore Petroleum as managers of the North West Shelf project?
- (2) Would the Minister show in this list the companies and their domicile which received the orders/contracts, the contract prices and currencies in which it was written?
- (3) Would the Minister also show a table disclosing what percentage of the aggregate contract values were allocated to -
- (a) Western Australian companies;
  - (b) other Australian companies;
  - (c) overseas companies?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) Goodwyn A platform contracts/commitments placed up until March 1990 amount to around \$0.5 billion. I understand this amount consists of hundreds of contracts/orders, details of which are provided on a confidential basis to the North West Shelf national liaison group.
- (2) As above.
- (3) Up until March 1990 -
- (a) 49 per cent.
  - (b) 11 per cent.
  - (c) 40 per cent.

**WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MEAT MARKETING CORPORATION - WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MEAT COMMISSION**

*Industrial Advocate - Productivity and Labour Relations Department*

504. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations:

Further to the Minister's reply to question 14 of 1990, under whose direction is the Western Australian Meat Marketing Corporation and the Western Australian Meat Commission required to use the Department of Productivity and Labour Relations as its industrial representative?

Mr TROY replied:

Cabinet, to ensure consistency in coordination of industrial relations policy and practices across Government.

**ADOPTION - STATISTICS**

509. Mr CLARKO to the Minister for Community Services:

- (1) How many children were placed for adoption outside the natural family in Western Australia in -
- (a) 1960;
  - (b) 1970;
  - (c) 1980;
  - (d) 1985;
  - (e) 1986;
  - (f) 1987;

- (g) 1988;
- (h) 1989?
- (2) How many children were gained by adoption from overseas by Western Australians and from what countries in -
  - (a) 1985;
  - (b) 1986;
  - (c) 1987;
  - (d) 1988;
  - (e) 1989?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- |     |     |         |   |      |
|-----|-----|---------|---|------|
| (1) | (a) | 1959-60 | : | 62   |
|     | (b) | 1969-70 | : | *637 |
|     | (c) | 1979-80 | : | 128  |
|     | (d) | 1984-85 | : | 32   |
|     | (e) | 1985-86 | : | 31   |
|     | (f) | 1986-87 | : | 48   |
|     | (g) | 1987-88 | : | 46   |
|     | (h) | 1988-89 | : | 19   |

\* Figures available only as "orders granted".

It should be noted that for years 1979-80 to 1988-89 figures do not include special needs for foster children. In addition, the figures include both departmental and non-departmental placements.

- |     |     |         |   |    |  |
|-----|-----|---------|---|----|--|
| (2) | (a) | 1984-85 | : | 77 | (South Korea 71, Hong Kong 3, Chile 2, Sri Lanka).     |
|     | (b) | 1985-86 | : | 40 | (South Korea 36, Hong Kong 1, Sri Lanka 1, India 2).   |
|     | (c) | 1986-87 | : | 21 | (South Korea 14, Hong Kong 2, India 4, Philippines 1). |
|     | (d) | 1987-88 | : | 38 | (South Korea 34, Hong Kong 2, India 1, Philippines 1). |
|     | (e) | 1988/89 | : | 22 | (South Korea 15, Hong Kong 1, India 5, Colombia 1).    |

#### BICKFORD, MR LINDSAY - FREMANTLE HOSPITAL BOARD

##### *Reappointment*

511. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Was Mr Lindsay Bickford reappointed for a three year term as a member of the Fremantle Hospital Board in August 1989?
- (2) Has Mr Bickford in recent times been advised that his term of appointment will now terminate on 30 June 1990?
- (3) Was Mr Bickford asked by the Chairman of the Fremantle Hospital Board whether he knew and had been speaking to the member for Applecross on the basis of a question that had been asked in Parliament?
- (4) What is the reason for the unscheduled termination of Mr Bickford's appointment that was to expire in 1992?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes. Unfortunately, at the time of appointment Mr Bickford's age was overlooked.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) I have no access to personal conversations between independent members of hospital boards.

- (4) It is Government policy that members of boards and committees retire upon reaching 70 years of age, as was the policy of previous Governments.

**AUSTRALIAN CONSERVATION FOUNDATION - RURAL LIAISON OFFICER**  
*Government Assistance*

514. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Given the result of the Federal elections and the Australian Conservation Foundation's partisan support for the Labor Party, will the Government continue to provide financial support to the ACF for a rural liaison officer?
- (2) How much will be provided this fiscal year for the ACF liaison officer?
- (3) What tasks have been undertaken by the incumbent ACF liaison officer?
- (4) Will the Government receive a comprehensive report on activities undertaken by its ACF officer?
- (5) Who is the ACF rural liaison officer and what is that person's qualifications?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1), (3)-(4)

The national soil conservation strategy was endorsed last year by the Federal Government, the National Farmers Federation and the Australian Conservation Foundation. This tripartite involvement led to the "Year and Decade of Land Care", and enhanced Commonwealth funding for land care initiatives in the States. The place of the ACF is considered important through its capacity to coordinate the activity of conservation groups and community participation in land care. The Government has received a report on the rural liaison officer's activities in 1989-90, and proposals for 1990-91. An extension of support is under consideration. I understand that the report has been circulated to parliamentary leaders, and additional copies are available through my office.

- (2) \$30 000.

- (5) Ms Jill Reading, primary producer and journalist.

**SOCIAL IMPACT UNIT - TASKS**

515. Mr HASSELL to the Minister representing the Minister for Resources:

- (1) What tasks have been undertaken by the social impact unit?
- (2) Which communities and or municipalities have benefited from the unit's services?
- (3) Which task or project has been allocated the most resources to date?
- (4) Who has been the head of the unit?
- (5) Will the unit complete the year within the \$500 000 allocation of June 1989?
- (6) What are its existing projects?
- (7) What further projects will it initiate in this fiscal year?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The social impact unit (SIU) has been involved in an assessment of social impacts for major economic developments in the State. It operates under the Environmental Protection Act to formally assess the social impact of projects. The SIU facilitates the development and implementation of public participation strategies by proponents.
- (2) The social impact unit has worked with the following communities -

Margaret River	Coorow	Argyle
Augusta	Jurien Bay	Collie
Waroona	Dandaragan	Eaton
Pinjarra	Harvey	Australind
Nannup	Baker's Hill	Brunswick Junction

Northam  
Hamel  
Moora  
Leeman

Kununurra  
Turkey Creek  
Doon Doon  
Port Hedland

Kemerton  
Boyanup  
Greenhead  
Karridale

- (3) See (6).
- (4) See question 517(2).
- (5) Yes.
- (6) Major current projects are as follows -
  - Argyle Social Impact Group Review
  - Hill River Coal Mine and Power Station
  - Kemerton Social Impact Committee
  - Gulf Holdings Solar Salt
  - Jangardup Mineral Sands
  - Beenup Mineral Sands
  - Argyle Hydro-electric Scheme
  - Worsley Alumina Expansion
  - Wagerup Alumina Expansion
  - Pinjar to Hill River transmission lines
  - Hill River Substation
  - Mineral Sands transport routes.
- (7) The SIU will be involved in all major developments.

#### SOCIAL IMPACT UNIT - AFFECTED COMMUNITY

516. Mr HASSELL to the Minister representing the Minister for Resources:

- (1) With regard to the criteria used by the social impact unit, what comprises an affected community?
- (2) What are examples of the created opportunities the unit will take advantage of, according to the claim made in the current advertisement for a director?
- (3) Who will comprise the people who the unit will ensure have the chance to influence decisions of Government?
- (4) How does the unit decide which developers it will work closely with?
- (5) Which Minister did the unit report to in the Dowding Government?
- (6) How can developers apply to receive an allocation or the resources of the unit?
- (7) Who will ensure that the unit's resources are equitably distributed through the development community?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The individuals and groups of people who might be affected by a proposed development.
- (2) There is a wide range of opportunities including economic opportunities - for example, expansion of the economic base of an area and opportunities for additional retail outlets - employment opportunities - for example, commitments to local employment policies and Aboriginal employment - and community development opportunities - for example, local infrastructure.
- (3) Those potentially affected.
- (4) This is determined on a case by case basis.
- (5) The Deputy Premier.
- (6) Advice on social impact assessment and public participation can be sought direct from the social impact unit.
- (7) The director in consultation, where appropriate, with the Minister.

**SOCIAL IMPACT UNIT - \$500 000 ALLOCATION**

517. Mr HASSELL to the Minister representing the Minister for Resources:

- (1) Under whose portfolio was the \$500 000 allocation for the social impact study unit made in this financial year?
- (2) Who has been the chief executive of the social impact unit since the inception of the unit in June 1989?
- (3) Who has been the unit's chief executive to this time, and what are the person's appropriate qualifications?
- (4) What position or consultative role has Ms A. Verschuer, an adviser to the former Minister for Environment, Hon Barry Hodge, had with the social impact unit?
- (5) What has been the reason for the delay in appointing a director to the unit?
- (6) Given the selective use of the services of the unit which is the prerogative of the Minister, will he ensure that the position of director currently advertised will be filled by a person without political affiliation?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Resources.
- (2) The unit's acting director has been Ms Ann Verschuer.
- (3) Ms Verschuer is a skilled manager; she has 10 years' experience in social impact management and environmental management in Government and the mining industry.
- (4) See (2).
- (5) There has been no delay.
- (6) There is no selective use as suggested. The appointment will be made by standard Public Service Commission procedures.

**TAFE - FREE COURSES**

*1990 Tuition Fee - Lip Reading Courses*

526. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister assisting the Minister for Education with TAFE:

- (1) Are some of the courses at TAFE which were offered free of charge subject to a fee from the commencement of tuition in 1990?
- (2) If so, does this extend to lip reading classes attended mainly by deaf and mostly aged people?
- (3) If answer to (2) is yes, will the Minister expand on the Government's policy in supporting handicapped and elderly people via educational classes at TAFE?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No, the \$2 fee for lip reading courses that was charged in 1989 has been increased to \$5 in 1990.
- (3) Not applicable.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TRADE MINISTRY - EMPLOYEES**

*Industrial Development Department*

527. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:

Of the total number of 267 employees shown on the bottom left hand side of page 15 in the annual report 1988-89 of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, which are the categories and numbers who according to their occupation would not have been employed in the Department of Industrial Development as it existed in 1979, but would have belonged to some other department?



Mr TAYLOR replied:

There are no employees of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade who would not have been employed in the Department of Industrial Development as it existed in 1979 but would have belonged to some other department.

Some aspects of the role of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade are different from that of the Department of Industrial Development as it existed in 1979 and therefore the mix of employees is different. For example, in 1979 the department had a number of regional offices and employed decentralisation officers. Currently there is only one regional office, in Bunbury, which is concerned with trade development in regional areas.

Activities undertaken by the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade which were not undertaken by the Department of Industrial Development include the promotion of trade in education services and the development of new technologies in Western Australia. However, these activities were not being undertaken in any other department in 1979.

#### SUITORS FUND ACT - LITIGATION

##### *Respondents - Benefit Payment Increase*

528. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) When did the Government last increase the benefits payable under the Suitors Fund Act to respondents in appeals and litigants?
- (2) When is it expected that the next increase will be made to keep up with inflation and the increased costs of litigation?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) Benefits payable under the suitors fund were last increased by regulation from \$1 000 to \$2 000 on 10 November 1970.
- (2) Consideration is currently being given to submissions received about benefits payable under the Act.

#### INDUSTRIAL LANDS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY - OFFSHORE

##### CONSTRUCTION YARD, JERVOISE BAY

##### *Company Submissions*

538. Mr COURT to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:

- (1) When were proposals invited from companies interested in developing the Industrial Lands Development Authority offshore construction yard at Jervoise Bay?
- (2) How many companies submitted proposals?
- (3) Did ILDA meet with all of the companies who had submitted proposals?
- (4) Has an agreement been reached with any of these companies?
- (5) If yes, what are the terms and conditions of that agreement?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Public advertisements were placed in *The West Australian* on 30 June 1989 and 1 July 1989.
- (2) Four.
- (3) ILDA met with the two companies whose submissions conformed with the invitation requirements.
- (4) No formal agreement has been finalised, but negotiations are currently being held with one of the conforming respondents.
- (5) Not applicable.

## PRICES MONITORING UNIT - OPERATING COST

553. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) What has been the cost of operating the prices monitoring unit in the period February 1989 to the end of April 1990?
- (2) Since its inception, what has been the total cost of the prices monitoring unit?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Cost of operating the prices monitoring unit, February 1989 - April 1990 -  
February 1989 - June 1989

Contingencies	\$77 143.68	
Salaries	<u>\$46 333.00</u>	
		\$123 476.68

July 1989 - April 1990

Contingencies	\$79 323.13	
Salaries	<u>\$70 615.43</u>	
		\$149 938.56
		<u>\$273 415.24</u>

- (2) Total cost of operating the prices monitoring unit February 1987 - April 1990 -

February 1987 - June 1988

Contingencies	\$86 658.00	
Salaries	<u>\$37 965.00</u>	
		\$124 623.00

July 1987 - June 1988

Contingencies	\$190 498.00	
Salaries	<u>\$95 202.46</u>	
		\$285 700.46

July 1988 - June 1989

Contingencies	\$107 990.00	
Salaries	<u>\$106 792.15</u>	
		\$214 782.15

July 1989 - April 1990

Contingencies	\$79 323.13	
Salaries	<u>\$70 615.43</u>	
		\$149 938.56
		<u>\$775 044.17</u>

## SULPHUR DIOXIDE - ATMOSPHERE

*Maximum Level*

564. Mr McNEE to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the maximum level of atmospheric sulphur dioxide recommended by the World Health Organisation?
- (2) What is the maximum level of atmospheric sulphur dioxide recommended by the Environmental Protection Authority for Kalgoorlie?
- (3) What is the maximum level of atmospheric sulphur dioxide recorded by the Environmental Protection Authority monitoring systems in the Kalgoorlie region?
- (4) Is the Minister aware of any children in the Kalgoorlie region having suffered from nausea and vomiting caused by sulphur dioxide poisoning?

- (5) Is the Minister aware of any above average incidence of asthma, sinusitis, and other respiratory and ophthalmological disorders in the Kalgoorlie region?
- (6) What steps will the Government take to see that maximum atmospheric sulphur dioxide levels in the Kalgoorlie region comply with World Health Organisation standards?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The World Health Organisation guidelines refer to combined sulphur dioxide and smoke exposure limits. These are -

	Sulphur Dioxide Micrograms per Cubic Metre	Smoke Micrograms per Cubic Metre
24 hour mean	100-150	100-150
Annual arithmetic mean	40- 60	40- 60

The WHO regional office for Europe has recommended the following air quality guidelines for Europe -

500 Micrograms per Cubic Metre for 10 minutes not to be exceeded.  
350 Micrograms per Cubic Metre for one hour.

These guidelines have a built-in safety factor of 2.

The National Health & Medical Research Council's Ambient Air Goals are -

1 400 Micrograms per Cubic Metre for 10 minutes.  
700 Micrograms per Cubic Metre for one hour mean  
60 Micrograms per Cubic Metre annual mean.

- (2)-(3) These questions should be directed to the Minister for the Environment, who has responsibility for the Environmental Protection Authority.
- (4)-(5) No.
- (6) See answer to (2) and (3) above.

**PAYROLL TAX - STATE TAXATION DEPARTMENT**  
*Universities - Western Australian College of Advanced Education*

567. Mr AINSWORTH to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:

What amount of payroll tax was received by the State Taxation Department for 1987-88 and 1988-89 from -

- (a) the University of Western Australia;
- (b) Murdoch University;
- (c) Curtin University of Technology;
- (d) Western Australian College of Advanced Education?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

The provisions of section 5(1) of the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Act preclude the disclosure of this information except with the consent of the taxpayers involved.

**JUVENILE OFFENDERS - "YEAR'S JAIL FOR VICIOUS ATTACK" REPORT**  
*Parole*

571. Mr HASSELL to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Further to question 1131 of 1989, has the youth involved been approved for any leave program?
- (2) Has he been considered for parole?

- (3) If so, when is he likely to be released?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) There has been no approval for any leave program other than participation in approved activity programs under section 94 of the Prisons Act.
- (2) He is to be considered for parole on 18 May 1990.
- (3) Earliest eligibility date for release on parole is 12 June 1990, but the release date is subject to a decision by the Parole Board.

**SCHOOLS - ROSSMOYNE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL**  
*Staffroom Improvement Funds*

589. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will the Government give consideration to funding improvements to the Rossmoyne Senior High School staffroom in the coming Budget?
- (2) If not, why not?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) Yes. Until such time as the full extent of the available funds is known; however, it is not possible to indicate definitely when the proposed work is to be commenced.
- (2) Not applicable.

**SCHOOLS - CROSSINGS**  
*"A" Crossings Approval*

591. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many type "A" crossings have been approved by the schools crossings committee but have yet to be funded?
- (2) Will the Minister please list the schools/crossings involved?
- (3) Why is it that these crossings, while given a category "A" classification, are yet to be funded?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Nil.
- (2)-(3) Not applicable.

**LAND - UNBURNT VEGETATION BACKLOG**  
*Stirling Range - Fitzgerald National Park Area*

604. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that there is a 20-year backlog of unburnt land in -
  - (a) the Stirling Range;
  - (b) the area of the Fitzgerald River National Park not burnt by fires this summer?
- (2) What strategies are being taken to reduce this hazard, and how long will they take to bring the situation up to date in -
  - (a) the Stirling Range;
  - (b) the Fitzgerald River National Park?
- (3) Does the Minister believe that the Department of Conservation and Land Management's policy of chaining and burning buffer strips in national parks is a viable, long term strategy for reducing the backlog?
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that up to 30 per cent of the species which were chained and burnt by the Department of Conservation and Land Management in the Stirling Range National Park perimeter last year will not regenerate?

- (5) Will the Minister establish a system of management committees to advise the Department of Conservation and Land Management with regard to the burning of buffer strips for each national park in Western Australia, which would include representatives from local government, farmer organisations, bushfires brigades, land conservation districts and recognised nature and conservation groups?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) There are areas of long, unburnt vegetation in both the national parks referred to. Past and present burning plans have not provided for burning of most of these areas; therefore there is no backlog. It is considered necessary to retain areas of long, unburnt vegetation to ensure persistence of some of the species of plants and animals in these parks.
- (2) (a) A gazetted fire plan has been produced for the Stirling Range National Park. This outlines a five-year plan for strategic burning and it is up to date after three years. This plan has been approved by all four shires and is reviewed by them each year.
- (b) A detailed strategy was outlined in the draft management plan for Fitzgerald River National Park in 1989. It is anticipated that the work will take between five and seven years to implement fully.
- (3) It is a short term strategy only.
- (4) No. There is no evidence available to CALM to this effect.
- (5) No. There is already a process for the production of fire plans which involves consultation with local bushfire brigades and local government. The management issues are also addressed in management plans which are developed through a consultative process.

#### POLICE - CRISIS COUNSELLING AND LEGAL ASSISTANCE SCHEME

##### *Rural Centres Allocation*

605. Mr HOUSE to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) How much of the \$250 000 provided for the crisis counselling and legal assistance scheme announced by the Minister will be allocated to rural centres?
- (2) Can the Minister outline which towns will be the beneficiaries of the scheme, and what the timetable is for expanding the scheme?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) It is not possible at this time to answer this question. It is our intention to conduct a program for victims of crime, initially in the Perth metropolitan area. Following a detailed assessment, consideration will then be given how best to expand the program on a Statewide basis.
- (2) Answered by (1).

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS - AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY INVOLVEMENT

610. Mr COWAN to the Minister for Local Government:

As a result of reports made to the Minister about various recent local government elections, can the Minister now advise the House whether there is any evidence of involvement by the Australian Labor Party in any of those elections?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

Reports made to me about various local government elections have not included information on the party membership or party affiliations of candidates. I am unable to provide any information additional to that which has been published in the Press.

**SERVICES DEPARTMENT - TELECOM PLUS**  
*Supplynet Joint Venture*

614. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Services:

- (1) On what date did the Department of Services enter into an arrangement, agreement or joint venture with Telecom Plus for Supplynet?
- (2) Was this the result of an open and competitive tendering process?
- (3) If yes, on what date were tenders called?

Mrs BUCHANAN replied:

- (1) The Department of Services entered into an agreement with Telecom Plus on 4 May 1989.
- (2) No. However, a feasibility study was undertaken by a local consulting firm and a number of organisations were identified and interviewed as potential private sector sponsors. The outcome of this process showed that Telecom, in conjunction with a major computing firm, was the only organisation to express an interest in the project.
- (3) Not applicable.

**SERVICES DEPARTMENT - TELECOM PLUS**  
*Supplynet Joint Venture*

616. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Services:

- (1) Further to the answer to question 503 of 1990, in which the Minister denied that there is a joint venture between the Department of Services and Telecom Plus to develop Supplynet, is the Minister aware that Mr Peter Wimsett, who is a Director of Information Technology at the Department of Services, in a paper he presented to a seminar organised by KPMG Peak Marwick on 5 April 1990, stated that -

... we began to search for an appropriate commercial partner ... In May 1988 we reached an agreement with Telecom Plus whereby they would develop and operate Supplynet on our behalf, and they would recoup their investment in the service through charges paid by the end users of Supplynet facilities, including both government and private sector users. ?

- (2) Does this mean that the department is, in effect, trailing Supplynet and that the cost of developing it will be recouped through charges on the public sector in excess of commercial rates?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that a brochure printed by the State Printing Division and entitled "Supplynet - Making Government Purchasing more efficient and effective" bears the logos of Supplynet, Telecom, Telecom Plus and the Department of Services?
- (4) Is the Minister aware that it states in that brochure that -

The idea (of Supplynet) was first investigated by the Western Australian Government, who called in Telecom Plus to help develop a system ... working closely with the Western Australian Government through the Department of Services, Telecom Plus created Supplynet. ?

- (5) How much did the department charge Telecom for its services?
- (6) (a) Is the business name "Supplynet" registered in Western Australia by the Department of Services;
- (b) if yes, when?
- (7) (a) Is the State Supply Policy Council playing an integral role in promoting the use of Supplynet;
- (b) if yes, what is the relationship between the State Supply Policy Council and the Department of Services?

- (8) (a) Did the Department of Services provide encouragement and support for Supplynet as a commercial venture;
- (b) if yes, what is the nature and the cost of that encouragement and support?
- (9) If the arrangement between the Department of Services and Telecom Plus is not a joint venture, will the Minister explain what it is?

Mrs BUCHANAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) The Department of Services is not trialling Supplynet;
- (b) The costs of implementing Supplynet are borne by Telecom, which recovers its costs through user charges;
- (c) The public sector does not pay more than commercial rates.
- (3)-(4) Yes.
- (5) Nothing.
- (6) (a) Yes;
- (b) 16 June 1988.
- (7) (a) The State Supply Policy Council is interested in the general promotion of the use of electronic communication, information exchange and electronic trading as part of its supply management reforms. Supplynet fulfils these objectives;
- (b) the State Supply Policy Council comprises a number of major Government bodies including the Department of Services, which also provides administrative and professional support to the council.
- (8) (a)-(b) The Department of Services continues to provide encouragement to Supplynet as part of supply management reform in this State. The commercial costs and risks are borne by Telecom.
- (9) The Government of Western Australia through the Department of Services has an arrangement with Telecom to provide information and implementation assistance for the Supplynet system. There is no "joint venture" in a commercial sense as Supplynet has been designed, developed, funded and implemented by Telecom as a commercial endeavour. This arrangement does not result in the Department of Services having any financial obligations.

**COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT - BADGINGARRA FARM**  
*Ownership*

617. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Does the Department for Community Services still own/control a farm at Badgingarra?
- (2) How and when did it acquire the property?
- (3) If not still owned, when was it disposed of?
- (4) Were tenders called?
- (5) If still owned by Government -
  - (a) to what extent has it been used for the treatment of juvenile offenders in each of the last five years;
  - (b) how many children have been sent there in each of such years;
  - (c) how many cabins are there and available for accommodation;
  - (d) what are Government plans for the use of this property;

- (e) what size is it;
- (f) what profit/loss has been achieved in each of the last five years?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 1971. From the Department of Land's and Administration to operate a training farm and group home as part of the then Hillston juvenile institutional program.

(3)-(4) Not applicable.

- (5) (a) Used as part of the department's community based offender program and other placements; more recently, programs for offending youth have been run at the farm in conjunction with Westrek.
- (b) No specific records kept on children attending until 1986. From October 1986 to October 1988 approximately 36 disadvantaged children, of which 14 were offenders, and 10 parents resided at the farm. For 1989, 71 children and youths participated in a variety of programs involving 23 supervisors.
- (c) One transportable unit can accommodate up to 10 children plus two supervisors.
- (d) The Department for Community Services has budgeted in 1990-91 to provide increased program moneys to allow for rural work experience and alternative custody placements for disadvantaged offending youth from the country and metropolitan areas.
- (e) 1 556 hectares.

(f) Year	Revenue from Sales
	\$
1985-86	6 053
1986-87	32 104
1987-88	69 641
1988-89	60 040
1989-90	Estimate 65 000

#### PACT RESOURCES NL - IRON CARBIDE PROCESS

621. Mr COURT to the Minister representing the Minister for Resources:

- (1) How is the development and testing proceeding on Pact Resources iron carbide process?
- (2) Will this process go into commercial production?
- (3) If yes, when is it anticipated this will occur?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Pilot-scale production of tonnage quantities of iron carbide concluded at Wundowie in November 1989. Testing of this product by steel mills in USA, New Zealand and Japan is approaching completion.
- (2) Pact Resources reports licensing the process from commercial operation in the USA.
- (3) Commitment to commercial operation is a matter for the commercial assessment of the licensees.

#### HODGE, HON BARRY - GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

622. Mr COURT to the Treasurer:

- (1) What consultancy work has Hon Barry Hodge received from the Government since he left politics?
- (2) How much has the Government paid to Mr Hodge for this work?



Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

I refer the member to the answer to question 237 of Thursday, 3 May 1990.

#### COAL MINE WORKERS' PENSIONS TRIBUNAL - INVESTMENTS

625. Mr COURT to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Would the Minister please identify which investments were made by the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Tribunal between 15 September 1988 and 28 October 1988 totalling \$0.55 million which the Crown Solicitor's Office has advised are specifically prohibited under section 16 C(3) of the Trustees Act?
- (2) What action was taken to resolve this problem?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) Pooled Unit Link Superannuation Funds -

Country Natwest Australia	\$50 000
Bankers Trust	50 000
Equitilink	400 000
Rothschild	50 000
	\$550 000

- (2) The Coal Industry Superannuation Act, which was assented to on 12 December 1989 and is due for proclamation on 1 July 1990, will validate the investments.

#### MINERAL SANDS - BEENUP

##### *Environmental Review and Management Program - Submission Extension*

627. Mr OMODEI to the Minister for the Environment:

In the light of demands by conservation groups and interested parties -

- (a) will the Minister extend the submission period for the Beenup mineral sands mine environmental review and management program beyond the 18 June 1990 deadline;
- (b) if not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (a) No.
- (b) This decision is the prerogative of the Environmental Protection Authority.

#### FISHING - "HUSH HUSH", "BLUE HOLES" FISHING SPOTS, WALPOLE

##### *Access Roads Closure - Conservation and Land Management Department*

628. Mr OMODEI to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Is the Department of Conservation and Land Management closing access roads to the Hush Hush and Blue Holes fishing spots near Walpole?
- (2) If yes to (1), will the Minister give reasons for closure of these access routes?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) If yes to (1), has the local community and the Shire of Manjimup been advised of these plans?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) No. The issue of access to locations within the Walpole-Nornalup National Park will be dealt with in the management plan for the national park. The draft management plan for the national park is scheduled for release to the public in July 1990.
- (2)-(4) Not applicable.

**SEWERAGE - ALBANY INDUSTRIES**  
*Effluent Disposal Options*

633. Mr COURT to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) What are the main options being put to those industries at Albany that have a problem with their effluent disposal into the harbour?
- (2) Will any of these companies be allowed to connect to the Water Authority of Western Australia sewerage system?
- (3) If yes to (2), what are the anticipated costs of this change?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The technical advisory group for the Albany Harbours Environmental Study (1988-1989) has recommended that the industries that have a problem with their effluent disposal into Princess Royal Harbour should cut back on these pollutant loads within two years.

The main options appear to be diversion of treated effluent from Princess Royal Harbour via a sewer, or local treatment of the waste to a level where discharge to the harbour, or reuse of the effluent, would be environmentally acceptable.

- (2) The Water Authority of Western Australia is currently reviewing sewerage reticulation and waste water treatment requirements for the Albany region. Options for industrial waste treatment and disposal are included in this review.
- (3) The various options are yet to be finally costed.

**REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES - SPORT SPONSORSHIP**

635. Mr WATT to the Minister for Regional Development:

- (1) Is it or has it been the practice of any of the regional development authorities to provide sponsorship or incentives to sporting associations, teams or individuals?
- (2) Are such payments made on a one-off basis or on a regular basis?
- (3) Which authorities are involved and who are the beneficiaries?
- (4) How are payments of this type justified during these times of financial constraint?
- (5) Is the disbursement of these funds coordinated in any way with the Ministry of Sport and Recreation?

Mrs BUCHANAN replied:

Answers to these questions refer only to the Great Southern Development Authority, which is the only regional development authority for which I have responsibility.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) One-off basis.
- (3) The WA Masters Games Association and the State Basketball League. In addition, the Great Southern Development Authority has provided underwriting of up to \$2 300 to the Albany Table Tennis Club to help it stage a test match between Australia and China in Albany.
- (4) The Masters Games were a major regional event. The addition of country teams to the State Basketball League has been important in economic and social development leading to the formation of associations throughout the great southern, and coaching of teams outside Albany. This is the first table tennis test match held in a country centre in Western Australia and therefore constitutes a major promotional opportunity for Albany and the great southern.

- (5) Yes. In the cases of the WA Masters Games Association and the State Basketball League, the sponsorship was sought by the Ministry of Sport and Recreation.

#### PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER'S ACT - AMENDMENTS

636. Mr MENSAROS to the Premier:

In view of the comments by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations in his 30 June 1989 report regarding problems relating to his jurisdiction, will the Premier inform the House when it can be expected that amendments to the Parliamentary Commissioner's Act, particularly to the schedule, will be introduced?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

This year.

#### PRINTING - GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

640. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister representing the Minister for Services:

What approximate proportion of the total printing work by Government departments and instrumentalities is being done by -

- (a) the State Printing Division;
- (b) private printers receiving commissions from the State Printing Division;
- (c) in-house printing within Government departments or instrumentalities;
- (d) private printers receiving commissions directly from Government departments or instrumentalities;
- (e) private printers through the Tender Board?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (a) Proportion unknown. However, value of public sector printing work carried out by the State Printing Division during 1988-89 was \$17.832 million - not including plain paper products.
- (b) Proportion unknown. However, value of work passed on to the private sector by the State Printing Division during 1988-89 was \$4.566 million.
- (c) Not known.
- (d) Proportion unknown, but estimated to be 50 per cent.
- (e) None.

#### TRANSPORT - LEGISLATION

##### *Motor Vehicle Registration Revenue - Federal Control Reports*

644. Mr NICHOLLS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) (a) Is the Minister aware of any State or Federal Government reports advocating Federal Government control of transport legislation and/or revenue raising from registration of vehicles;
- (b) if so, how many reports are there;
- (c) who compiled the report(s);
- (d) who initiated the report(s)?
- (2) How much revenue will be lost to the Federal Government under such a proposal?
- (3) How much revenue is raised by the Federal Government currently, through various taxes placed on Western Australians, per annum?
- (4) How much direct funding is returned to Western Australia for -
  - (a) road funding (capital works);

- (b) road maintenance funding;
- (c) other?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) One.
- (c) The Inter-State Commission.
- (d) Hon Bob Brown, Minister for Land Transport.
- (2) The State Government revenues that would potentially be lost to the Federal Government are the State fuel levy and vehicle registration fees. The Budget estimates for these items in 1989-90 are \$130 million and \$78.7 million respectively. However, under the Inter-State Commission's proposals, States would receive additional Commonwealth funding which would have to be taken into account in determining the overall impact on State finances.
- (3) The Commonwealth Government raises revenue from a wide range of taxes such as income tax, sales tax and excise duties. Information on the amount raised by these taxes on a State by State basis would have to be obtained from the Federal Treasurer.
- (4) (a)-(b) The Budget estimates of Commonwealth road funding to Western Australia in 1989-90 is \$160.7 million. The allocation of these funds between capital works and maintenance depends upon conditions imposed by the Commonwealth on the various categories of funding and on the road needs assessed by the Main Roads Department.
- (c) Western Australia receives general revenue grants from the Commonwealth and a wide range of specific purpose payments. Details of these payments can be obtained from the State Budget papers.

#### TIMBER - MILLING ROYALTY PAYMENTS

*Conservation and Land Management Policy*

648. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Can the Minister outline the Department of Conservation and Land Management's policy and schedule regarding the charging of royalty payments on milling timber?
- (2) Are all milling companies charged at the same rate, and if there is a difference, what is the reason for the differentiation?
- (3) Can the Minister confirm that the small sawmillers obtain up to 60 per cent recovery rate, whereas Bunnings recovers 40 per cent from first grade karri logs?
- (4) Can the Minister confirm the assertion of the Australian Conservation Foundation that if Bunnings improved its recovery rate from first grade karri logs by 20 per cent the area of old growth forest now allocated for clear-felling would be nearly halved?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes. The Department of Conservation and Land Management fulfils the Government's policy on royalties for logs. Royalties are set using the principle that the cost of growing the resource must at least be covered by the return from the timber harvested. This principle is used to arrive at a target royalty for each timber species and grade of log. The various cost components for growing forests are identified. Royalties are designed to recover these costs and to provide a return to the Government on the capital invested in growing the forest. The latter component is referred to as the internal rate of return (IRR). Details of the system of royalty calculations are contained in the Timber Strategy, part 8, pages s67-70.

The present royalties for the major species and log products are -

	Jarrah \$/M3	Karri \$/M3	Marri \$/M3	Pine \$/M3
Premium Grade	\$73.20	\$72.97	-	\$74.02
First Grade	\$28.48	\$34.00	\$12.00	\$60.29
Second Grade	\$18.27	\$24.23	\$12.00	\$39.33
Third Grade	\$12.00	\$12.00	-	\$26.91
Small (regrowth)	\$18.27	\$25.87	\$25.87	\$19.54
Industrial	\$7.00	\$10.29	\$10.29	\$8.39

- (2) No. Some mills accept smaller logs as first grade logs. The applicable target royalty for the species and grade of log being sold is used as an upset royalty for logs to be sold by public tender or auction. Where companies are successful at the sale, the royalty paid is that bid. In most cases, an amount higher than the target royalty has been obtained. When comparing royalties, members should ensure that they are comparing the royalty for the same grade of log.
- (3) No. Raw recovery figures quoted are often misleading because different companies record different products. For example, one mill claims it obtains 100 per cent recovery from its logs because it sells everything, even bark and sawdust.
- (4) No. The member may be interested to note that over the last five years the annual area cut over in the karri forest has been reduced by over 40 per cent due to improvements in utilisation. Massive capital investments are at present taking place in the timber industry as a result of the long term contracts for logs that have been concluded. I have no doubt that further improvements will occur in the future.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### JUVENILE OFFENDERS - OPPOSITION PROPOSALS

#### *Premier's Rejection*

78. Mr MacKINNON to the Premier:

- (1) Can the Premier explain why in 1988 she was a member of the Cabinet which -
  - (a) rejected moves to end the unlimited number of dismissals in juvenile courts;
  - (b) opposed moves to ensure that juvenile offenders would pay some form of restitution; and
  - (c) opposed moves to make parents take more responsibility for their children by insisting that parents must accompany their children to court?
- (2) Will she now support each of those moves as proposed by the Opposition as well as the amendments to strengthen the Bail Act as outlined by the Opposition?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

Unless my recollection serves me wrongly, the specific moves referred to by the Leader of the Opposition were not dealt with by Cabinet in those terms. Nonetheless, it is important to say that it is possible under the existing regulations and laws to insist on the payment of restitution. What I tried to say to members last night is that it is very important that we look at a range of measures, some of which were suggested by the Opposition and some of which were just outlined by the Leader of the Opposition. We have not

precluded the endorsement of any set of proposals. I announced last week a range of measures to ensure that re-education and training of offenders is a critical part of any detention program. I know the member for Cottesloe holds the view that we should use training institutions, and the Minister for Justice indicated yesterday that the Government would be allocating funds for that purpose.

Mr MacKinnon: He did not!

Dr LAWRENCE: I understand that he did. It is important that young people are exposed to the results of their crime. Paying restitution, directly or indirectly, is one means of doing that; however, in some cases a direct payment is not in a sense a punishment for if a child comes from a wealthy family, his or her parents will almost certainly be able pay that restitution and the consequences for the child will be minimal. For a family in poverty that restitution could be extremely difficult to meet and would result in further punishment because of that poverty rather than for the effects of the crime. However, that is one option. Another option is to ensure that people see the results of their crime. They may be asked to take part in a rehabilitation program to bring home exactly what they have done. In some cases this may involve assisting the victim of the crime in repairing the damage done. These are all excellent suggestions and ones that should be endorsed by the Parliament.

#### ALCOHOL ADVERTISING - TELEVISION AND RADIO NATIONAL BAN

79. Mr DONOVAN to the Premier:

Will she support a national ban on the television and radio advertising of alcohol?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

Today, when I was presented with the final report of the State Domestic Violence Coordinating Committee, I called for a national ban on television and radio advertising of alcohol. I did so because this is a very serious and topical issue being discussed right across the community.

The medical profession has indicated over recent months it has very strong support for that move.

Mr Hassell: The nanny state!

Dr LAWRENCE: I knew that would be the response from the member for Cottesloe. We, as a community, must examine the consequences of the excessive use of alcohol. I am not concerned about drinking; I do not believe that members of this House should be prevented from having a glass of wine over dinner or a quiet drink with their mates at the bar.

Mr Taylor: Or even a beer at breakfast.

Dr LAWRENCE: I suspect that people who have a beer at breakfast have a serious problem.

There is clear evidence that the excessive use of alcohol, particularly by young people, contributes directly to a range of violence-related matters including domestic violence, assault, car accidents, and other events that we have seen in recent days. Alcohol is a contributing factor to many of our serious violence problems. We have a responsibility, particularly with television and radio advertising, to ensure that young people in our community are not given the view that alcohol can be abused, is an attractive element of their image, or can be part of their lives with impunity. It is a very substantial toxic drug, despite what people think who enjoy a tippie over dinner, and it can have devastating effects on families and on life and limb.

I have put that proposal. It is the Commonwealth Government's responsibility and a principal recommendation of the National Committee on Violence.

## STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE - LEGISLATION AGREEMENT

80. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Finance:

- (1) Will the Minister confirm that the Opposition parties and the Government have reached an agreement on legislation concerning the State Government Insurance Office?
- (2) Will the Minister confirm also that the legislation will include the separation of the boards of the State Government Insurance Office and the State Government Insurance Commission, and provisions to strengthen the Auditor General's role, to ensure that the SGIO's investment will be returned to the direct control of its board, and to ensure that provisions of the Statutory Corporations (Directors' Liability) Bill will be applied to the SGIC board?
- (3) What impact will this have on the commercial operations of the SGIO?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1)-(3)

Members of Parliament from both sides of politics have got together in difficult circumstances to sort out matters which they believe have not been good for this State. On this occasion, the matters considered concerned the State Government Insurance Office and the State Government Insurance Commission. These matters have been a political football in this State for some time.

I was pleased yesterday and last night to sit down with the member for Avon, the Attorney General, Mr Foss and Mr Max Evans from the upper House to try to resolve this issue for the good of the SGIC. I have told the Leader of the National Party and the Leader of the Opposition that I appreciate the support we received from them and from the member for Avon on this matter. I know that the member for Avon has been interested in this matter for some time and we have had the occasional debate on it in this House.

Mr MacKinnon: And there will be further debates.

Mr TAYLOR: What the member for Avon said about the SGIO and the matters that are being taken up by the Government are correct. I believe that the SGIO now has the support of all political parties in what it is seeking to achieve. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there will be further debate on the issue. I am sure that there will be other issues that need to be debated in the future. We will take them on board when they arise.

The decisions made last night are reassuring to the people of Western Australia and I am pleased today that the managing director, Frank Michell, issued a Press statement that he welcomed the support he has received on the issue. I think it is a coup for politics in Western Australia.

Mr Lewis: A coup for the Opposition.

Mr TAYLOR: I am not saying whether it is a coup for either party. It is an excellent opportunity to ensure that the SGIO gets on with the job and again becomes the good insurance company it has been in the past.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have given the call to the member for Kingsley. If the member for Marmion wants the call at the end of this question and answer he should rise to his feet and seek it.

## JUVENILE BAIL - BAIL AMENDMENT (CHILDREN) BILL

81. Mrs EDWARDES to the member for Cottesloe:

- (1) In view of the comments by the Minister for Justice yesterday about the Government's view of juvenile bail problems, is the member concerned about the likely prospects of the Bail Amendment (Children) Bill 1990, which was introduced by him?

(2) Would that Bill alleviate problems of juvenile bail?

(3) If so, how?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(1)-(3)

I thank the member for some notice of her question and for the excellence of its drafting.

Mr Pearce: I am not surprised the Opposition has stopped asking the Government questions and is asking questions of its own members because they are easier marks.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HASSELL: I am pleased to answer this serious question. Yesterday I asked the Minister for Justice a question about this matter and he indicated that the Government would reject Opposition proposals in relation to juvenile bail. He obviously was caught, as he so often is, and was immediately followed by a Dorothy Dix question to the Premier who indicated in the course of her argument that she welcomed the various views of the Opposition in relation to juvenile problems, in which the Government subsequently became interested, given the coming by-elections.

The issue of juvenile bail is a serious one and our Bill is aimed at stopping the practice of its being automatic.

Mr D.L. Smith: It is not automatic.

Mr HASSELL: In practice, it is automatic.

Mr D.L. Smith: Not in law.

Mr HASSELL: The Minister for Justice can speak his legal language if he likes, but we are in the Parliament where we talk in the language that people understand and people in the community say that bail for juveniles is automatic.

Mr D.L. Smith: That is why we have so many juveniles in lockups.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HASSELL: The fact is that a recorded case exists of a juvenile charged with offences for a high speed car chase while on bail for nine previous high speed car chases. The Minister for Justice tells me he does not share the Opposition's concern about the juvenile bail situation.

Parents come to us complaining that they are telephoned by their juveniles who have been charged and released on bail before the parents know the child has been charged. Having been bailed, if the juvenile does not then choose to leave the court and steal a car to drive home, he or she expects the parents to pick them up. The parents are asking to be notified of charges so that they can attend the bail procedure to have their authority enhanced by having the person who has perpetrated the offence submit to the imposition of such things as a curfew.

Mr Taylor: Is this a speech or answer?

Mr HASSELL: Is the Deputy Premier complaining?

Mr Pearce: Not at all.

Mr HASSELL: The Deputy Premier was.

Mr Pearce: He was asking whether it was a speech.

Mr HASSELL: He was complaining. Our bail provisions are important. The Government is wasting question time with its interjections. I hope, in the light of what the Premier said yesterday, she will once again give the message to the Minister for Justice that he is out of touch with the reality of what is happening.



**GOLD - AUSTRALIAN NUGGET GOLD COIN**  
*Production Program*

82. Mr READ to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:

Three years have elapsed since the program to produce the Australian Nugget gold coin began. Can the Minister say whether progress to date is regarded as satisfactory, and what is the outlook for the program?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

I thank the member for some limited notice of the question -

Several members interjected.

Mr TAYLOR: It is a very important issue; in fact so important that an Opposition member asked me a question about it the other day.

It was three years last month since the Australian Nugget was first marketed in Australia and overseas, with the objective of gaining a 10 per cent share of the world market for gold bullion coins within three years. By the end of the second year, a 15 per cent retail share had been attained, and it is expected that when international figures for 1989-90 become available it will be higher than 15 per cent for that financial year. It is pleasing that this has been achieved in a smaller overall market for bullion coins and despite a very poor climate since 1987 for precious metals investment products. As members might be aware, the Nugget is produced in two qualities: Proof and bullion.

Mr Court: Is that an answer to my question that you are reading?

Mr TAYLOR: No; it is not actually. The proof coins are produced in very small numbers of very high quality and sell at a fixed price above the value of the metal they contain. The bullion coins are mass produced and sell at a low mark-up over the value of the metal content. More than 2.2 million Nugget coins have been sold since the commencement of the program. This represents more than 34 tonnes of Australian gold; this is important when one is the member for Kalgoorlie. By volume, almost 90 per cent of the sales have been overseas, generating export income of about \$A600 million. That is a very good result for the Australian Nugget coin program, and is an outstanding result for GoldCorp and for a Government initiative which, in the initial days at least, was criticized by the Opposition.

**ROYAL COMMISSION - LEGISLATION**  
*O'Connor, Mr Terence QC - Opinion Request*

83. Mr FRED TUBBY to the Leader of the Opposition:

- (1) Is it true that yesterday a member of the Premier's staff requested from the Leader of the Opposition's office a copy of the Terence O'Connor, QC opinion on the Royal Commission, legislation relating to which we have given notice of motion to introduce?
- (2) Is it true also that the Government refuses to table its own legal advice on the same matter; and why is this so?

*Point of Order*

Mr THOMPSON: Mr Speaker -

The SPEAKER: I am about to deal with the question anyway, but I will take the point of order.

Mr THOMPSON: The Standing Orders make no provision for dealing with questions without notice; they are controlled strictly by the Speaker. No-one complains about that, but I suggest it is time that the Standing Orders Committee gave consideration to the laying down of some Standing Orders to deal with questions without notice. In respect of questions without notice being directed to people other than Ministers of the Crown -

Mr Watt: Or people who have a Bill on the Notice Paper.

Mr THOMPSON: Yes. There is provision for a question to be asked of a person other than a Minister if that person happens to be the sponsor of a motion or a Bill, but the Standing Orders say that such questions must be on notice. The question asked of the Leader of the Opposition can, quite properly, be asked on notice, but in my view and in my experience a question without notice asked of such a member is not a part of the practice of this House and it certainly is in direct contradiction to Standing Order No 106.

The SPEAKER: I might say, before commenting on the actual points made in your point of order, that I had already commenced discussions with the Clerk to determine whether we could arrange for that precise matter to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Standing Orders Committee because, as you have correctly pointed out, it is a bit vexing in the Standing Orders. However, in order to facilitate the will of the House, until such time as the Standing Orders Committee has had a look at it I propose to continue to allow questions without notice to be directed to Ministers, or members of either side, who actually have a Bill on the Notice Paper and members require to ask that person questions in relation to that matter. I intend to allow that to continue, both on and off notice, until such time as it has been discussed by the Standing Orders Committee.

I am concerned that the question now being asked by the member for Roleystone is a substantial step further down the track from that particular line. While not ruling the question totally out of order, I would like to examine it and give some further consideration to the matter before making a decision.

*Questions without Notice Resumed*

**PROGRAMS - UNDERPERFORMANCE**  
*Ministerial Statement*

84. Mr COWAN to the Premier:

In her ministerial statement the Premier made reference to programs which were underperforming. She said, "I do not need to wait for such a full analysis to know that some programs are underperforming." She went on to give the example of the renewal guarantee scheme program launched in 1988. Can she inform the House if any other programs are underperforming which do not need a full review or analysis for her to inform the House of those programs? If so, which are they?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

The scheme referred to since its initiation had received only one application. That is a fair indication of its underperformance. In other areas members will be aware that in the same statement I indicated that it was time for a restructuring of the Public Service Commission and the Office of Public Sector Management, and the abolition of DOCIT. I indicated how that would be achieved. Those departments have been the subject of an internal examination within my own departments, and the necessary steps have been taken.

We have established an Expenditure Review Committee, one of whose tasks is the forming of a budget to identify whether departments are performing their functions and services in the interests of Western Australia, and whether they are performing them to the best effect. That process will continue, and I hope members of the Opposition will contribute from time to time. I indicated that a large number of agencies and authorities - I think I listed the numbers - needed to be rationalised in some respects. I pulled the Public Service Commission and the Office of Public Sector Management together to streamline and strengthen the Public Service Commission and minimise the amount of duplication. This process is a normal part of the annual review of appropriations.

# JUVENILE OFFENDERS - CAUTIONING SYSTEM

## *Repeat Offender Charges*

85. Mr KOBELKE to the Premier:

I refer to comments in *The West Australian* this morning to the effect that juveniles previously cautioned for offences will now be charged and also to the Premier's statement on Monday that a formal police cautioning system would be introduced. Is she able to clarify the matter?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

I thought it was important to do so before the House because there is an apparent contradiction between the statements made by a senior police officer and by the Government. The discrepancy is explained by the fact that the Government clearly endorses tougher measures for repeat offenders, and that was the light in which the police officer concerned made a statement. However, a formal police cautioning system is to be introduced for minor offences as a result of amendments to the Child Welfare Act.

## ROYAL COMMISSION - LEGISLATION

### *O'Connor, Mr Terence QC - Opinion Request*

The SPEAKER : I have given some consideration to the question asked by the member for Roleystone, and while parts of it are considered to be not entirely appropriate, the first part of the question does appear, on a second reading, to relate to a Bill which has been introduced into this place by the Leader of the Opposition. On that basis I am prepared to allow the question; but I advise members that they should be careful in framing their questions so that this sort of error does not happen again.

86. Mr FRED TUBBY to the Leader of the Opposition:

Is it true that a member of the Premier's staff requested from his office yesterday a copy of the Terence O'Connor, QC opinion on the Royal Commission, legislation relating to which he has given notice of introducing into the Parliament?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

At the outset, let me say to the Premier that the Opposition is gravely concerned about this matter and the fact that one of her staff members approached my office to get a copy of this opinion is a clear indication, firstly, that she had not read the opinion itself, otherwise why should they be asking my office for a copy? Secondly, that the Premier has launched into a major attack on Terry O'Connor, QC from the precincts of this Chamber without reading that opinion; and thirdly, that it highlights the point I have made consistently that if the Premier is to have some credibility on the matter she should table the Government's own opinion on the question. Perhaps the Premier wanted the opinion because it indicates quite clearly that, and I quote -

The only commission which could be in contempt of pending proceedings are those set up by the Executive under the royal prerogative or under a general act of Parliament such as the Royal Commission Act 1968.

Perhaps also the Premier wanted to find and read once again where Mr O'Connor clearly indicated that the proper course of action to take with respect to a Royal Commission would be by Parliament's setting up the commission and that, and I quote -

In particular, it could not be a contempt for the Parliament to pass the Bill proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

But, overriding all of those reasons, the Premier probably wanted to read the final paragraph of the opinion, where it said -

From the foregoing, it is obvious that I believe the Honourable the Premier has misapprehended the state of the law relating to contempt of court.

I would have to say that is an accurate observation and conclusion, and it is not surprising, given that the request for the opinion by the Premier indicates that she has not even read the opinion, so how can she have an opinion that was informed? Why has the Government not tabled the Government's advice? I would say it is because the Government's advice clearly indicates, in line with Mr O'Connor's advice, that the question of contempt is not an issue if the Royal Commission is established on the right forms.

Finally, let the Premier take notice that if she is going to continue the practice of not answering questions but listing them on the Notice Paper and refusing to answer them, the Opposition will continue to highlight that practice for as long as she continues to avoid the question, whether it relates to franking machines, or Royal Commissions, or the 100-odd questions on the Notice Paper that have not been answered. It is the Premier's responsibility to ensure that question time in this House is a proper one and not one where we must resort to the Opposition answering questions in order to get some answers.

ROYAL COMMISSION - LEGISLATION  
*O'Connor, Mr Terence QC - Opinion Request*

87. Mr P.J. SMITH to the Premier:

Can the Premier confirm that the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition in his answer to the previous question are correct?

Mr Hassell: What a joke!

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

I do not think it is a joke at all. A question was asked of the Leader of the Opposition about something a member of my staff was alleged to have done, and I simply want to inform the House that when I first heard the allegation in the question I was not aware of any member of my staff having made such a request because, indeed, I was aware of the content of Mr O'Connor's opinion and I had not instructed anyone to seek that information. What I have established, however - and this is by way of a note from a member of my staff -

Mr Hassell: A phantom of Carmen.

Dr LAWRENCE: If there are duplicates of me around the place, that is possible. The Minister's office for the Legislative Council asked Mr MacKinnon's office for a copy of the O'Connor opinion, possibly not realising that we had one, and I apologise for that. It was actually requested by a member in the other place. I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition got his information from, but it was wrong.

BY-ELECTIONS - FREMANTLE AND MAYLANDS  
*Electoral Rolls Regulation*

88. Mr CLARKO to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

What special actions is the Government taking to ensure, through the Electoral Commissioner, that the electoral rolls in the electorates of Fremantle and Maylands are in order for the forthcoming by-elections, and in particular that any examples of -

- (a) dead people voting,
  - (b) people voting twice,
  - (c) people who have not lived in the electorates for years voting, and
  - (d) postal voting malpractices,
- are pursued vigorously so as to ensure that such practices are stamped out?

Dr GALLOP replied:

It goes without saying that the Electoral Commission will pursue vigorously the issue any allegations regarding postal voting malpractices. In respect of people who pass on, a constant supply of information is handed over to the Electoral Commission by the Registrar of Births Deaths and Marriages and the records are adjusted accordingly.

Mr Trenorden: Months and months behind.

Dr GALLOP: Does the member have evidence for that? Has he written to the Electoral Commissioner about it?

Mr Trenorden: Yes I have.

Dr GALLOP: Then of course the Electoral Commissioner will follow it up.

The possibility of people voting twice is very unlikely in a State election when the final results are recorded and the records are checked.

In respect of people who have been out of the electorate for years, habitation checks are conducted frequently by both the Australian Electoral Commission and the Western Australian Electoral Commission. Through those checks information is found that enables the electoral rolls to be as up to date as they possibly can be. Obviously, there will always be a slight margin for error, given the transience which occurs in our population. But I have great confidence that the independent Electoral Commission created by this Government takes these matters very seriously. We can be assured that the by-elections to be held on Saturday week will be conducted properly, and the results will be recorded properly, so long as those who take part in the elections - that is, the politicians and their friends - do not interfere or try to muck up the process.

#### HOUSING - KEYSTART HOME LOANS SCHEME *Economic Viability*

89. Mrs WATKINS to the Minister for Housing:

Would the Minister comment on statements made by the member for Applecross in yesterday's *The West Australian* about the economic viability of Keystart?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

I thank the member for the question. Indeed, I saw the article in yesterday's *The West Australian* which was headed, "MP attacks Keystart" which reads as follows -

The State Government should stop making false promises about the Keystart housing scheme, according to the Opposition housing and planning spokesman, Mr Richard Lewis.

He said yesterday the Government could not reintroduce Keystart because sustained high interest rates would prevent the economics of the scheme from working.

There can be few statements made by the Opposition spokesman on housing that have caused greater embarrassment to the Opposition than this one. In fact on the very day his comments were reported in *The West Australian*, the Government increased the amount of funds allocated to Keystart by \$100 million. This is in addition to the \$200 million allocated in the first year of the scheme. Keystart has been the most successful scheme initiated by the State Government to assist low income home buyers into their own homes. During the first 12 months of the scheme more than \$183 million was allocated to 2 500 families, all of whom, I am sure, welcomed the opportunity to purchase their own homes. The housing industry has welcomed the Government's initiative; consumers have been calling for the initiative to be extended, and the Government has responded to that by increasing the funds.

Mr Lewis: When?

Mrs HENDERSON: The member was here; he heard the Premier announce that \$100 million would be made available as from now. Homeswest and those involved in the management structure of the scheme are, as of now, collecting together those funds in the private sector for the \$100 million to be loaned to low income home buyers.

In addition, an extra \$200 million has been promised by the State Government as of 1 July. Altogether that extra \$300 million will provide finance for a very large number of home buyers in Western Australia to achieve their aspirations of home ownership.

---